

# Formation of multiple flocks in a simple nonlocal aggregation model

Carrie Clark\*

October 19, 2021

## Abstract

We consider a family of interaction energies given by kernels having a “well-barrier” shape, and investigate how these kernels drive the formation of multiple flocks within a larger population. We use the dichotomy case of the concentration compactness principle to obtain an energy minimizer, even though minimizing sequences are expected to break apart into flocks which may move far away from one another.

## 1 Introduction

The study of aggregation phenomena in biology (see for example [2][17]) and physics (see for example [18][9]) has produced an interesting class of geometric shape optimization problems. Large scale collective behaviour, such as collaboration and formation into flocks, is shaped at least in part by social forces between individuals.

In this paper we will consider the case where the attractive and repulsive forces between individuals are determined entirely by the distances between individuals. Even in this simple case there are a wide range of complex phenomena. For instance, Carrillo, Figalli and Patacchini [5] have shown that weak repulsion at short distances implies that global minimizers of the interaction energy have finite support. Lim and McCann [13] have shown that for certain power law kernels with mild repulsion and strong attraction, the interaction energy is uniquely minimized by measures that are uniformly distributed on the vertices of a unit simplex. For certain power law kernels, Lopes [15] has shown that minimizers are unique and radially symmetric. For further examples, see [1], [4], and [8].

We focus on the particular phenomenon of formation of multiple flocks within a large population. To this end, we consider interactions that are attractive at short distances, followed by a repulsive “barrier” at mid distances, and neutral at long distances. See Figure 1 for a sketch of such an interaction kernel. The short range attraction motivates individuals to flock together, while the mid range repulsion prevents the entire population from forming into a single flock. In biological applications, the aggregation problem typically involves kernels that are repulsive at short distances, to prevent collisions between individuals, for

---

\*This work was supported in part by NSERC Discovery Grant #311685




Figure 1: Sketch of a “well-barrier” type kernel. The parameters  $d$  and  $w$  represent the depth and width of the attractive well, and the parameters  $h$  and  $W$  represent the height and width of the repulsive barrier.

example see [16]. In this paper, we use a density constraint, to prevent the population from concentrating to a point, and to force the population to spread out as its size increases. So, while there is no short-range repulsion built into the kernel, the density constraint provides what [7] refer to as a hard-core repulsion.

We show that, under certain conditions on the relative sizes of the attractive well and repulsive barrier, there are minimizing sequences of densities that are indicator functions of balls, whose centres get infinitely far apart from one another. To show this, we use the concentration compactness principle to show that minimizers exist in the case where distant individuals have no mutual interaction. The dichotomy case of the concentration compactness principle is our main tool for extracting a minimizer even though an arbitrary minimizing sequence is expected to split into many pieces whose supports may be far away from each other.

## 2 Statement of Main Results

Consider the problem of minimizing the energy

$$\mathcal{E}[\rho] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x - y|) \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy$$

given by an interaction kernel  $K$  over the set

$$\mathcal{A}_m = \{\rho \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N) : 0 \leq \rho \leq 1, \|\rho\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = m\}$$

of densities having total mass  $m$ . This nonlocal interaction energy arises in the study of aggregation in biology, as outlined in [2].

We will be considering a certain family of kernels. The key features of these kernels are that they are attractive at short distances, followed by a repulsive “barrier,” followed by decay at infinity. More precisely, we will only consider kernels  $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  which have a “well-barrier” shape, as given by the following conditions:

**(K1) Well.**  $K(0) < 0$ , and  $K$  is non-decreasing on some interval  $[0, a]$ ,

**(K2) Barrier.**  $K(r) \geq h$  on  $[a, a + W]$ , for some width  $W > 0$ , and

**(K3) Decay.**  $K(r) \geq 0$  on  $(a + W, \infty)$ , and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K(r) = 0$

It turns out, for large mass, minimizers do not exist, but we can construct minimizing sequences that consists of indicators of finitely many disjoint balls that become increasingly far apart.

To get a separation into droplets for general well-barrier type kernels, we will make the following additional assumptions on the relative sizes of the attractive well and repulsive barrier. Let  $d = -K(0)$ , which represents the depth of the well, and let  $w = \inf\{r > 0 : K(r) > 0\}$  be the width of the well.

