

SECOND ORDER EXPANSION FOR THE NONLOCAL PERIMETER FUNCTIONAL

HANS KNÜPFER AND WENHUI SHI

ABSTRACT. The seminal results of Bourgain, Brezis, Mironescu [8] and Dávila [18] show that the classical perimeter can be approximated by a family of nonlocal perimeter functionals. We consider a corresponding second order expansion for the nonlocal perimeter functional. In a special case, the considered family of energies is also relevant for a variational model for thin ferromagnetic films. We derive the Γ -limit of these functionals as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We also show existence for minimizers with prescribed volume fraction. For small volume fraction, the unique, up to translation, minimizer of the limit energy is given by the ball. The analysis is based on a systematic exploitation of the associated symmetrized autocorrelation function.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and statement of main results	2
2. Autocorrelation functions and energy	6
2.1. Autocorrelation functions	6
2.2. Properties of the energies	11
2.3. Equivalent formulations of the energy	13
3. Proof of the theorems	16
3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1	16
3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3	18
4. Stripes and balls configurations	21
Appendix A. Connection to the results by Dávila	27
Appendix B. Interaction energy of two balls	28
References	29

(H. Knüpfer) UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG, MATCH AND IWR, INF 205, 69120 HEIDELBERG, GERMANY

(W. Shi) 9 RAINFOREST WALK LEVEL 4, MONASH UNIVERSITY, VIC 3800, AUSTRALIA

E-mail addresses: (H. Knüpfer) hans.knuepfer@math.uni-heidelberg.de, (W. Shi) wenhui.shi@monash.edu.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

The seminal results of Bourgain, Brezis, Mironescu [8] and Dávila [18] show that the classical perimeter can be approximated by a family of nonlocal perimeter functionals. In a slightly reformulated setting this implies that for any function $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell, \{0, 1\})$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} |\nabla u| \, dx = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{M_\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_\epsilon(z) \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \frac{|u(x+z) - u(x)|}{2|z|} \, dx dz, \quad (1)$$

for a family of kernels $K_\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $K_\epsilon \in L^1(B_1)$, $K_\epsilon(z) = K_\epsilon(|z|)$ and which asymptotically have a singularity at the origin as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (see (3)–(4) below). Here, \mathbb{T}_ℓ is the flat torus with sidelength $\ell > 0$, Furthermore, M_ϵ is defined by

$$M_\epsilon := \omega_{d-1} \int_0^1 K_\epsilon(t) t^{d-1} \, dt,$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ and where ω_d is the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . In this paper we consider the corresponding second order expansion for the nonlocal perimeter functional, i.e. we consider the family of energies

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) := M_\epsilon \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} |\nabla u| \, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_\epsilon(z) \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \frac{|u(x+z) - u(x)|}{2|z|} \, dx dz. \quad (2)$$

We assume that the kernels satisfy $K_\epsilon \nearrow K_0$ for $\epsilon \searrow 0$ with

$$\int_0^\infty K_0(r) r^{d-1} \, dr = \infty \quad (3)$$

$$\int_\delta^\infty K_0(r) \min\{r^{d-2}, r^{d-1}\} \, dr < \infty \quad \forall \delta > 0. \quad (4)$$

In particular, this includes the following kernels

$$K_\epsilon^{(1)}(r) = r^{-d} \chi_{(\epsilon, \infty)}(r) \quad (5)$$

$$K_\epsilon^{(2)}(r) = r^{-d+\epsilon} \quad (6)$$

$$K_\epsilon^{(3)}(r) = r^{-q} \chi_{(\epsilon, \infty)}(r) \quad \text{for } q > d. \quad (7)$$

We denote the corresponding energies by $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. When $d = 2$, $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon^{(1)}$ is a sharp interface version of a problem from micromagnetism for thin plates with perpendicular anisotropy [26, 29, 34, 32]. In this setting, $\{u = 1\}$ and $\{u = 0\}$ are the magnetic domains where the magnetization points either upward or downward. The interfacial energy penalizes interfaces between the magnetic domains, while the nonlocal term describes the dipolar magneto-static interaction energy between the domains. For $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon^{(2)}$, the nonlocal term in the energy (2) is the so-called fractional perimeter $P_s(\Omega)$ with $s = 1 - \epsilon$ of the set $\Omega := \text{spt } u$ (see e.g. [10, 11, 9]), and the functional is the second order asymptotic expansion of the fractional perimeter as $s \nearrow 1$. The third energy $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon^{(3)}$ shows that our model also includes some cases where the nonlocal term in the energy is more singular in terms of its scaling than the perimeter.

In the first two cases (5)–(6), the nonlocal term and the perimeter term in (2) both formally have the same scaling for $\epsilon = 0$. However, due to the non-integrability of the kernel r^{-d} we have $M_\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$, and both terms in (2) are infinite for $\epsilon = 0$. In our analysis we show that the singularity of these two terms cancels in the leading order, and we calculate the remainder which describes the limiting behaviour of (2) for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Our main result establishes compactness and Γ -convergence for the family of energies (2):

Theorem 1.1. *Let $K_\epsilon \nearrow K_0$ where K_0 satisfies (3)–(4).*

(i) (Compactness) *For any family $u_\epsilon \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ with $\sup_\epsilon \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) < \infty$, there exists $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ and a subsequence (not relabelled) such that*

$$u_\epsilon \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} |\nabla u_\epsilon| \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} |\nabla u| \quad \text{for } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

(ii) (Γ -convergence) $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\Gamma} \mathcal{E}_0$ in the L^1 -topology, where

$$\mathcal{E}_0(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} K_0(|z|) \left(\left| \frac{z}{|z|} \cdot \nabla u(x) \right| \chi_{B_1}(z) - \frac{|u(x+z) - u(x)|}{|z|} \right) dx dz \quad (8)$$

for $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ and $\mathcal{E}_0(u) = +\infty$ otherwise.

In fact, statement (i) of Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of the fact that we have a uniform BV estimate for our family of energies (2) as stated in Proposition 3.1. The Γ -convergence result demonstrates that the functional \mathcal{E}_0 , given in (8), is the second order of the asymptotic expansion for the nonlocal perimeter functional and quantifies asymptotically the error in the approximation (1).

A key observation for our analysis is that both interfacial energy and nonlocal energy can be expressed solely in terms of the autocorrelation function

$$C_u(z) := \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} u(x+z)u(x) dx.$$

As a result the energies \mathcal{E}_ϵ for $\epsilon \geq 0$ can be written in terms of the autocorrelation functions

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{C_u(z) - C_u(0) - z \cdot \nabla C_u(0) \chi_{B_1}(z)}{|z|} K_\epsilon(z) dz$$

for $\epsilon \geq 0$, cf. Proposition 2.6 for the radially symmetrized expression. We note that the new formulated energy has a simpler structure: it is linear in the space of autocorrelation functions. This leads to easier proofs for the Γ -convergence for more general kernels compared with the existing literature, e.g. [32, 12]. We note that the method of autocorrelation function can also be used for a simpler proof of Dávila's result [18], see Appendix A. We have chosen a periodic setting, but our methods can also be used to derive corresponding results for the corresponding full space problem.

While autocorrelation functions are natural and often used tools in physics and stochastic geometry, they seem not have been used in the context of non-local isoperimetric problems before. We note that the idea of linearization of the problem by a change of configuration space also appears in the formulation of quantum field theory as well as in the theory of optimal transport. In both cases the problem gets linear but the configuration space becomes very complex.

We next consider the minimization problem for energies \mathcal{E}_ϵ with prescribed volume fraction, i.e. for some fixed $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we assume

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} u \, dx = \lambda. \quad (9)$$

We first note that for any $\epsilon \geq 0$, the minimization problem has a solution:

Proposition 1.2 (Existence of minimizers). *For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and each $\epsilon \geq 0$ there exists a minimizer u of \mathcal{E}_ϵ in the class of functions $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ which satisfy (9).*

The proof for Proposition 1.2 is based on the uniform BV -bound in Proposition 3.1. Next we note that the energy $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(\chi_\Omega)$ only depends on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ for any set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. In fact, this can be seen from

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) = \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(1 - u) \quad \forall \epsilon \geq 0,$$

which follows from the symmetry property for the autocorrelation function (Proposition 2.3(v)). In particular, the minimal energy for prescribed volume fraction is symmetric with respect to $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ $\forall \epsilon \geq 0$. We thus expect that minimizers for \mathcal{E}_ϵ in the case of the equal volume fraction $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ are equally distributed stripes.

In the following, we discuss properties of minimizers of the limit energy for the special choice (5) or (6) of the kernel, i.e. $K_0(r) = r^{-d}$, and the corresponding energy is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}$. We first prove that when the volume is sufficiently small, the unique minimizer (up to translation) is given by a single ball:

Theorem 1.3 (Ball as minimizer for small mass). *Let $K_0(r) = r^{-d}$. Then there exists $m_0 = m_0(d) > 0$, such that if*

$$\lambda \leq \min \left\{ \frac{m_0}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|}, \frac{\omega_d}{4^d} \right\},$$

the unique, up to translation, minimizer u of $\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}$ in $BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ with constraint (9) is a single ball.

Theorem 1.3 actually holds for a slightly larger class of kernels, cf. Proposition 3.3. The proof relies on the sharp quantitative isoperimetric inequality in [20] and a careful study of the limit energy using the autocorrelation function. The optimality of the ball as minimizers has been shown for related models with interfacial term and competing nonlocal energy such as the

Ohta-Kawasaki energy [27, 28, 24, 7, 19, 33]. The difference in our model in comparison to these previous results is that the nonlocal energy has the same critical scaling as the perimeter, which requires a particularly careful analysis. We note that Theorem 1.3 is concerned with the case of small volume instead of small volume fraction, as the smallness assumption for λ is not uniform in ℓ .

To study the minimizers for small volume fraction, we calculate the energy $\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}$ for periodic stripes and lattice balls. For this, we allow that the centers of the balls are arranged in an arbitrary Bravais lattice which requires a slightly more general formulation of our energy (cf. Definition 4.1). In particular, we show that in $2d$ when the volume fraction is almost equal, equally distributed stripes have strictly smaller energy than all lattice ball configurations:

Proposition 1.4 (Ball vs. stripe patterns). *Let $d = 2$ and $K_0(r) = r^{-2}$. Then there is $c_0 > 0$ such that if $|\lambda - \frac{1}{2}| < c_0$, then the energy of equally distributed stripes is strictly smaller than the energy of periodic ball configurations.*

The precise statement and the proofs are given in Section 4.

Previous literature and related models. We note that isoperimetric problems have been extensively researched in the mathematical community. A prototype model which has been investigated is the sharp-interface Ohta-Kawasaki energy, where the system is described by a sharp interface term together with a nonlocal Coulomb interaction term (or more general Riesz interaction term), see e.g. [2, 3, 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 23, 25, 31]. However, our model is different from these models, as the nonlocal term asymptotically has the same (or higher) scaling as the interfacial energy.