**(K4)**  $d < h$ , and

**(K5)**  $2w < W$ .

To better understand the underlying geometry, we first consider a toy version of this problem where the kernel  $K$  is  $-1$  on  $[0, 1]$ , followed by  $+\infty$  on an interval  $[1, 1 + W]$ , and zero elsewhere. If  $W \geq 1$ , then any density with finite energy can be easily decomposed into finitely many pieces whose supports have diameter at most 1. However, the geometric problem becomes more complicated when the repulsive barrier is narrower. For the narrower range of forbidden distances, we show in dimension  $N = 1$  and for integer mass  $m > 0$  that the energy is minimized by the indicator of a disjoint union of intervals which do not interact with one another. The most degenerate case is when the width  $W$  of repulsive barrier is zero. In this case we conjecture in dimension  $N = 1$  that the minimal energy corresponds to that of several non-interacting intervals. However, there are examples of configurations which attain this conjectured minimal energy and which cannot be decomposed into pieces that do not interact with one another.

**Theorem 2.1** (Existence of minimizers for compactly supported kernels). *Let  $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded kernel satisfying **(K1)** – **(K5)**. Suppose  $K$  is zero outside of some large radius  $R > 0$ . Then for any  $m > 0$  the infimum*

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho]$$

*is attained by some  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$ . Moreover, if  $K$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, a]$  and  $a + w \leq W - 2w$ , then, up to sets of measure zero, any minimizer has the form*

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)}, \tag{1}$$

*for some centres  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and radii  $r_i > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)}, \mathbb{1}_{B(x_j, r_j)}] = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ .*

The main tool in the proof of Theorem 2.1 is Lions' concentration compactness principle. We start with a minimizing sequence, and concentration compactness tells us that there is a subsequence that is vanishing, tight up to translation, or dichotomous. A common strategy when using concentration compactness is to rule out the possibility of a vanishing

or dichotomous minimizing sequence. The resulting tight minimizing sequence is then used to show that a minimizer exists. In our case, we cannot rule out dichotomy, instead we use it to decompose the minimizing sequence into finitely many pieces whose supports become very far away from each other. Further, each of these pieces are tight up to translation. Then, since the kernel is zero outside of some large radius, these pieces do not actually need to spread out far away from each other in order to reach the minimal energy, allowing us to construct a minimizer. When the kernel  $K$  decays at infinity, minimizers do not generally exist, but we can still consider the minimal energy:

$$E(m) = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho].$$

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded kernel satisfying **(K1)** – **(K5)**. Further, assume  $K$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, a]$  and  $a + w \leq W - 2w$ . Then for any  $m > 0$ ,*

$$E(m) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{E}[\mathbf{1}_{B(0, r_i)}] \tag{2}$$

for some radii  $r_i > 0$ .

We prove Theorem 2.2 by first truncating the kernel  $K$ , which allows us to use the existence Theorem for kernels with no decay. A minimizing sequence is then obtained by sending the pieces of the minimizer for the truncated problem infinitely far away from each other. In 5.3 we analyze this using the notion of generalized minimizers.

In 5.4 we show that the minimal energy grows linearly in  $m$ . In Section 6 we investigate the sizes of the droplets in the specific example where the kernel is a power law near 0. We show that generalized minimizers consist of many balls of the same size, and at most one other smaller ball.

### 3 Preliminaries on shape of minimizers

Throughout this section we consider kernels  $K$  which satisfy the well-barrier conditions **(K1)**-**(K3)**. Additionally, we will need following notation to denote the interaction energy between two densities  $\rho$  and  $\eta$

$$\mathcal{E}[\rho, \eta] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x - y|) \rho(x) \eta(y) dx dy.$$

Using this notation we will write  $\mathcal{E}[\rho + \eta] = \mathcal{E}[\rho] + 2\mathcal{E}[\rho, \eta] + \mathcal{E}[\eta]$ .

#### 3.1 Balls are minimal for small mass

First we show that indicators of balls are minimal for small mass.