When $u \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2; \{0, 1\})$ and K_ϵ is defined in (5), the energy has been studied by Muratov and Simon in [32], where the authors show among other results the Γ -convergence of the energy. The Γ -convergence for the energies (6) is studied by Cesaroni and Novaga [12]. Our model includes the models considered in both [32] and [12] (in the periodic setting). We generalize some results of these papers, however, with a different strategy of proofs and in a more general setting. Moreover, we characterize the minimizers of the limit energy when the volume is small, and show that in $2d$ stripes have strictly smaller energy than lattice of balls if the volume fraction is close to $1/2$. These have not been considered in [32, 12].

Structure of paper. In Section 2 we introduce the autocorrelation functions, collect and prove some of their basic properties. We write the energy in terms of the autocorrelation function and use it to explore some properties of the energy. We also derive different formulations of the energy. In Section 3, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3. The stripes and balls configurations are studied in Section 4.

Notation. Throughout the paper unless specified we denote by C a positive constant depending only on d . By $\mathbb{T}_\ell := \mathbb{R}^d/(\ell\mathbb{Z})^d$ we denote the flat torus in \mathbb{R}^d with side length $\ell > 0$. We repeatedly identify functions on \mathbb{T}_ℓ with \mathbb{T}_ℓ -periodic functions on \mathbb{R}^d using the canonical projection $\Pi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_\ell$. Similarly, any set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}_\ell$ can be identified with its periodic extension onto \mathbb{R}^d .

Let \mathcal{M} be the space of signed Radon measures of bounded variation on \mathbb{T}_ℓ . For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ we write $\|\mu\| := |\mu|(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$ for its total variation. For any function of bounded variation $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$, we analogously write $\|\nabla u\| = |\nabla u|(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$. By the structure theorem for BV functions we have $\nabla u = \sigma|\nabla u|$ for some $\sigma : \mathbb{T}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. By a slight abuse of notation we sometimes write

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\omega \cdot \nabla u(x)| \, dx := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\omega \cdot \sigma(x)| d|\nabla u|.$$

Given a measurable set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}_\ell$ (or $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$), the Lebesgue measure of Ω is denoted by $|\Omega|$. If Ω has finite perimeter, the perimeter of Ω is denoted by $P(\Omega) := \|\nabla \chi_\Omega\|$. Furthermore, ω_d is the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d and $\sigma_{d-1} = d\omega_d$ is the area of the $(d-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

2. AUTOCORRELATION FUNCTIONS AND ENERGY

In this section we give various different formulations for our energy, in particular in terms of the autocorrelation function.

2.1. Autocorrelation functions. In this section we introduce the autocorrelation function in our setting and show some of properties of the autocorrelation function. At the end of the section, we compute explicitly the autocorrelation function for a single ball and stripes. The autocorrelation function of a characteristic function is defined as follows:

Definition 2.1 (Autocorrelation functions). *Let $\ell > 0$. For $u \in L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell, \{0, 1\})$, we define the autocorrelation function $C_u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by*

$$C_u(z) := \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} u(x+z)u(x) \, dx. \quad (10)$$

Its radially symmetrized version $c_u : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is given by

$$c_u(r) := \int_{\partial B_r} C_u(y) \, dy = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} C_u(r\omega) \, d\omega$$

We can also write the autocorrelation function (10) as $C_u = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} u * \mathcal{I}u$, where $\mathcal{I}u(x) := u(-x)$. We note that both C_u and c_u are dimensionless. Moreover, they are invariant under translation and reflection with respect to the origin.

Autocorrelation functions are widely used in other fields such as physics and stochastic geometry: One common use of these functions is to study spectral properties of observed patterns in theoretical physics (e.g. astrophysics). In the field of stochastic geometry, the autocorrelation function is also called

covariogram or set covariance (cf. e.g. [30] and [4]). A common question in this field is to reconstruct a set from its autocorrelation function. One conjecture is e.g. whether the autocorrelation function for a convex set can characterize the set uniquely up to translation and reflection [30].

We note that the definition of autocorrelation function can be extended to more general configurations:

Remark 2.2 (General periodic configurations). *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a periodicity cell and assume that $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Λ -periodic, i.e. $u(x + \Lambda) = u(x)$. Then the autocorrelation function C_u can be defined by*

$$C_u(z) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[-\ell, \ell]^d} u(x+z)u(x) dx. \quad (11)$$

Alternatively, one can define it by replacing \mathbb{T}_ℓ by the periodicity cell in (10), and it is easy to see that the two definitions coincide. In fact, the definition (11) is also well-defined for more general functions such as almost periodic functions, cf. eg. [16]. The symmetrized autocorrelation function is defined accordingly. Equation (11) shows in particular that C_u (and c_u) do not depend on the choice of periodicity cell.

Some properties of the autocorrelation function are derived in e.g. [21, Prop. 11]. However, otherwise we have not found many results about analytical properties of the autocorrelation function in the mathematical literature. We hence collect some basic properties about C_u in the following proposition:

Proposition 2.3 (Properties of C_u). *Let $u, \tilde{u} \in L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$. Then $C_u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, [0, \infty))$, C_u is \mathbb{T}_ℓ -periodic and $C_u(-z) = C_u(z)$. Furthermore,*

- (i) $C_u(0) = \|C_u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}$
- (ii) $\|C_u - C_{\tilde{u}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|\tilde{u} - u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}$
- (iii) $\|C_u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}^2$
- (iv) $|C_u(z_2) - C_u(z_1)| \leq C_u(0) - C_u(z_2 - z_1) \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
- (v) $C_{1-u} = C_u + 1 - 2\|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}$.

If $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ then $C_u \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Furthermore,

- (vi) $\|\partial_i C_u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|\partial_i u\|, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.
- (vii) $\partial_{ij} C_u = -\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \partial_i u * \mathcal{I} \partial_j u \in \mathcal{M}$ where $\mathcal{I}u(x) := u(-x)$ and

$$\|\partial_{ij} C_u\| \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|\partial_i u\| \|\partial_j u\| \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

Proof. The periodicity and symmetry of C_u follows directly from the periodicity of u and the change of variable $y = x - z$.

(i)-(iv): For (i) we note that $|\mathbb{T}_\ell|C_u(z) = |\Omega^{per} \cap (\Omega - z)|$ for $\Omega := \text{spt } u \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Omega^{per} = \cup_{e \in (\ell\mathbb{Z})^d} (\Omega + e)$. Hence, clearly $C_u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, [0, \infty))$ and takes the maximum at $z = 0$. By the triangle inequality and since $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty}, \|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$, for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |C_u(z) - C_{\tilde{u}}(z)| &\leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \left(\|(u - \tilde{u})(\cdot + z)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)} + \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

The identity (iii) follows directly from Fubini and since u is periodic. Estimate (iv) is given in [21, Prop.5].

(vi): By periodicity and since $|u(x+z) - u(x)| = |u(x+z) - u(x)|^2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} C_u(0) - C_u(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} u(x)^2 - u(x)u(x+z) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} |u(x+z) - u(x)| dx \leq \frac{\|\nabla u\| |z|}{2|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Together with (iv), this yields (vi).

(vii): We choose a sequence $u_\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$ with $\nabla u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{*} \nabla u$ in \mathcal{M} . For $u_\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$ and with the notation $(\mathcal{I}f)(x) := f(-x)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{ij} C_{u_\epsilon}(z) &= \partial_i \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \partial_j u_\epsilon(x+z) u_\epsilon(x) dx = \partial_i \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \partial_j u_\epsilon(y) u_\epsilon(y-z) dy \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \partial_j u_\epsilon(y) \partial_i u_\epsilon(y-z) dy = - \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} (\partial_j u_\epsilon * \mathcal{I} \partial_i u_\epsilon)(z). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We note that (13) with $g := \partial_i u_\epsilon$ and $f := \partial_j u_\epsilon$ defines a bilinear operator $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with $(g, f) \mapsto g * \mathcal{I}f$. Since $\|\mu_1 * \mu_2\|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq \|\mu_1\|_{\mathcal{M}} \|\mu_2\|_{\mathcal{M}}$, we get $\varphi_\epsilon * \psi_\epsilon \xrightarrow{*} \varphi * \psi$ for all $\varphi_\epsilon, \psi_\epsilon \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\varphi_\epsilon \xrightarrow{*} \varphi, \psi_\epsilon \xrightarrow{*} \psi$ in \mathcal{M} . Passing to the limit in the weak formulation of (13) one gets $\partial_{ij} C_u \in \mathcal{M}$ and moreover $|\mathbb{T}_\ell| \partial_{ij} C_u = -\partial_j u * \mathcal{I} \partial_i u$.

(v): Follows directly from the definition. \square

We note some of the assertions in Proposition 2.3 can be easily generalized to the case of $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$ in which case an additional norm $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$ has to be added on the right hand side.

In the following we derive properties of the symmetrized autocorrelation. Similarly, these properties extend to general functions $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$. However, in the general case we have to replace $\|\nabla u\|$ by $\|D_s u\|$ in (v) where $D_s u$ is the jump part of the derivative of u .

Proposition 2.4 (Properties of c_u). *Let $u, \tilde{u} \in L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$. Then $c_u \in C^0([0, \infty))$ and c_u is uniformly continuous. Furthermore,*

$$(i) \quad c_u(0) = \|c_u\|_{L^\infty([0, \infty))} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (ii) \quad & \|c_u - c_{\tilde{u}}\|_{L^\infty([0, \infty))} \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}. \\
 (iii) \quad & |c_u(r_2) - c_u(r_1)| \leq c_u(0) - c_u(r_2 - r_1) \quad \forall 0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 < \infty. \\
 (iv) \quad & \frac{1}{r}(c_u(0) - c_u(r)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \frac{1}{r} |u(x) - u(x + r\omega)| \, dx d\omega \quad \forall r > 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

If $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ then $c'_u \in BV_{loc}((0, \infty))$ and $c'_u(0)$ exists. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (v) \quad & c'_u(0) = -\|c'_u\|_{L^\infty([0, \infty))} = -\frac{\omega_{d-1}}{\sigma_{d-1}} \frac{\|\nabla u\|}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|}. \\
 (vi) \quad & \text{(Asymptotics as } r \rightarrow \infty) \text{ When } d \geq 2 \text{ and } r\ell \geq 1 \text{ we have}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{1}{\ell} |c_u(r) - c_u(0)|^2 + |c'_u(r)| \leq \frac{C}{r^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \ell^{\frac{3d-1}{2}}} \|\nabla u\|^2.$$

(vii) Let $\Omega = \text{spt } u$ with outer unit normal ν . Then for each $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, \infty))$ and with $z := y - x$ we have

$$\int_0^\infty c'_u(r) \varphi'(r) \, dr = \frac{1}{\sigma_{d-1} |\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{(\nu(y) \cdot \frac{z}{|z|})(\nu(x) \cdot \frac{z}{|z|})}{|z|^{d-1}} \varphi(|z|) \, dy dx.$$

Proof. (i)–(iii): Follows from Proposition 2.3(i) by taking the spherical mean.