**Lemma 3.1.** *There is a mass  $m_0 > 0$ , such that for all  $m \leq m_0$*

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho] = \mathcal{E}[\mathbf{1}_{B(0, r)}] \tag{3}$$

where  $B(0, r)$  is the ball of measure  $m$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $m > 0$  and let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  and let  $r$  be the radius of a ball with measure  $m$ . First note that

$$K(r) \leq \mathbb{1}_{[0,w]}(r)K(r).$$

The right hand side,  $\mathbb{1}_{[0,w]}(r)K(r)$  is non-decreasing, and so we may apply the Riesz rearrangement inequality (see [12] Ch.3), which says that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x-y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| \leq w} \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x-y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| \leq w} \rho^*(x) \rho^*(y) dx dy$$

where  $\rho^*$  is the symmetrically decreasing rearrangement of  $\rho$ . By the bathtub principle (see [12] Theorem 1.14) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x-y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| \leq w} \rho^*(x) \rho^*(y) dx dy \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x-y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| \leq w} \mathbb{1}_{B(0,r)}(x) \mathbb{1}_{B(0,r)}(y) dx dy.$$

Finally, if  $r \leq w$ , then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x-y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| \leq w} \mathbb{1}_{B(0,r)}(x) \mathbb{1}_{B(0,r)}(y) dx dy = \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_{B(0,r)}].$$

So, if  $m$  is small enough so that  $r \leq w$ , we have that  $\mathcal{E}[\rho] \geq \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_{B(0,r)}]$  for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Minimizers have compact support

We adapt Lemma 4.2 in [3] to the case where the kernel  $K$  is allowed to take the value  $+\infty$ . This Lemma is used to prove that minimizing densities have compact support. It also plays a key role in showing that points in the support of a minimizing density cannot be within certain range of distances from one another.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  be a local minimizer of the energy  $\mathcal{E}$ , in the  $L^1$  topology. Then there is a  $\lambda < 0$  such that for almost every  $x$  we have*

$$K * \rho(x) \begin{cases} \geq \lambda, & \text{if } \rho(x) = 0, \\ = \lambda, & \text{if } 0 < \rho(x) < 1, \\ \leq \lambda, & \text{if } \rho(x) = 1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* The proof follows the same method as in [3], with some modifications to account for the kernel  $K$  taking the value  $+\infty$ . Let  $S_0 = \{\rho = 0\}$ , and  $S_1 = \{\rho = 1\}$ . We want to construct a perturbation of  $\rho$ , by adding to  $\rho$  on  $S_0$ , and subtracting on  $S_1$ . Fix any nonnegative, bounded, compactly supported  $\varphi$  and  $\psi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\psi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = 1$ , and  $\varphi = 0$  a.e. in  $S_1$  and  $\psi = 0$  a.e. in  $S_0$ . Note that  $\mathcal{E}[\psi, \rho] < \infty$ , since  $\psi = 0$  almost everywhere in  $S_0$ , and  $\mathcal{E}[\rho] < \infty$ . For now assume that  $\mathcal{E}[\varphi, \rho] < \infty$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and define

$$\varphi_\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\|\varphi \mathbb{1}_{\rho < 1-\epsilon}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}} \varphi(x) \mathbb{1}_{\rho < 1-\epsilon}(x),$$

$$\psi_\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\|\psi \mathbb{1}_{\rho > \epsilon}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}} \psi(x) \mathbb{1}_{\rho > \epsilon}(x).$$

Then  $\eta_t = \rho + t(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_m$ . For sufficiently small  $t > 0$  we have  $\mathcal{E}[\eta_t] \geq \mathcal{E}[\rho]$ , since  $\rho$  is a local minimizer. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{E}[\rho + t(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon)] - \mathcal{E}[\rho]}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{E}[\rho] + 2t\mathcal{E}[\rho, \varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon] + t^2\mathcal{E}[\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon] - \mathcal{E}[\rho]}{t} \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K * \rho(x)(\varphi_\epsilon(x) - \psi_\epsilon(x)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then taking  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , by dominated convergence we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K * \rho(x)\varphi(x) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K * \rho(x)\psi(x) dx. \quad (4)$$