(iv): Taking the spherical average of (12) and by (i), we get (iv).

(v): By (iv) and [21, Prop. 11] (noting that the identity also holds for periodic functions) the derivative $c'(0)$ exists and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 -c'_u(0) & \stackrel{(iv)}{=} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \frac{1}{r} |u(x) - u(x + r\omega)| \, dx d\omega \\
 & = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\omega \cdot \nabla u(x)| \, d\omega dx = \frac{\omega_{d-1}}{\sigma_{d-1}} \frac{\|\nabla u\|}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For the last identity, we have used that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\omega \cdot e_1| \, d\omega = \frac{2\sigma_{d-2}}{d-1} = 2\omega_{d-1}. \quad (14)$$

To conclude we note that by (iii) we have $\|c'_u\|_{L^\infty([0, \infty))} \leq -c'_u(0)$.

(vi): For $k \in (\frac{2\pi}{\ell}\mathbb{Z})^d$, let α_k be the Fourier coefficient of C_u . Since $C_u(x) = C_u(-x) \in \mathbb{R} \, \forall x \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$, we have $\alpha_{-k} = \alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\alpha_k := \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} C_u(x) e^{-ik \cdot x} \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} C_u(x) \cos(k \cdot x) \, dx.$$

Then

$$C_u(x) = \sum_{k \in (\frac{2\pi}{\ell}\mathbb{Z})^d} \alpha_k e^{ik \cdot x} = \sum_{k \in (\frac{2\pi}{\ell}\mathbb{Z})^d} \alpha_k \cos(k \cdot x). \quad (15)$$

Integrating by parts and since $\|D^2 C_u\| \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \|\nabla u\|^2$ (Prop. 2.3(vii)), we get

$$|\mathbb{T}_\ell|^2 k^2 |\alpha_k| \leq \|\nabla u\|^2 \quad (16)$$

Thus the series (15) is absolutely convergent. Then

$$c_u(r) = \sum_k \alpha_k \oint_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{ik \cdot r \omega} d\omega = \sum_k \alpha_k \int_0^\pi \cos(|k|r \cos \theta) (\sin \theta)^{d-2} d\theta,$$

since $\int_0^\pi \sin(|k|r \cos \theta) (\sin \theta)^{d-2} d\theta = 0$. Note that $\alpha_0 = c(0)^2$ and thus

$$c_u(r) - c_u(0)^2 = (2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{k \neq 0} \alpha_k J_{\frac{d-2}{2}}(r|k|) (r|k|)^{\frac{2-d}{2}}, \quad (17)$$

where J_α are the Bessel functions of the first kind. The decay estimate for $|c_u(r) - c_u(0)^2|$ then follows from the estimate $|J_\alpha(t)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi t}} + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{t})$ for $\alpha \geq 0$ and $t \geq 1$ (cf. [1, 10.17]).

Using the recurrence relation $\frac{d}{dt}(t^{-\alpha} J_\alpha(t)) = -t^{-\alpha} J_{\alpha+1}(t)$ we obtain (the series in (17) is absolutely and uniformly convergent for all $r > 0$ by (16))

$$c'_u(r) \stackrel{(17)}{=} -(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{|k| \alpha_k}{(r|k|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}}} J_{\frac{d}{2}}(r|k|), \quad (18)$$

The decay estimate for (18) then follows analogously as for (17). This completes the proof for (vi).

(vii): For any test function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, \infty))$ we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty c'_u(r) \varphi'(r) dr &= -\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_0^\infty \oint_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \frac{d}{dr} [\omega \cdot \nabla C_u(r\omega)] \varphi(r) d\omega dr \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_{d-1} |\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{|z|^{d+1}} (z, D^2 C_u(z) z) \varphi(|z|) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where we have integrated by parts in the last line. By Proposition 2.3

$$(z, D^2 C_u z) = -\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} (z \cdot \nabla u) * \mathcal{I}(z \cdot \nabla u) \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Since $\nabla u = -\nu \mathcal{H}^{d-1} \llcorner \partial\Omega$ and with $z := y - x$ we then get

$$\int_0^\infty c'_u(r) \varphi'(r) dr = \frac{1}{\sigma_{d-1} |\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{(\nu(y) \cdot z)(\nu(x) \cdot z)}{|z|^{d+1}} \varphi(|z|) dy dx.$$

For $\text{spt } \varphi \in [\delta, \infty)$ the expression above is estimated by $C(\delta) \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty}$. This shows that $c'_u \in BV_{loc}((0, \infty))$. \square

Lemma 2.5 (Autocorrelation functions for balls and stripes).

(i) Let $u = \chi_{B_\rho}$ for some $\rho \in (0, \frac{\ell}{4})$. Then for $r \in [0, 2\rho]$ we have

$$c_u(r) = \frac{2\omega_{d-1}}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \left(\int_{\frac{r}{2\rho}}^1 (1-t^2)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} dt \right) \rho^d,$$




FIGURE 1. Illustration for autocorrelation function $C_u(r)$ for a ball.

(ii) Let $u = \chi_S$, where $S = \cup_{i=1}^k [a_i, b_i] \times [0, \ell]^{d-1}$ is a finite union of stripes. Let $d_0 = \min_i |b_i - a_i| > 0$. Then c_u is affine linear near 0, i.e.

$$c_u(r) = \frac{\|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} - \left(\frac{\omega_{d-1}}{\sigma_{d-1}} \frac{\|\nabla u\|}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \right) r \quad \text{for } r \in (0, d_0).$$

Proof. (i): By invariance and using cylindrical coordinates we have

$$c_u(r) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} |B_\rho \cap B_\rho(re_d)| = 2\omega_{d-1} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^\rho (\rho^2 - s^2)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} ds.$$

for $r \in [0, 2\rho]$ (see Fig. 1) and

$$c'_u(r) = -\frac{\omega_{d-1}}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{4\rho^2} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \rho^{d-1}.$$

(ii): For given S and $r \in (0, d_0)$ we have

$$c_u(0) - c_u(r) = \frac{\ell^{d-1}}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |r\omega \cdot e_1| d\omega \stackrel{(14)}{=} \frac{2\omega_{d-1}\ell^{d-1}}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} r = -c'_u(0)r.$$

Then the claim follows from Proposition 2.4. \square

2.2. Properties of the energies. In this section, we express our energies in terms of the autocorrelation function and use this expression to explore their properties. We first note that by Proposition 2.4 our energies can be expressed in terms of the symmetrized autocorrelation function c_u :

Proposition 2.6 (Energy in terms of c_u). *Let $d \geq 1$. Let $\epsilon \geq 0$ and suppose that K_ϵ, K_0 satisfy (3)–(4). Then for any $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) = \sigma_{d-1} \int_0^\infty (c_u(r) - c_u(0) - rc'_u(0)\chi_{(0,1)}(r)) K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} dr. \quad (19)$$

Furthermore, there is $C = C(K_0, d) > 0$ such that $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) \geq -C$ for $\epsilon \geq 0$.

Proof. We first note that the integral in (19) is well-defined in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$: Indeed, in view of Proposition 2.4(i)(ii) we have $c_u(r) - c_u(0) - rc'_u(0) \geq 0$ and $c_u(0) - c_u(r) \geq 0 \ \forall r > 0$. Thus the integrand is nonnegative in $(0, 1)$ and negative in $(1, \infty)$. This combined with our assumptions (3)–(4) on the kernels K_ϵ and that $c_u \in C^{0,1}((0, \infty))$ gives that the integral (19) is well-defined in \mathbb{R} for $\epsilon > 0$, and is well-defined in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for $\epsilon = 0$. To show the uniform lower bound we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) &\geq -\sigma_{d-1} \int_1^\infty (c_u(0) - c_u(r)) K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} dr \\ &\geq -\sigma_{d-1} \frac{\|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_1^\infty K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} dr \geq -C, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the assumption (4). In view of Proposition 2.4(i)(ii) and using polar coordinates we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) &= -\sigma_{d-1} c'_u(0) \int_0^1 K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-1} dr \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \left[\oint_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} |u(x + r\omega) - u(x)| dx \right] K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} d\omega dr. \end{aligned}$$

Then (19) directly follows from Proposition 2.4(iv). \square

The truncation at $r = 1$ is arbitrary. More generally, we have:

Remark 2.7 (Different truncation). *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. For any $r_0 > 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) &= \sigma_{d-1} \int_0^\infty \left[c_u(r) - c_u(0) - rc'_u(0) \chi_{(0, r_0)}(r) \right] K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} dr \\ &\quad + \sigma_{d-1} c'_u(0) \int_1^{r_0} K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-1} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Although the energies are linear in terms of the autocorrelation functions, they are not linear in u . Indeed, they are sublinear in the following sense:

Lemma 2.8 (Interaction energy). *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. Suppose that $u_1, u_2 \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ have essentially disjoint support, i.e. $u_1 + u_2 \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ and $\|D(u_1 + u_2)\| = \|Du_1\| + \|Du_2\|$. Then the interaction energy*

$$\mathcal{I}_\epsilon(u_1, u_2) := \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_1 + u_2) - \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_1) - \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_2)$$

is non-negative and for $\Omega_i := \text{spt } u_i$, $i = 1, 2$ we have

$$\mathcal{I}_\epsilon(u_1, u_2) = \frac{2}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \sum_{e \in (\mathbb{Z})^d} \int_{\Omega_1 + e} \int_{\Omega_2} \frac{K_\epsilon(|x - y|)}{|x - y|} dx dy.$$

Proof. Let $u := u_1 + u_2$. By assumption, we have $c_u(0) = c_{u_1}(0) + c_{u_2}(0)$ and $c'_u(0) = c'_{u_1}(0) + c'_{u_2}(0)$. Together with $u = u_1 + u_2$ the assertion follows

from the energy expression (19) and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\epsilon(u_1, u_2) &= \sigma_{d-1} \int_0^\infty (c_{u_1+u_2}(r) - c_{u_1}(r) - c_{u_2}(r)) K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} dr \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \left(u(x)u(x+z) - \sum_{i=1,2} u_i(x)u_i(x+z) \right) \frac{K_\epsilon(|x-y|)}{|x-y|} dx dz. \end{aligned}$$

Using the symmetry of the sum and substituting the supports of u_i , we obtain the desired expression for \mathcal{I}_ϵ . \square

The space of functions with finite limit energy is quite complicated: the condition $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell, \{0, 1\})$ is in general only a necessary but not sufficient condition for a configuration to have finite energy. Below we construct a BV function with infinite energy $\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}$ using the nonnegativity of the interaction energy in Lemma 2.8:

Remark 2.9 (*BV-function with infinite energy $\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}$*). Let $(B_{r_k}(x_k))_{k=2}^\infty$ be a sequence of disjoint balls in $\mathbb{T}_\ell \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with radius $r_k = \frac{1}{k(\ln k)^2}$. Let $u := \sum_{k=2}^\infty \chi_{B_{r_k}(x_k)}$. On one hand, it is immediate from $\sum_{k=2}^\infty r_k < \infty$ that $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$. On the other hand, from Lemma 2.8 and the estimate of the energy for a single disk (cf. Lemma 4.4(i) below) we have

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) \geq \sum_{k=2}^\infty \mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u_k) \geq C \sum_{k=2}^\infty (-\ln r_k) r_k = +\infty.$$

We end this section by a remark on the finite energy configurations for $\mathcal{E}_0^{(3)}$:

Remark 2.10 (*Finite $\mathcal{E}_0^{(3)}$ energy configurations*). The family of sets which have finite energy $\mathcal{E}_0^{(3)}$ becomes increasingly smaller as q increases. Indeed, as q getting larger the (symmetrized) autocorrelation function c_u needs to converge faster to its affine approximation at 0 in order to get a finite energy (cf. Proposition 2.6). It follows from the explicit computation of c_u (cf. Lemma 2.5) that, if Ω is a ball and $u = \chi_\Omega$ then $\mathcal{E}_0^{(3)}(u) < \infty$ for $q < d + 2$ and infinite for $q \geq d + 2$. If Ω consists of multiple stripes, then $\mathcal{E}_0^{(3)}(u) < \infty$ for all $q > d$.

2.3. Equivalent formulations of the energy. In this section, we give some further geometric representations of the limit energy \mathcal{E}_0 . These representations are in particular helpful for the calculation of the energy for specific configurations. We note that the assumption $\|K_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \infty$ is used in the proof of Lemma 2.11 below. Hence, the results do not hold for the approximating energies \mathcal{E}_ϵ . Throughout the section $F, G : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ are defined by

$$F(r) := \sigma_{d-1} \int_r^\infty K_0(t) t^{d-2} dt, \quad G(r) := \left| \int_1^r F(t) dt \right|,$$

Note that for $K_0(r) = r^{-d}$ we have $F(r) = \sigma_{d-1} r^{-1}$ and $G(r) = \sigma_{d-1} |\ln r|$.

We start with an auxiliary lemma:

Lemma 2.11 (Asymptotics for $r \rightarrow 0$). *Let $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$. Suppose that (3)–(4) hold. If $\mathcal{E}_0(u) < \infty$ then there are sequences $\delta_j, \gamma_j \rightarrow 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} F(\delta_j) (c_u(\delta_j) - c_u(0) - c'_u(0)\delta_j) = 0, \\ (ii) \quad & \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} G(\gamma_j) (c'_u(\gamma_j) - c'_u(0)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i): With the representation (19) of the energy, we have

$$\sigma_{d-1} \int_0^1 (c_u(r) - c_u(0) - c'_u(0)r) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr < \mathcal{E}_0(u) + C_{K_0} \|c_u\|_{L^\infty} < \infty, \quad (20)$$

where we also used (3)–(4). Arguing by contradiction we may assume that there exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$F(r) (c_u(r) - c_u(0) - c'_u(0)r) \geq c, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, \delta_0). \quad (21)$$

Since $F > 0$ and $c_u(r) - c_u(0) - c'_u(0)r \geq 0$, from (21) and (20) as well as the definition of F we get

$$c \int_0^{\delta_0} \frac{-F'(r)}{F(r)} dr \stackrel{(21)}{<} \mathcal{E}_0(u) + C_{K_0} \|c_u\|_{L^\infty} < \infty. \quad (22)$$

Since $F(\delta_0) < \infty$ by the assumption (4) of the kernel K_0 , from (22) one has that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \ln F(r) < \infty$. This is a contradiction, because $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} F(r) \geq \int_0^1 K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr = \infty$.

(ii): Applying integration by parts to (20) from δ_j to 1 and using (i) we have

$$- \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\delta_j}^1 (c'_u(r) - c'_u(0)) F(r) dr < \infty.$$

Analogously as for (i) and using that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} G(r) \geq \int_0^1 K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr = \infty$, one then gets a sequence $\tilde{\delta}_j \rightarrow 0$ which satisfies (ii). \square

With Lemma 2.11 at hand we can express the energy using geometric quantities of $\Omega := \text{spt } u$:

Proposition 2.12 (Equivalent formulations for \mathcal{E}_0). *Let $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ with $\mathcal{E}_0(u) < \infty$. Suppose that (3)–(4) hold. Let $\Omega := \text{spt } u$ and let $H^-(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : (y - x) \cdot \nu(x) \leq 0\}$ for $x \in \partial\Omega$, where ν is the measure theoretic unit outer normal of Ω at x . We use the notation $z := y - x$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad |\mathbb{T}_\ell| \mathcal{E}_0(u) &= -\omega_{d-1} P(\Omega) F(1) \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_{(\Omega \Delta H^-(x)) \cap B_1(x)} \frac{F(|z|)}{|z|^{d-1}} \left| \frac{z}{|z|} \cdot \nu(x) \right| dy dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_{\Omega \cap B_1(x)^c} \frac{F(|z|)}{|z|^{d-1}} \left(\frac{z}{|z|} \cdot \nu(x) \right) dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Let $\tilde{\delta}_j \rightarrow 0$ be any sequence as in Lemma 2.11(ii). Assume that there is a sequence $R_j \rightarrow \infty$ such that $G(R_j)R_j^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{T}_\ell| \mathcal{E}_0(u) &= -\omega_{d-1} P(\Omega) F(1) \\ &+ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{P_j} \frac{G(|z|)}{|z|^{d-1}} \left(\nu(y) \cdot \frac{z}{|z|} \right) \left(\nu(x) \cdot \frac{z}{|z|} \right) dy dx, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $P_j := \{(x, y) \in \partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega^{\text{per}} : \tilde{\delta}_j \leq |x - y| \leq R_j\}$ with $\Omega^{\text{per}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ being the periodic copies of Ω .

Proof. (i): We start with the representation (19) of \mathcal{E}_0 in Proposition 2.6. We note that $F(R) \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$ which follows from (4). Integrating by parts both integrals in (19) (for the first integral of (19) we integrate by parts from δ_j to 1, where the sequence δ_j is from Lemma 2.11(i), and then let $\delta_j \rightarrow 0$) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_0(u) &= c'_u(0)F(1) + \int_0^1 (c'_u(r) - c'_u(0)) F(r) dr + \int_1^\infty c'_u(r) F(r) dr \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Here we have used that the integrand for I_2 is nonnegative and thus the limit exists. We note that $I_1 = -\frac{\omega_{d-1} P(\Omega)}{\sigma_{d-1} |\mathbb{T}_\ell|} F(1)$. To calculate I_2 and I_3 we first express $c'_u(r)$ using the geometric quantities. Using $\nabla u(x) = -\nu(x) \mathcal{H}^{d-1} \llcorner \partial^* \Omega$ and with $\Omega_r(x) := \frac{\Omega - x}{r}$, for a.e. $r > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} c'_u(r) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} \omega \cdot \nabla u(y) u(y - r\omega) dy d\omega \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma_{d-1} |\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \Omega_r(x)} \omega \cdot \nu(x) d\omega dx. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In the limit as $r \rightarrow 0$ we get

$$c'_u(0) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap H^-(x)} \omega \cdot \nu(x) d\omega dx. \quad (26)$$

Inserting (25) and (26) into the integrand of I_2 and by Fubini we get

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_0^1 F(r) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \Omega_r(x)} \omega \cdot \nu(x) d\omega - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap H^-(x)} \omega \cdot \nu(x) d\omega \right) dx dr.$$

Observing that for each $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ fixed, $f(K) := -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap K} \omega \cdot \nu d\omega$ achieves its maximum when $K = H^-(x)$, we have

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_0^1 F(r) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap (\Omega_r(x) \Delta H^-(x))} |\omega \cdot \nu(x)| d\omega dr dx. \quad (27)$$

Similarly, inserting (25) into the integrand of I_3 we have

$$I_3 = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_1^\infty F(r) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \Omega_r(x)} \omega \cdot \nu(x) \, d\omega dr dx.$$

The desired identity then follows from (24), (27) and (27) with $\omega = \frac{y-x}{|y-x|} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with $y \in B_1(x)$ and $r = |y-x|$ and by a change from polar coordinates to Cartesian coordinates.

(ii): We choose a sequence $\tilde{\delta}_j \rightarrow 0$ such that the convergence in Lemma 2.11(ii) holds. Starting point is the representation (24) of the energy. Integrating by parts and using that $G(1) = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tilde{\delta}_j}^1 (c'_u(r) - c'_u(0)) F(r) \, dr + \int_1^\infty c'_u(r) F(r) \, dr \\ &= - \int_{\tilde{\delta}_j}^{R_j} c''_u(r) G(r) \, dr - \left(c'_u(\tilde{\delta}_j) - c'_u(0) \right) G(\tilde{\delta}_j) - c'_u(R_j) G(R_j). \end{aligned}$$

By our choice of sequence, the second term on the right hand side vanishes as $j \rightarrow \infty$. By assumption as well as Proposition 2.4(vi)(v) the term related to the evaluation at R_j vanishes as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Adding the expressions for short-range and long-range interaction together we obtain the claimed equivalent form of the energy. \square

Remark 2.13 (Principal value interpretation of energy formula).

- (i) When $K_0(r) = r^{-d}$, Proposition 2.12(i) holds without the assumption $\mathcal{E}_0(u) < \infty$. This is because $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{c_u(r) - c_u(0)}{r} = c'_u(0)$ for any $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ by Proposition 2.4(v) and $F(r) = \sigma_{d-1} r^{-1}$, then Lemma 2.11(i) holds for any $\delta \rightarrow 0$ without the assumption $\mathcal{E}_0(u) < \infty$. Thus in this special case the energy formula (i) holds for all $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$.
- (ii) The integrand in the energy formula (23) is not absolutely integrable in general if either $\tilde{\delta} = 0$ or $R = \infty$. An example for this is a configuration which consists of stripe domains, cf. Lemma 4.3.