The inequality (4) also holds for any nonnegative  $\varphi, \psi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  that satisfy  $\|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \|\psi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1$ ,  $\psi = 0$  a.e. in  $S_0$ ,  $\varphi = 0$  a.e. in  $S_1$ , and  $\mathcal{E}[\varphi, \rho] < \infty$ , by density of bounded compactly supported functions in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Finally, we can relax the assumption that  $\mathcal{E}[\varphi, \rho] < \infty$ , since (4) is trivial in this case. Now let

$$\lambda = \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K * \rho(x)\psi(x) dx : \|\psi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1, \psi \geq 0; \psi = 0 \text{ a.e. in } S_0 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Then, by (4)

$$\lambda \leq \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K * \rho(x)\varphi(x) dx : \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1, \varphi \geq 0; \varphi = 0 \text{ a.e. in } S_1 \right\}. \quad (6)$$

These two equations tell us that  $K * \rho(x) \leq \lambda$  for a.e.  $x$  such that  $\rho(x) > 0$  and  $K * \rho(x) \geq \lambda$  for a.e.  $x$  such that  $\rho(x) < 1$ , respectively.

To see that  $\lambda < 0$ , suppose for contradiction that  $K * \rho(x) \geq 0$  on a set of positive measure  $A \subset \{\rho > 0\}$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $A$  has small enough diameter so that  $\mathcal{E}[\rho|_A] < 0$ . Then,

$$\mathcal{E}[\rho - \rho|_A] = \mathcal{E}[\rho] - 2\mathcal{E}[\rho, \rho|_A] + \mathcal{E}[\rho|_A] < \mathcal{E}[\rho].$$

This says that we can improve  $\rho$  by removing a small piece of it. We can construct a competitor by adding a small piece at infinity. To make the perturbation from  $\rho$  small, we can pick  $A$  to be as small as we like.  $\square$

Again, following the general argument from [3], we can now prove that local minimizers are compactly supported.

**Lemma 3.3** ( $L^1$  local minimizers have compact support). *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  be a local minimizer of the energy  $\mathcal{E}$ , in the  $L^1$  topology. Then  $\rho$  is compactly supported.*

*Proof.* Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  be a local minimizer of the energy  $\mathcal{E}$ , in the  $L^1$  topology. Then by Lemma 3.2, there is a  $\lambda < 0$  such that, up to a set of measure zero,  $\{\rho > 0\} \subseteq \{K * \rho \leq \lambda\}$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $R > 0$  be large enough so that

$$\int_{|y|>R} \rho(y) dy < \epsilon.$$

Let  $r_0 > 0$  be such that  $K(r) \geq 0$  for all  $r > r_0$ . Then, noting that  $K(r)$  takes its minimum value at  $r = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} K * \rho(x) &\geq \int_{|x-y|<r_0} K(0)\rho(y) dy \\ &> K(0)\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

for all  $|x| > R + r_0$ . Thus

$$\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} K * \rho(x) \geq 0.$$

But, since  $\lambda < 0$ , this means that the set  $\{K * \rho(x) \leq \lambda\}$  is bounded.  $\square$

### 3.3 Subadditivity

For  $m > 0$ , let

$$E(m) = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho].$$

We will show that this is a subadditive function of the mass  $m$ .

**Lemma 3.4** (Subadditivity). *Let  $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded kernel satisfying the “well-barrier” conditions **(K1)** – **(K3)**. Let  $m, n > 0$ . Then,*

$$E(m+n) \leq E(m) + E(n)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{\rho_k^m\} \subset \mathcal{A}_m$  and  $\{\rho_k^n\} \subset \mathcal{A}_n$  be minimizing sequences for  $\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho]$  and  $\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_n} \mathcal{E}[\rho]$ , respectively. From these two sequences we will construct a sequence  $\{\rho_k\} \subset \mathcal{A}_{m+n}$ , for which

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^m] + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^n].$$

Our approach will be essentially to add a translated copy of  $\rho_k^n$  to  $\rho_k^m$ . The translations will be chosen so that the translated  $\rho_k^n$  has small interaction with  $\rho_k^m$ . Since these densities may not be compactly supported, we will consider their restrictions to balls of suitably large radius, and add a small corrective term to ensure the resulting density is in  $\mathcal{A}_{m+n}$ . For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is a radius  $R_k > 0$  for which

$$\int_{B(0, R_k)} \rho_k^m \geq m - \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B(0, R_k)} \rho_k^n \geq n - \frac{1}{k}. \quad (7)$$

Next, define

$$\bar{\rho}_k^m := \rho_k^m|_{B(0, R_k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\rho}_k^n := \rho_k^n|_{B(0, R_k)}.$$

Finally, set

$$\rho_k(x) := \bar{\rho}_k^m + \bar{\rho}_k^n(\cdot + x_k) + \mathbb{1}_{B(x_k, r_k)}$$

where  $r_k \geq 0$  is chosen so that  $\rho_k \in \mathcal{A}_{m+n}$ , and  $x_k = (k + 2R_k)e_1$ . This choice for  $x_k$  means that the supports of these three pieces become arbitrarily far apart as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, we may expand

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] &= \mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^m] + \mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^n] + \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_{B(x_k, r_k)}] \\ &\quad + 2\mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^m, \bar{\rho}_k^n(\cdot + x_k)] + 2\mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^m, \mathbb{1}_{B(x_k, r_k)}] \\ &\quad + 2\mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^n(\cdot + x_k), \mathbb{1}_{B(x_k, r_k)}]. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

First, we will check that the final three terms in (8) approach 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . By our choice of  $x_k$ ,  $\text{dist}(B(0, R_k), B(-x_k, R_k)) \geq k$ , hence

$$|\mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^m, \bar{\rho}_k^n(\cdot + x_k)]| = \left| \int_{B(0, R_k)} \int_{B(-x_k, R_k)} K(|x - y|) \rho_k^n(x + x_k) \rho_k^m(y) dx dy \right| \tag{9}$$

$$= \left| \int_{B(0, R_k)} \int_{B(-x_k, R_k)} K(|x - y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x - y| \geq k} \rho_k^n(x + x_k) \rho_k^m(y) dx dy \right| \tag{10}$$

$$\leq mn \sup_{r \geq k} K(r). \tag{11}$$

To conclude, use the fact that  $K(r)$  tends to 0 as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar estimates can be done for the other two pair interaction terms.

Next, we need to check that the correction term  $\mathbb{1}_{B(x_k, r_k)}$  has arbitrarily small self interaction as  $k$  gets large. By (7),  $|B(x_k, r_k)| \leq 2/k$ . Combining this with the fact that  $K$  is bounded, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_{B(x_k, r_k)}]| &\leq \|K\|_\infty |B(0, r_k)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{4\|K\|_\infty}{k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we need to check that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^m] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^m].$$

We may write

$$\mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^m] = \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^m - (\rho_k^m - \bar{\rho}_k^m)] = \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^m] + \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^m - \bar{\rho}_k^m] - 2\mathcal{E}[\bar{\rho}_k^m, \rho_k^m - \bar{\rho}_k^m] \tag{12}$$

As before, using the fact that  $K$  is bounded and  $\|\rho_k^m - \bar{\rho}_k^m\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1/k$ , it is straightforward to check that the second and third term in the right hand side of (12) both tend to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## 4 A Toy Model

In this section we analyze a toy model version of our problem. Understanding the geometry of the toy model is an important ingredient in understanding the more general situation with kernels satisfying **(K1)**-**(K5)**.



For  $w > 0$ , define the kernel  $K_w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  by

$$K_w(r) = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq 1, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } 1 < r < 1 + w, \\ 0, & \text{if } r \geq 1 + w, \end{cases}$$

Denote the corresponding interaction energy by  $\mathcal{E}_w$ . This kernel is attractive for distances between 0 and 1, followed by a range of strictly forbidden distances. Understanding the geometry of the supports of densities for which  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho]$  is finite will be important in our analysis for a family of more general kernels. Later, we will see in fact that suitable assumptions on the attractive well and repulsive barrier (I think I should have this in the intro so I can easily reference) in fact create a forbidden region associated to the support of minimizers .

The parameter  $w$  represents the width of the range of forbidden distances. If  $w$  is large, it turns out that admissible densities decompose into pieces that are separated by large distances. If  $w$  is small, admissible densities can have many configurations, so the first step in minimizing the energy is to understand the geometry of admissible densities. In dimension 1 we show that if the mass  $m$  is an integer then an optimal density consists of intervals of diameter 1. The key detail is to observe that non-separated configurations cannot allow mass to concentrate too much.

The most extreme situation occurs when  $w = 0$ . For  $w = 0$ , the interaction energy is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_0[\rho] = \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}(|x-y|) dx dy, & |x-y| \neq 1 \text{ whenever } \rho(x), \rho(y) > 0 \\ +\infty, & \text{else .} \end{cases}$$

Again in the 1-dimensional case, if the mass  $m$  is an integer then an optimal density consists of intervals of diameter 1. For non-integer mass, there are examples of configurations having the same energy as many intervals of length 1, and one smaller interval, although it is not clear yet whether this is the minimal energy.