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREMS

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1. We establish the compactness and Γ -convergence of the nonlocal energy $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We first establish the compactness result:

Proposition 3.1 (BV-bound and compactness). *Let K_ϵ, K_0 satisfy (3)–(4).*

- (i) *For $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ there are constants $C = C(K_0, d) > 0$ such that*

$$\|\nabla u\| \leq C(|\mathbb{T}_\ell| \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) + C\|u\|_{L^1}).$$

(ii) For any family $u_\epsilon \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ with $\sup_\epsilon \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) < \infty$, there exists $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ and a subsequence (not relabelled) such that

$$u_\epsilon \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla u_\epsilon\| \rightarrow \|\nabla u\| \quad \text{for } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. (i): We use the expression of the energy $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u)$ in terms of the auto-correlation function in Proposition 2.6. By the assumptions (3)–(4) as well as $K_\epsilon \nearrow K_0$, there are $C_0, C_1 > 0$ and a measurable set $A \subset (0, 1)$, which depends on K_0 , such that for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$C_0 \leq \int_A K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-1} dr \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{A \cup (1, \infty)} K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} dr \leq C_1. \quad (28)$$

Using (28) as well as $c_u(r) - c_u(0) - c'_u(0)r \geq 0$ we then get

$$\begin{aligned} -2c'_u(0) \int_A K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-1} dr &\leq \sigma_{d-1}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) + \int_{A \cup (1, \infty)} (c_u(0) - c_u(r)) K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} dr \\ &\leq \sigma_{d-1}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) + C_1 \|c_u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) + C_1 \frac{\|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)}}{|\mathbb{T}_\ell|}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Proposition 2.4(ii) and (28) for the last estimate. Recalling the expression for $c'_u(0)$ in Proposition 2.4(iv), we thus obtain the desired estimate from the above inequality.

(ii): By (i) we have $\|\nabla u_\epsilon\| \leq C$. By the compactness of the BV functions, there is a subsequence of u_ϵ (which we still denote by u_ϵ) and $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell, \{0, 1\})$, such that $u_\epsilon \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$ and $\|\nabla u\| \leq \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\nabla u_\epsilon\|$. To show the convergence of $\|\nabla u_\epsilon\|$, by Proposition 2.4 it suffices to show $c'_{u_\epsilon}(0) \rightarrow c'_u(0)$. Assume $c'_{u_{\epsilon_j}}(0) \rightarrow \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ along a subsequence. By the lower semi-continuity of the BV-norm we have $\alpha \leq c'_u(0)$. It remains to show that $\alpha \geq c'_u(0)$: By Fatou's lemma and (28) for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_\delta^1 (c_u(r) - c_u(0) - \alpha r) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{d-1}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{K_{\epsilon_j}}(u_{\epsilon_j}) + C_1 \leq C.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.4

$$\int_\delta^1 (c_u(r) - c_u(0) - c'_u(0)r) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr \geq 0.$$

Taking the difference of the above two inequalities yields

$$\int_\delta^1 (c'_u(0) - \alpha) K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr \leq C.$$

Since $\int_0^\infty K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr = \infty$ and $K_0 \geq 0$, then $\int_\delta^\infty K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr \rightarrow \infty$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. This implies that $c'_u(0) \leq \alpha$, particularly one has $-c'_u(0) \geq \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} -c'_{u_\epsilon}(0)$. \square

As a consequence of Proposition 3.1, we get the existence of minimizers for \mathcal{E}_ϵ with prescribed volume fraction:

Proof for Proposition 1.2. Let $\epsilon \geq 0$ be fixed. It follows from Lemma 2.5 (ii) that $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) < +\infty$ if u is a stripe configuration, and furthermore $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) \geq -C$ for all $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ (cf. Proposition 2.6). Hence the infimum of $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u)$ exists and is finite. Let $\{u_k\}$ be a minimizing sequence for \mathcal{E}_ϵ . Then by Proposition 3.1(ii) up to a subsequence $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)$ and $\|\nabla u_k\| \rightarrow \|\nabla u\|$ for some $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$. In particular u satisfies (9). Hence $c_{u_k} \rightarrow c_u$ pointwisely and $c'_{u_k}(0) \rightarrow c'_u(0)$ by Proposition 2.4(ii) and (v). Applying Fatou's lemma (in $(0, 1)$) and dominated convergence theorem (in $(1, \infty)$) to the autocorrelation function formulation of \mathcal{E}_ϵ in Proposition 2.6, we obtain that $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_k)$. This implies that u is a minimizer. \square

At the end of the section we establish the Γ -convergence of \mathcal{E}_ϵ :

Theorem 3.2 (Γ -limit). *Suppose that (3)–(4) hold. Then $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\Gamma} \mathcal{E}_0$ in the L^1 -topology, where \mathcal{E}_0 is given in (8).*

Proof. We use the representation of \mathcal{E}_ϵ from Proposition 2.6, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) = \sigma_{d-1} \int_0^\infty (c_u(r) - c_u(0) - c'_u(0)r\chi_{(0,1)}(r)) K_\epsilon(r)r^{d-2} dr.$$

(i): *Liminf inequality.* We need to show that for any sequence $u_\epsilon \rightarrow u$ in L^1 and $\sup_\epsilon \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \leq C < \infty$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}_0(u) \leq \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon). \quad (29)$$

By Proposition 3.1(i) the sequence u_ϵ is uniformly bounded in $BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$. This together with the L^1 convergence of u_ϵ and Proposition 3.1(ii) yields that $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ and $\|\nabla u_\epsilon\| \rightarrow \|\nabla u\|$. Then by Proposition 2.4 we have $c_{u_\epsilon} \rightarrow c_u$ uniformly and $c'_{u_\epsilon}(0) \rightarrow c'_u(0)$. Moreover, the integrands of the energy are nonnegative for $r \in (0, 1)$. Thus by Fatou's lemma (applied to the integral over $(0, 1)$) and the dominated convergence theorem (applied to the integral over $(1, \infty)$) one has

$$\mathcal{E}_0(u) \leq \sigma_{d-1} \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\infty (c_{u_\epsilon}(r) - c_{u_\epsilon}(0) - c'_{u_\epsilon}(0)r\chi_{(0,1)}(r)) K_\epsilon(r)r^{d-2} dr,$$

which yields (29).

(ii): *Limsup inequality.* Let $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_\ell; \{0, 1\})$ with $\mathcal{E}_0(u) < \infty$. Since $K_\epsilon \nearrow K$ by our assumption, by the monotone convergence theorem for the constant sequence $u_\epsilon := u$ we then obtain $\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u) \leq \mathcal{E}_0(u)$. \square

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3. In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.3, i.e., we show that if the volume $\|u\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_\ell)} = \lambda|\mathbb{T}_\ell|$ is sufficiently small depending on the dimension, then the minimal energy is attained by a single ball. We give the proof for a class of energies which in particular includes the

energy $\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}$ in Theorem 1.3. More precisely, we assume that there is some $M = M(d) > 0$ such that for all $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ we have

$$\int_{\eta}^1 K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr \geq M \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\eta^2} \int_0^{\eta} K_0(r) r^{d+1} dr, \eta \int_{\eta}^1 K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr \right\} \quad (30)$$

We note that the assumption (30) holds for $K_0^{(3)}(r) = r^{-q}$ for $d \leq q \leq d + \alpha_0$ for some $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(d) > 0$. Moreover, (30) together with (33) ensures that the energy of a single ball is finite. Then Theorem 1.3 is a consequence of the next proposition:

Proposition 3.3 (Balls as minimizers for small volume). *Suppose that (30) holds. Then $m_0 = m_0(d, K_0) > 0$ such that if*

$$\lambda \leq \min \left\{ \frac{m_0}{|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}|}, \frac{\omega_d}{4^d} \right\},$$

then the unique, up to translation, minimizer u of \mathcal{E}_0 in $BV(\mathbb{T}_{\ell}; \{0, 1\})$ with constraint (9) is a single ball.

Proof. The proof is based on a contradiction argument. Similar proofs have been made using the sharp isoperimetric deficit (cf. [20]) e.g. in [27, 28, 24, 7, 19, 33]. We adapt these arguments to the autocorrelation function formulation of our model. The novelty in our proof is that the nonlocal term has the same scaling as the perimeter term.

The *isoperimetric deficit* of the bounded Borel set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined by

$$D(\Omega) := \frac{1}{|\partial B|} |\partial \Omega| - 1,$$

where $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the ball with $|B| = |\Omega|$. The sharp estimate on the isoperimetric deficit in [20] entails that

$$\min \left\{ \frac{|\Omega \Delta B|}{|B|} : B \subset \mathbb{R}^d \text{ is a ball with } |B| = |\Omega| \right\} \leq C_d \delta^2, \quad (31)$$

where $\delta := \min\{1, D(\Omega)\}$, noting that the left hand side of (31) is called the *Fraenkel asymmetry* of Ω .

Let $u = \chi_{\Omega} \in BV(\mathbb{T}_{\ell}; \{0, 1\})$ be a minimizer in the class of functions $u \in BV(\mathbb{T}_{\ell}; \{0, 1\})$ which satisfy (9). Let $u_0 = \chi_B$, where $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the ball with $|B| = |\Omega|$ with radius $\rho := (\omega_d^{-1} \lambda |\mathbb{T}_{\ell}|)^{\frac{1}{d}} \in (0, \frac{\ell}{4})$, which realizes the minimality in (31). By the definition of δ we have $\|\nabla u\| \geq (1 + \delta) \|\nabla u_0\|$. If $\delta = 0$ there is nothing to prove, so that we assume $\delta > 0$ in the following noting that $\delta = \delta(\rho)$ in general.

Let $\eta > 0$. By assumption (4) we have

$$X_{\eta} := \int_{\eta}^1 K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $c_u(r) - c_u(0) - rc'_u(0) \geq 0$ and $K_0 \geq 0$, for $\eta \in (0, \rho)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{E}_0(u)}{\sigma_{d-1}} &\geq - \int_{\eta}^1 c'_u(0) K_0(r) r^{d-1} dr - \int_{\eta}^{\infty} (c_u(0) - c_u(r)) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr \\ &= -X_{\eta} c'_u(0) - \int_{\eta}^{\infty} (c_u(0) - c_u(r)) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr \\ &\geq -(1 + \delta) X_{\eta} c'_{u_0}(0) - \int_{\eta}^{\infty} (c_u(0) - c_u(r)) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\mathcal{E}_0(u) \leq \mathcal{E}_0(u_0)$ this implies

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta c'_{u_0}(0) X_{\eta} &\leq \int_0^{\eta} (c_{u_0}(r) - c_{u_0}(0) - rc'_{u_0}(0)) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr \\ &\quad + \int_{\eta}^{\infty} (c_{u_0}(r) - c_u(r)) K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

By Lemma 2.5 and since $\ell \geq 4\rho$, we have $|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}| |c''_{u_0}(r)| \leq Cr\rho^{d-3}$ for $r \leq \frac{\rho}{2}$ and $|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}| (\|c_{u_0}\|_{L^{\infty}} + \rho \|c'_{u_0}\|_{L^{\infty}}) \leq C\rho^d$ for $r \geq \frac{\rho}{2}$. This implies

$$|c_{u_0}(r) - c_{u_0}(0) - rc'_{u_0}(0)| \leq \frac{C}{|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}|} r^3 \rho^{d-3} \quad \forall r \geq 0. \quad (33)$$

Using (33) we then get

$$I_1 \leq \frac{C}{|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}|} \rho^{d-3} \int_0^{\eta} K_0(r) r^{d+1} dr. \quad (34)$$