## 4.1 Toy model with large range of unfavourable distances

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume  $w \geq 1$ . Let  $m > 0$ , and write  $m = n|B(0, 1/2)| + \alpha$  for some natural number  $n$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < |B(0, 1/2)|$ . Then,*

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}_w[\rho] = -n|B(0, 1/2)|^2 - \alpha^2.$$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Assume  $w \geq 1$ . If  $m \leq |B(0, 1/2)|$ , then*

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}_w[\rho] = -m^2,$$

*and the infimum is attained by the indicator of a ball, or any density which is supported on a set of diameter no larger than 1. These are the only minimizers*

*Proof.* Fix any  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$ . Note that  $K_w(r) \geq -1$  for all  $r$ . So,

$$\mathcal{E}_w[\rho] \geq - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x)\rho(y) dx dy = -m^2.$$

It is obvious that any  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  that is supported on a set of diameter no greater than 1 will attain this.  $\square$

The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 4.1 is the following decomposition Lemma. We write  $\rho$  as a sum of densities whose supports are of distance at least 2 from each other, and which each have small mass.

**Lemma 4.3** (Decomposition Lemma for  $w \geq 1$ ). *Let  $w \geq 1$ . Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  have finite energy  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho]$ . Then we may decompose  $\rho$  into a finite sum of densities*

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^k \rho_i$$

satisfying the following:

$$\|\rho_i\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq |B(0, 1/2)| \text{ for each } i, \text{ and} \quad (13)$$

$$\text{dist}(\text{supp}(\rho_i), \text{supp}(\rho_j)) \geq 1 + w, \text{ for } i \neq j \quad (14)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  have finite energy. We will first assume that  $\rho$  is compactly supported. First observe that we may define an equivalence relation on  $\text{supp}(\rho)$  by  $x \sim y$  if and only if  $|x - y| \leq 1$ . It is obvious that this relation is reflexive and symmetric. To see that it is transitive, let  $x, y, z \in \text{supp}(\rho)$  be such that  $|x - y| \leq 1$  and  $|y - z| \leq 1$ . By the triangle inequality  $|x - z| \leq 2 \leq 1 + w$ . Then  $|x - z| \leq 1$  since  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho] < \infty$ . Thus, we may decompose  $\text{supp}(\rho)$  into sets of diameter at most 1, noting that each of these must be separated by a distance of at least  $1 + w$ .

If  $\rho$  is not compactly supported, then there is a radius  $R > 0$  so that

$$\int_{B(0, R)} \rho(x) dx \geq m - |B(0, 1/2)|.$$

Let

$$A = \left( \cup_{x \in \text{supp}(\rho) \cap B(0, R)} B(x, 1) \right) \cup B(0, R).$$

Set  $\rho_0 = \rho|_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A}$ . Our choice of  $A$  guarantees that the supports of  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho - \rho_0$  are at a distance of at least  $1 + w$  from each other. Also,  $\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq |B(0, 1/2)|$  and  $\rho - \rho_0$  is compactly supported, so the above argument can be used to decompose  $\rho - \rho_0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Let  $w \geq 1$ . Let  $m = n|B(0, 1/2)| + \alpha$ . Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  have finite energy. Decompose  $\rho$  as in Lemma 4.3. Then,

$$\mathcal{E}_w[\rho] = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{E}_w[\rho_i] + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathcal{E}_w[\rho_i, \rho_j].$$

The second sum is 0 by (14), and we may apply Lemma 4.2 to the first sum since each  $\rho_i$  has mass at most  $|B(0, 1/2)|$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_w[\rho] &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{E}[\rho_i] \\ &\geq - \sum_{i=1}^k \|\rho_i\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $m_i = \|\rho_i\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ . We seek to minimize  $-\sum_{i=1}^k m_i^2$  with the constraints that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k m_i = m, \text{ and } 0 \leq m_i \leq |B(0, 1/2)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k.$$

This amounts to minimizing a concave function over a polytope, and it is now straightforward to check that

$$\mathcal{E}_w[\rho] \geq -n|B(0, 1/2)|^2 - \alpha^2.$$

Finally, to conclude that

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}_w[\rho] = -n|B(0, 1/2)|^2 - \alpha^2,$$

set

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{B(x_i, 1/2)} + \mathbb{1}_{B(x_0, r)},$$

where  $r$  is chosen so  $\alpha = |B(0, r)|$ , and the points  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are chosen so that  $|x_i - x_j| > 2 + w$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Toy model with smaller range of unfavourable distances

We now consider the case where  $0 < w < 1$ , and dimension  $N = 1$ . In this case we show that for integer valued mass  $m$ , the interaction energy is minimal only for indicators of unions of separated intervals of length 1.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $0 < w < 1$ ,  $N = 1$ , and  $m > 0$  be an integer. Then*

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}_w[\rho] = -m.$$

*Moreover,  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  is a minimizer if and only if  $\rho = \mathbb{1}_{I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_m}$  for some intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_m$  each of length 1 such that  $\text{dist}(I_i, I_j) > 1$  for  $i \neq j$ .*

To prove this, we need the following Lemma, which says that admissible densities  $\rho$  cannot fill more than half of interval of length 2. Moreover, it says that if  $\rho$  is spread out in an interval of length 2, then it fills strictly less than half of the interval.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $0 < w < 1$ , and  $N = 1$ . Suppose  $\rho$  has finite energy  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho]$ . If*

$$\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]) > 1,$$

*then*

$$|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]| \leq 1 - w$$

*Proof.* Let  $0 < w < 1$ , and  $N = 1$ . Suppose  $\rho$  has finite energy  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho]$ . Let  $x$  be such that

$$\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]) > 1.$$

First, consider the case that  $\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]$  is a finite union of disjoint intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_k$ . First note that  $(I_j \pm 1) \cap \text{supp}(\rho) = \emptyset$  for each  $j$ . In particular,  $|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x]| \leq 1 - |\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x, x + 1]|$ . From the assumption  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]) > 1$ , there are two intervals, say  $I_1 \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x]$  and  $I_2 \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x, x + 1]$ , that are at distance at least  $1 + w$  from each other. Since  $\text{supp}(\rho)$  consists of finitely many intervals we may also assume without loss of generality that  $I_2$  is the interval closest to  $I_1 + 1 + w$  from the right. See figure 2 for an illustration of  $I_1, I_2$ , and their associated “forbidden regions”,  $I_1 + 1$  and  $I_2 - 1$  which are drawn in red. Note that the interval  $[\inf(I_2 - 1) - w, \inf(I_2 - 1)]$  is also “forbidden” since it contains numbers whose distance from  $I_2$  are between 1 and  $1 + w$ . This interval is drawn in yellow in figure 2.




Figure 2: Two intervals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  and their associated “forbidden regions”

Suppose  $\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x, x + 1] = \cup_{i=2}^l I_i$ . Then the sets  $I_i - 1$  for  $i = 2, \dots, l$  and  $[\inf(I_2 - 1) - w, \inf(I_2 - 1)]$  are all disjoint and

$$|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x]| \leq 1 - w - \sum_{i=2}^l |I_i| = 1 - w + |\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x, x + 1]|,$$

and so

$$|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]| \leq 1 - w.$$

□

We are now ready to prove Theorem. 4.4

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* Let  $0 < w < 1$ , and  $m > 0$  be an integer. Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  have finite energy  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho]$ . Then by Lemma 4.5,  $|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]| \leq 1$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, also using the fact that  $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_w * \rho(x) &= - \int_{x-1}^{x+1} \rho(y) dy \\ &\geq -1. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we may compute the following lower bound for the energy

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_w[\rho] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_w * \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \\ &\geq - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho(x) dx. \\ &= -m.\end{aligned}$$

This value is obtained for any  $\rho = \mathbb{1}_{I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_m}$  where  $I_1, \dots, I_m$  are intervals of length 1 such that  $\text{dist}(I_i, I_j) > 1$  for  $i \neq j$ . On the other hand, if  $\rho$  does not take the form described above, then either

$$\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]) < 1 \text{ for all } x \in \text{supp}(\rho)$$

or there is an  $x \in \text{supp}(\rho)$  such that

$$\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]) > 1.$$

In the first case,  $|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]| < 1$  for all  $x$ , and so the inequalities in our earlier calculations become strict and  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho] > -m$ . In the second case, we may apply Lemma 4.5 to conclude that there is an  $x \in \text{supp}(\rho)$  such that  $|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]| \leq 1 - w$ . Then, there is a set of positive measure containing  $x$  on which  $K_w * \rho > -1$ , and so  $\mathcal{E}_w[\rho] > -m$ .  $\square$