By an application of Proposition 2.4(ii) we get

$$I_2 \leq \frac{\|u - u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}_{\ell})}}{|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}|} \int_{\eta}^{\infty} K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr \leq \frac{C\delta^2 \rho^d}{|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}|} \int_{\eta}^{\infty} K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr, \quad (35)$$

where we have used the estimate of the isoperimetric deficit (31) and the definition of δ in the last inequality. Combining (32), (34) and (35) and recalling $-c'_{u_0}(0) = \frac{\omega_{d-1}}{|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}|} \rho^{d-1}$ we get

$$\delta \rho^{d-1} X_{\eta} \leq C \rho^{d-3} \int_0^{\eta} K_0(r) r^{d+1} dr + C \delta^2 \rho^d \int_{\eta}^{\infty} K_0(r) r^{d-2} dr.$$

Inserting the assumption (30) to the above inequality and by (4), we obtain

$$\delta X_{\eta} \leq \frac{C}{M} \left(\frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} + \frac{\delta^2 \rho}{\eta} \right) X_{\eta} + C_{d,K} \delta^2 \rho.$$

With the choice $\eta := \delta\rho$, the above inequality gives $X_{\eta} \leq \frac{C(1+\delta)}{M} X_{\eta} + C_{d,K} \delta\rho$. Taking $M = 4C$ and recalling that $\delta \leq 1$ we thus get $X_{\eta} \leq C_{d,K} \rho$. Since $X_{\eta} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$, then necessarily we have $\rho \geq \eta \geq C$ for some $C = C(d, K) > 0$, and hence $\lambda|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}| = \omega_d \rho^d \geq c > 0$ for some constant $c = c(d, K) > 0$. We thus get a contradiction if $\lambda|\mathbb{T}_{\ell}| \leq m_0$ for some $m_0 = m_0(d, K)$ sufficiently small. \square

Remark 3.4. *Proposition 3.3 is for small volume configurations instead of the volume fraction, as the smallness condition on λ is not independent of ℓ . Actually it follows from Lemma 4.4 below that when the volume fraction λ is sufficiently small, periodic balls have smaller energy than a single ball in \mathbb{T}_ℓ for sufficiently large ℓ .*

4. STRIPES AND BALLS CONFIGURATIONS

In this section we explicitly compute the limit energy for stripes and lattice balls for given volume fraction. Throughout this section we assume the kernel is the prototypical $K_0^{(1)}(r) = r^{-d}$. In the previous sections we have used the technical assumption that the configurations are \mathbb{T}_ℓ -periodic for some arbitrary periodicity ℓ . To compare the energy for configurations with fixed volume fraction, it is natural to consider more general configurations. We hence write

Definition 4.1 (Energy for generalized configurations). *Let $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a measurable function such that*

$$C_u(z) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[-R, R]^d} u(x+z)u(x) dx$$

exists. Then we set

$$\mathcal{E}_0(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{C_u(z) - C_u(0) - z \cdot \nabla C_u(0) \chi_{B_1}(z)}{|z|} K_0(z) dz. \quad (36)$$

As noted in Remark 2.2, this energy is independent of the lattice Λ where it arises from. In particular, the definition (36) is consistent with and generalizes the definition of the energy \mathcal{E}_0 in Theorem 1.1(ii). We also note that we analogously get a more general definition of the energies \mathcal{E}_ϵ . However, these will not be used in this article.

Remark 4.2 (Minimization in generalized configurations). *It is natural to study the minimization problem among generalized configurations with fixed volume fraction $\lambda = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[-\ell, \ell]^d} u(x) dx$. One could minimize \mathcal{E}_0 in 4.1 in the space of autocorrelation functions*

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda := \left\{ C_u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : C_u(0) = \lambda \right\}.$$

Here u is any function in $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d; \{0, 1\})$ such that C_u is well-defined. One can show that \mathcal{A}_λ is convex. Even though the limit energy is a linear functional in terms of autocorrelation functions, the problem still seems to be very hard since it is difficult to characterize the space \mathcal{A}_λ .

In the rest of the section we calculate and compare the energy for stripe and ball configurations with the prototypical kernel $K_0^{(1)}(r) = r^{-d}$ (and the corresponding energy is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}$). We recall the generalized harmonic

number H_q with index $q \geq 0$ is given by

$$H_q := \int_0^1 \frac{1-t^q}{1-t} dt. \quad (37)$$

Lemma 4.3 (Energy of stripes). *Let $d \geq 1$. Let Ω be a periodic set of stripes of width $d_0 > 0$, distance $d_1 > 0$ and volume fraction $\lambda := \frac{d_0}{d_0+d_1}$. More precisely, for $a := d_0 + d_1$ let*

$$\Omega := \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (ja, ja + d_0) \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}.$$

Then the following holds:

(i) The function $u := \chi_\Omega$ is \mathbb{T}_a -periodic and

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) = -\frac{2\lambda\omega_{d-1}}{d_0} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}} + \ln \left(\frac{d_0 \sin(\pi\lambda)}{\pi\lambda} \right) \right),$$

where H_q is the harmonic number (cf. (37)).

(ii) Among configurations with prescribed $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ the minimal energy is

$$e_S(\lambda) := \min_{\lambda \text{ fixed, stripes}} \mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) = -2\omega_{d-1} e^{\frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}} \frac{\sin(\pi\lambda)}{\pi}. \quad (38)$$

with optimal width $d_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\pi\lambda}{\sin(\pi\lambda)} e^{-\frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}}.$

Proof. For the calculation we reduce the problem to the calculation of the interaction energy between two parallel slices. Note that the configuration is \mathbb{T}_a -periodic.

(i): By Proposition 2.12(ii) the interaction energy between two parallel slices $\{0\} \times [0, a]^{d-1}$ and $\{\rho\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, $\rho > 0$, with opposite outer normal reads

$$\begin{aligned} I(\rho) &:= \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_a|} \int_{\{0\} \times [0, a]^{d-1}} \int_{\{\rho\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{\ln \frac{1}{|x-y|}}{|x-y|^{d-1}} \frac{y_1 - x_1}{|y-x|} \frac{y_1 - x_1}{|x-y|} dy dx \\ &= -\frac{\rho^2}{2a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{\ln(\rho^2 + |y'|^2)}{(\rho^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} dy', \end{aligned}$$

where we used that the inner integral in the first line above is independent of x and $y_1 - x_1 = \rho$. An explicit calculation yields

$$I(\rho) = -\frac{\sigma_{d-2}}{2a} \int_0^\infty \frac{\ln \rho^2 + \ln(1+t^2)}{(1+t^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} t^{d-2} dt = -\frac{\omega_{d-1}}{a} \left(\ln \rho + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}} \right).$$

By Proposition 2.12(ii) with $I(0) := 0$ and $I(-\rho) := I(\rho)$ for $\rho < 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) &= -\frac{\omega_{d-1}}{a^d} P(\Omega) + \frac{2}{a^d} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(I(ka + d_0) - I(ka) \right) \\ &= -\frac{\omega_{d-1}}{a^d} P(\Omega) + \frac{2}{a^d} \left(I(d_0) + \sum_{k=1}^\infty (I(ka + d_0) - 2I(ka) + I(ka - d_0)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The infinite sum in the first line above is taken in the p.v. sense . Inserting the formula for $I(\rho)$ and since $P(\Omega) = 2a^{d-1}$, we arrive at

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) = -\frac{2\omega_{d-1}}{a} \left(\ln d_0 + 1 + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \ln \frac{(ka + d_0)(ka - d_0)}{(ka)^2} \right).$$

Using $d_0 = \lambda a$ and the Euler's formula $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^2 - \lambda^2}{k^2} = \frac{\sin(\pi\lambda)}{\pi\lambda}$ we arrive at

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) = -\frac{2\lambda\omega_{d-1}}{d_0} \left(\ln d_0 + 1 + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}} + \ln \left(\frac{\sin(\pi\lambda)}{\pi\lambda} \right) \right).$$

(ii): The results follows by a standard calculation. \square

As a competitor we next consider a lattice of balls, arranged on a Bravais lattice. We need to fix some notations: For a set of linearly independent vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $1 \leq i \leq d$ we consider the Bravais lattice

$$\Lambda := \mathbb{Z}v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{Z}v_d$$

By $|\Lambda|$ we denote the volume of the periodicity cell, i.e.

$$|\Lambda| := |\{[0, 1]v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus [0, 1]v_d\}|.$$

The energy for lattice balls can then be formulated in terms of the Appell series F_4 , which in turn can be expressed using the Pochhammer symbols $(a)_n$, given by $(a)_n := 1$ for $n = 0$ and $(a)_n := a(a+1) \cdots (a+n-1)$ for $n \geq 1$. We set

$$\mathcal{H}_d(t) := F_4\left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{d+1}{2}; \frac{d+2}{2}, \frac{d+2}{2}; t, t\right) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{3}{2})_{m+n} (\frac{d+1}{2})_{m+n}}{(\frac{d+2}{2})_m (\frac{d+2}{2})_n m! n!} t^{m+n}. \quad (39)$$

With these notations, we have

Lemma 4.4 (Energy of ball configurations). *Let $d \geq 1$. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Bravais lattice and let $\rho > 0$. Let $\Omega = \bigcup_{q \in \Lambda} B_\rho(q)$ be a periodic set of balls with centers on Λ with radius*

$$\rho \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \{ \text{dist}(p, q) : p, q \in \Lambda \} \quad (40)$$

Then

(i) *The function $u := \chi_\Omega$ is Λ -periodic and we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) = -\omega_{d-1} \left(\ln(2\rho) + 1 - \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}} \right) \frac{|\partial B_\rho|}{|\Lambda|} + I_\Lambda |B_\rho|^2,$$

where H_q is defined in (37) and where

$$I_\Lambda := \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{q \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\mathcal{H}_d\left(\frac{\rho^2}{|q|^2}\right)}{|q|^{d+1}},$$

where the Appell series \mathcal{H}_d is defined in (39).

(ii) Let Λ_0 be a fixed lattice with $|\Lambda_0| = 1$ and let $e_{B, \Lambda_0}(\lambda)$ be the minimal energy among lattices of the form $\Lambda = a\Lambda_0$ for $a > 0$ and for prescribed volume fraction $\lambda = \frac{|B_\rho|}{|\Lambda|}$. Then

$$e_{B, \Lambda_0}(\lambda) = -(2\omega_{d-1}de^{-\frac{1}{2}H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}})\lambda + \sum_{e \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|e|^{d+1}} \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2+\frac{1}{d}}) \quad (41)$$

for all $\lambda \leq \lambda_0$, where $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\Lambda_0)$ is the largest volume fraction which can be realized by balls in the lattice. The radius of the optimal ball configuration is given by $\rho_{\text{opt}} = \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}} + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. (i): We introduce the full-space (radially-symmetrized) autocorrelation function for the single ball $\tilde{u} := \chi_{B_\rho}$ by

$$\tilde{c}_u(r) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{u}(x + r\omega) \tilde{u}(x) dx d\omega$$

Using Lemma 2.8, we decompose the energy as

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{(1)}(u) = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \left(E_{\text{self}}(\rho) + I_{\text{int}}(\Lambda, \rho) \right), \quad (42)$$

Here, E_{self} is the self-interaction energy of a single ball, i.e.

$$E_{\text{self}}(\rho) := \sigma_{d-1} \int_0^1 \frac{\tilde{c}_u(r) - \tilde{c}_u(0) - \tilde{c}'_u(0)r}{r^2} dr + \sigma_{d-1} \int_1^\infty \frac{\tilde{c}_u(r) - \tilde{c}_u(0)}{r^2} dr.$$

Furthermore, the interaction energy of a single ball B_ρ with other copies is

$$I_{\text{int}}(\Lambda, \rho) := \sum_{q \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} \int_{B_\rho(q)} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{d+1}} dx dy$$

Computation of $E_{\text{self}}(\rho)$: By definition we have $\tilde{c}_u(r) = 0$ for $r \geq 2\rho$. Using Remark 2.7 and integration by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\text{self}}(\rho) &= \sigma_{d-1} \left(\tilde{c}'_u(0) \ln(2\rho) + \int_0^{2\rho} \frac{\tilde{c}_u(r) - \tilde{c}_u(0) - r\tilde{c}'_u(0)}{r^2} dr - \frac{\tilde{c}_u(0)}{2\rho} \right) \\ &= \sigma_{d-1} \tilde{c}'_u(0) \left(\ln(2\rho) + 1 + \int_0^{2\rho} \frac{\tilde{c}'_u(r) - \tilde{c}'_u(0)}{\tilde{c}'_u(0)r} dr \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{c}_u(r) = |\Lambda|c_u(r)$ for $0 \leq r \leq 2\rho$, in view of the formula in Lemma 2.5(i) and with the change of variables $r = \rho\sqrt{1-s}$ we get

$$\int_0^{2\rho} \frac{\tilde{c}'_u(r) - \tilde{c}'_u(0)}{\tilde{c}'_u(0)r} dr = -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{1-t^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{1-t} dt \stackrel{(37)}{=} -\frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}$$

Using the formula $\tilde{c}'_u(0) = -\frac{\omega_{d-1}}{\sigma_{d-1}} |\partial B_\rho|$ we arrive at

$$E_{\text{self}}(\rho) = \omega_{d-1} \left(\ln \frac{1}{2\rho} - 1 + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}} \right) |\partial B_\rho|. \quad (43)$$

Estimate of $I_{\text{int}}(\Lambda, \rho)$: For the estimate of $I_{\text{int}}(\Lambda, \rho)$ we note that by (50) in Appendix B we have

$$\frac{I_{\text{int}}(\Lambda, \rho)}{|\Lambda|} = |B_\rho|^2 I_\Lambda.$$

Together with (43) and (42), this yields (i).

(ii): Using $\lambda = \frac{|B_\rho|}{|\Lambda|}$, we can further express E_{self} in terms of λ and ρ as

$$\frac{E_{\text{self}}(\rho)}{|\Lambda|} \stackrel{(43)}{=} \frac{d\omega_{d-1}\lambda}{\rho} \left(\ln \frac{1}{2\rho} - 1 + \frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}} \right), \quad (44)$$

We note that $I_\Lambda = \frac{1}{a^{2d+1}} I_{\Lambda_0}$, where

$$I_{\Lambda_0} := \sum_{e \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\mathcal{H}_d(\frac{\tilde{\rho}^2}{|e|^2})}{|e|^{d+1}}, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \frac{\rho}{a}.$$

Using this and $\lambda = \frac{|B_\rho|}{a^d}$ and $\omega_d \rho^d = \lambda a^d$, the averaged interaction energy can be rewritten in terms of ρ and λ as

$$\frac{I_{\text{int}}(\Lambda, \rho)}{|\Lambda|} = \frac{\lambda^2}{a} I_{\Lambda_0} = \frac{\lambda^{2+\frac{1}{d}}}{\omega_d^{\frac{1}{d}} \rho} I_{\Lambda_0}. \quad (45)$$

From Lemma B.1 and that $\frac{\tilde{\rho}}{|e|} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, which follows from (40), we have that $\sum_{e \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|e|^{d+1}} \leq I_{\Lambda_0} \leq C \sum_{e \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|e|^{d+1}}$. Thus the self-interaction energy in (44) is of leading order in λ for $\lambda \ll 1$ for fixed lattice Λ_0 . By minimization (44) in ρ we obtain

$$\min_{\rho} \frac{E_{\text{self}}(\rho)}{|\Lambda|} = \frac{E_{\text{self}}(\rho_{\text{opt}}^*)}{|\Lambda|} = -(2\omega_{d-1} d e^{-\frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}}) \lambda \quad \text{with } \rho_{\text{opt}}^* := \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}}.$$

Since expression (45) is of lower order in λ , (ii) follows by a standard argument. \square

We compare the minimal energy for stripes and balls in (ii) of Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 with fixed volume fraction λ .

Proposition 4.5 (Stripes vs balls). *Let $K_0^{(1)}(r) = r^{-d}$ and let Λ_0 be a Bravais lattice with $|\Lambda_0| = 1$. Let e_S, e_{B, Λ_0} be defined in (41) and (38). Then there are $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(d, \Lambda_0) > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ independent of Λ_0 such that*

- (i) *if $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, then $e_{B, \Lambda_0}(\lambda) < e_S(\lambda)$.*
- (ii) *if $d = 2$ and $|\lambda - \frac{1}{2}| < \delta_0$, then $e_S(\lambda) < e_{B, \Lambda_0}(\lambda)$.*

Proof. (i): Comparing the leading order (in λ) terms of $e_S(\lambda)$ and $e_{B, \Lambda_0}(\lambda)$ (which is independent of Λ_0) and using that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{e_S(\lambda)}{2\omega_{d-1}\lambda} = -e^{\frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}} > -d e^{-\frac{1}{2} H_{\frac{d-1}{2}}} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{e_{B, \Lambda_0}(\lambda)}{2\omega_{d-1}\lambda}$$

for all $d \geq 2$ we can conclude the assertion.

(ii): For large volume fraction the interaction energy is no more of lower order. Moreover, noting that balls have smaller self-interaction energy than stripes, we have to estimate the lower bound of interaction energy for balls. When $d = 2$, by Lemma 4.3(ii) and since $H_{\frac{1}{2}} = 2 - 2 \ln 2$ we have

$$e_S(\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{2e}{\pi}.$$

Now we estimate the lower bound for the interaction energy among Bravais lattices in \mathbb{R}^2 . Given any Bravais lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $a^2 = |\Lambda|$ and $\Lambda_0 := \frac{1}{a}\Lambda$, from (50) in Lemma B.1 and using that $\lambda a^2 = \pi \rho^2$ we have

$$I_{\text{int}}(\Lambda, \rho) \geq \frac{|B_\rho|^2}{a^5} \sum_{e \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|e|^3} = \frac{\lambda^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\sqrt{\pi} \rho} \sum_{e \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|e|^3}.$$

Thus combining with the self-interaction energy in Lemma 4.4 we have that for $u = \bigcup_{q \in \Lambda} B_\rho(q)$ with $0 < \rho \leq \frac{1}{2} \min_{p, q \in \Lambda} |p - q|$ and $\lambda = \frac{|B_\rho|}{|\Lambda|} = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\mathcal{E}_0(u) \geq -\frac{2}{\rho} \ln(4\rho) + \frac{\zeta(\Lambda_0)}{4\sqrt{2\pi}\rho}, \quad \zeta(\Lambda_0) := \sum_{e \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|e|^3}. \quad (46)$$

By Rankin [35], $\zeta(\Lambda_0)$ attains the minimum at the triangle lattice $H_{\text{nor}} := \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}}(\mathbb{Z}(1, 0) \oplus \mathbb{Z}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}))$ among all $2d$ Bravais lattices with volume 1, and furthermore from its explicit expression we have that $\zeta(H_{\text{nor}}) > 8$. Thus (46) together with the standard minimization gives

$$\min_{\Lambda_0} e_{B, \Lambda_0}(\frac{1}{2}) > \min_{\rho} \left(-\frac{2}{\rho} \ln(4\rho) + \frac{8}{4\sqrt{2\pi}\rho} \right) > e_S(\frac{1}{2}).$$

Since the energy functionals are continuous in λ , then there is $\delta_0 > 0$ independent of Λ_0 such that if $\lambda \in (\frac{1}{2} - \delta_0, \frac{1}{2} + \delta_0)$ stripes have strict smaller energy than any $2d$ lattice balls with the volume fraction λ . \square

Remark 4.6 (Triangular lattice in 2d). *We conjecture that in 2d for sufficiently small volume fraction λ , the triangle lattice H_{nor} has the smallest energy among all lattice of balls. Indeed, we recall from Lemma 4.4(i) that the energy consists of the self-interaction energy and the interaction energy. In view of (44), the self-interaction energy is independent of the lattice Λ_0 . For the interaction energy, cf. (45), we expect that I_{Λ_0} achieves its minimum for the triangle lattice H_{nor} if λ is sufficiently small. To prove such a result one would (at least) need to extend the methods in [6] to the case of non-integrable potentials and we leave it for the future work.*

APPENDIX A. CONNECTION TO THE RESULTS BY DÁVILA

We start by recalling the classical result by Dávila [18]. Let $K_\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a family of nonnegative radially symmetric kernels, which satisfy

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|K_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_\delta)}}{\|K_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \delta > 0. \quad (47)$$

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded set with finite perimeter. Then Dávila showed that for $u := \chi_\Omega$ one has

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\|K_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x+z) - u(x)|}{|z|} K_\epsilon(z) \, dx dz = \frac{2\omega_{d-1}}{\sigma_{d-1}} \|\nabla u\|. \quad (48)$$

Using the autocorrelation function, one can give a simpler proof for (48) as we explain below: Let

$$\tilde{c}_u(r) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x+z) u(x) dz$$

be the (full space) radially symmetrized autocorrelation function. One can easily get the analogous statements as in Proposition 2.4 for the full space symmetrized autocorrelation function. Then it follows from assumptions (47) on K_ϵ as well as the existence of $\tilde{c}'_u(0)$, cf. Proposition 2.4, that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma_{d-1}}{\|K_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}} \int_0^\infty (\tilde{c}_u(0) - \tilde{c}_u(r)) K_\epsilon(r) r^{d-2} \, dr = -\tilde{c}'_u(0). \quad (49)$$

With this at hand, (48) directly follows from writing the above equation in terms of u (cf. Proposition 2.4(iv) and (v) in the non-periodic setting).

We note that the decay of K_ϵ at infinity is not needed when Ω is bounded. Furthermore, instead of $\|K_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ it suffices to normalize the LHS of (48) by $\|K_\epsilon\|_{L^1(B_{r_0})}$ for arbitrary $r_0 > 0$.

Now we comment on our assumptions on the kernels K_ϵ as well as the convergence in (1). Since in this paper we are interested in the second order asymptotic expansion for the perimeter, we assume that $K_\epsilon \nearrow K_0$ as $\epsilon \searrow 0$ for some measurable function $K_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\|K_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \infty$, i.e. (3). Moreover, in the periodic setting one needs to consider the interaction of Ω with its periodic copies, consequently the autocorrelation function $\tilde{c}_u(r) - \tilde{c}_u(0)$ does not decay as $r \rightarrow \infty$ but remains uniformly bounded. Thus in view of (49) we assume $\int_1^\infty K_0(r) r^{d-2} \, dr < \infty$ (cf. (4)) such that the energy functional is well-defined. Under these assumptions (1) holds true, which is an analogue of (48) in the periodic setting and whose proof is a simple modification of that for (48). We also mention that the monotone convergence of K_ϵ is used when we prove the Γ -convergence of \mathcal{E}_ϵ (cf. Theorem 3.2) to avoid the concentration effect. It might be possible to weaken this assumption, but this was not our aim in this paper.

APPENDIX B. INTERACTION ENERGY OF TWO BALLS

In this section we provide the explicit expression for the full-space interaction energy between two.

Lemma B.1 (Interaction energy between two balls in full space). *Let $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for $0 < \rho \leq \frac{|q|}{2}$ we have*

$$\oint_{B_\rho(q)} \oint_{B_\rho(0)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d+1}} dx dy = \frac{1}{|q|^{d+1}} \mathcal{H}_d\left(\frac{\rho^2}{|q|^2}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{H}_d(t)$ is given in (39). In particular, for $C = C_d > 0$ we have

$$\frac{3(d+1)}{d+2} \frac{\rho^2}{|q|^{d+3}} \leq \frac{1}{|q|^{d+1}} \mathcal{H}_d\left(\frac{\rho^2}{|q|^2}\right) - \frac{1}{|q|^{d+1}} \leq \frac{C\rho^2}{|q|^{d+3}}. \quad (50)$$

Proof. By scaling and rotation invariance, we may assume that $\rho = 1$, $\lambda := |q| \geq 2$ and $q = |q|e_1$. We note that the Fourier transform for $\chi_{B_1(0)}$ is

$$\widehat{\chi_{B_1(0)}}(\xi) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{B_1(0)} e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx = |\xi|^{-\frac{d}{2}} J_{\frac{d}{2}}(|\xi|), \quad (51)$$

where J_ν is the Bessel function of first kind. Using that $B_1(0) =: B_1$ and $B_1(q) = B_1 + q$ are disjoint, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= \int_{B_1(q)} \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d+1}} dx dy \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{|h|^{d+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\chi_{B_1}(x+h) - \chi_{B_1}(x))(\chi_{B_1+q}(x+h) - \chi_{B_1+q}(x)) dx dh. \end{aligned}$$

By Plancherel and with the change of variable $h \mapsto \frac{h}{|\xi|}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} X &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot q} |\widehat{\chi_B}(\xi)|^2 \frac{|e^{i\xi \cdot h} - 1|^2}{|h|^{d+1}} d\xi dh \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot q} |\widehat{\chi_B}(\xi)|^2 |\xi| \frac{|e^{ih_1} - 1|^2}{|h|^{d+1}} d\xi dh \\ &= -c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot q} |\widehat{\chi_B}(\xi)|^2 |\xi| d\xi, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where the second equation of (52) follows from the and where

$$c_d := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|e^{ih_1} - 1|^2}{|h|^{d+1}} dh = \frac{\pi^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})}.$$

Plugging (51) into (52) and with $s := |\xi|\lambda$, $\xi_1 = |\xi|\cos\theta$ and $t := \cos\theta$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} X &= -c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi_1\lambda} |J_{\frac{d}{2}}(|\xi|)|^2 |\xi|^{-d+1} d\xi \\ &= -c_d \frac{\sigma_{d-2}}{\lambda} \int_0^\infty |J_{\frac{d}{2}}(\frac{s}{\lambda})|^2 \int_{-1}^1 e^{its} (1-t^2)^{-\frac{d-3}{2}} dt ds \\ &= -\frac{c_d(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\lambda} \int_0^\infty J_{\frac{d-2}{2}}(s) |J_{\frac{d}{2}}(\frac{s}{\lambda})|^2 s^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} ds = \frac{\pi^d}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)^2 \lambda^{d+1}} \mathcal{H}_d(\frac{1}{\lambda^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to [5, eq. (7.1)]. Taking the average of X by dividing ω_d^2 and since $\omega_d = \frac{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(1+\frac{d}{2})}$, we obtain (39). From the definition we see that $\mathcal{H}_d(t)$ is monotonically increasing in t with $\mathcal{H}_d(t) \geq 1 + \frac{3(d+1)}{d+2}t$. This yields the lower bound in (50). The upper bound follows since $\mathcal{H}_d(t) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(t)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. \square

Acknowledgements: HK and WS are very grateful to Felix Otto who brought up the idea of using the autocorrelation function. This project started in discussions with him. H.K. is a member of the Heidelberg STRUC-TURES Excellence Cluster, which is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2181/1 - 390900948.

REFERENCES

- [1] Digital library of mathematical functions.
- [2] E. Acerbi, N. Fusco, and M. Morini. Minimality via second variation for a nonlocal isoperimetric problem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 322(2):515–557, 2013.
- [3] G. Alberti, R. Choksi, and F. Otto. Uniform energy distribution for an isoperimetric problem with long-range interactions. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 22(2):569–605, 2009.
- [4] G. Averkov and G. Bianchi. Confirmation of Matheron’s conjecture on the covariogram of a planar convex body. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 11(6):1187–1202, 2009.
- [5] W. Bailey. Some Infinite Integrals Involving Bessel Functions. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 40(1):37–48, 1935.
- [6] Laurent Bétermin and Hans Knüpfer. Optimal lattice configurations for interacting spatially extended particles. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 108(10):2213–2228, 2018.
- [7] M. Bonacini and R. Cristofori. Local and global minimality results for a nonlocal isoperimetric problem on \mathbb{R}^N . *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 46(4):2310–2349, 2014.
- [8] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis, and P. Mironescu. Another look at Sobolev spaces. In *Optimal control and part. diff. eq.*, pages 439–455. IOS, Amsterdam, 2001.
- [9] Xavier Cabré, Eleonora Cinti, and Joaquim Serra. Stable s -minimal cones in \mathbb{R}^3 are flat for $s \sim 1$. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 764:157–180, 2020.
- [10] L. Caffarelli, J.-M. Roquejoffre, and O. Savin. Nonlocal minimal surfaces. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 63(9):1111–1144, 2010.
- [11] Luis Caffarelli and Enrico Valdinoci. Uniform estimates and limiting arguments for nonlocal minimal surfaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 41(1-2):203–240, 2011.
- [12] A. Cesaroni and M. Novaga. Second-order asymptotics of the fractional perimeter as $s \rightarrow 1$. *arXiv preprint: arXiv: 2001.11415*, 2020.

- [13] R. Choksi and M. Peletier. Small volume fraction limit of the diblock copolymer problem: I. Sharp-interface functional. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(3):1334–1370, 2010.
- [14] R. Choksi and M. Peletier. Small volume-fraction limit of the diblock copolymer problem: II. Diffuse-interface functional. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(2):739–763, 2011.
- [15] M. Cicalese and E. Spadaro. Droplet minimizers of an isoperimetric problem with long-range interactions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(8):1298–1333, 2013.
- [16] Constantin Corduneanu. *Almost periodic oscillations and waves*. Springer, New York, 2009.
- [17] R. Cristoferi. On periodic critical points and local minimizers of the Ohta-Kawasaki functional. *Preprint (2015)*.
- [18] J. Dávila. On an open question about functions of bounded variation. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 15(4):519–527, 2002.
- [19] A. Figalli, N. Fusco, F. Maggi, V. Millot, and M. Morini. Isoperimetry and stability properties of balls with respect to nonlocal energies. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 336(1):441–507, 2015.
- [20] N. Fusco, F. Maggi, and A. Pratelli. The sharp quantitative isoperimetric inequality. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 168(3):941–980, 2008.
- [21] B. Galerne. Computation of the perimeter of measurable sets via their covariogram. Applications to random sets. *Im. Anal. Ster.*, 30(1):39–51, 2011.
- [22] D. Goldman, C. Muratov, and S. Serfaty. The Γ -limit of the two-dimensional Ohta-Kawasaki energy. I. Droplet density. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 210(2):581–613, 2013.
- [23] D. Goldman, C.B. Muratov, and S. Serfaty. The Γ -limit of the two-dimensional Ohta-Kawasaki energy. II. Droplet arrangement via the renormalized energy. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 212(2):445–501, 2014.
- [24] V. Julin. Isoperimetric problem with a Coulomb repulsive term. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 63(1):77–89, 2014.
- [25] V. Julin and G. Pisante. Minimality via second variation for microphase separation of diblock copolymer melts. *J. Reine Angew. Math. (to appear)*.
- [26] J. Kent-Dobias and A. Bernoff. Energy-driven pattern formation in planar dipole-dipole systems in the presence of weak noise. *Phys. Rev. E*, 91:032919, Mar 2015.
- [27] H. Knüpfer and C. Muratov. On an isoperimetric problem with a competing non-local term. I. The planar case. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(7):1129–1162, 2013.
- [28] H. Knüpfer and C. Muratov. On an isoperimetric problem with a competing non-local term. II. The general case. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 67(12):1974–1994, 2014.
- [29] H. Knüpfer, C. Muratov, and F. Nolte. Magnetic domains in thin ferromagnetic films with strong perpendicular anisotropy. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 232(2):727–761, 2019.
- [30] G. Matheron. *Random sets and integral geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1975. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.
- [31] M. Morini and P. Sternberg. Cascade of minimizers for a nonlocal isoperimetric problem in thin domains. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 46(3):2033–2051, 2014.
- [32] C. Muratov and T. Simon. A nonlocal isoperimetric problem with dipolar repulsion. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 372(3):1059–1115, 2019.
- [33] C. Muratov and A. Zaleski. On an isoperimetric problem with competing nonlocal term: quantitative results. *Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom.*, 47(1):63–80, 2015.
- [34] F. Nolte. *Optimal scaling laws for domain patterns in thin ferromagnetic films with strong perpendicular anisotropy*. PhD thesis, University of Heidelberg, 2017.
- [35] R. A. Rankin. A minimum problem for the Epstein zeta-function. *Proc. Glasgow Math. Assoc.*, 1:149–158, 1953.