### 4.3 Toy model with distance 1 forbidden

We now consider the 1-dimensional problem with distance 1 forbidden. That is, we consider the energy

$$\mathcal{E}_0[\rho] = \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(|x - y|) dx dy, & \text{if } |x - y| \neq 1 \text{ whenever } \rho(x), \rho(y) > 0 \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

As before, if  $\mathcal{E}_0[\rho] < \infty$ , then we have for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$|\text{supp}(\rho) \cap [x - 1, x + 1]| \leq 1.$$

So, for any  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}_0[\rho] \geq -m.$$

If  $m$  is an integer, then

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}_0[\rho] = -m$$

and the only minimizers are unions of separated intervals of length 1. However, if  $m = n + a$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $0 < a < 1$ , then there are configurations which have the same energy as  $n$  intervals of length 1 and one smaller interval of length  $a$ . If  $m = 1 + a$ , one may take for instance  $\rho = \mathbb{1}_A$  where

$$A = (0, a) \cup \left( \frac{1+a}{2}, 1 \right) \cup \left( 1+a, \frac{3+a}{2} \right) \cup (2, 2+a).$$

The set  $A$  is illustrated in figure 3.




Figure 3: Example of a set  $A$  with  $|A| = m = 1 + a$  with  $\mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_A] = -1 - a^2$

## 5 Proof of Main Results

Throughout this sections we will only be considering kernel which satisfy **(K1)**-**(K5)**.

### 5.1 Separation Lemma

The next Lemma will allow us to conclude that minimizers of the energy  $\mathcal{E}$  cannot have points in their support within a certain range of “forbidden” distances. This is useful because we can analyze the support of a minimizer using the same reasoning as we did for the toy model.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$ . Suppose  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  satisfy*

1.  $K * \rho(x_1), K * \rho(x_2) \leq 0$ , and
2.  $a + w \leq |x_1 - x_2| \leq a + W - w$ .

Then,  $x_1, x_2 \notin \text{supp}(\rho)$ .

*Proof.* For  $i = 1, 2$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq K * \rho(x_i) &= \int_{|x_i - y| \leq w} K(|x_i - y|) \rho(y) dy + \int_{|x_i - y| > w} K(|x_i - y|) \rho(y) dy \\ &\geq -d \int_{|x_i - y| \leq w} \rho(y) dy + h \int_{a \leq |x_i - y| \leq a+W} \rho(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, we obtain

$$\int_{a \leq |x_i - y| \leq a+W} \rho(y) dy \leq \frac{d}{h} \int_{|x_i - y| \leq w} \rho(y) dy \quad (15)$$

This estimate says that  $\rho$  cannot have too much mass in the annulus ..... relative to its mass near  $x_i$ . Also note that for  $i \neq j$

$$\int_{|x_i - y| \leq w} \rho(y) dy \leq \int_{a \leq |x_j - y| \leq a+W} \rho(y) dy \quad (16)$$

since  $a + w \leq |x_1 - x_2| \leq a + W - w$ . Then, for  $i \neq j$  we alternate between using (15) and

(16) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{|x_i-y|\leq w} \rho(y) dy &\leq \int_{a\leq|x_j-y|\leq a+W} \rho(y) dy \\
&\leq \frac{d}{h} \int_{|x_j-y|\leq w} \rho(y) dy \\
&\leq \frac{d}{h} \int_{a\leq|x_i-y|\leq a+W} \rho(y) dy \\
&\leq \left(\frac{d}{h}\right)^2 \int_{|x_i-y|\leq w} \rho(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Then since  $\rho \geq 0$  and  $d < h$ , we must have

$$\int_{|x_i-y|\leq w} \rho(y) dy = 0.$$

□

## 5.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

In this section, we prove existence of minimizers for kernels which are 0 outside of some large radius. The main tool we will use is Lions' concentration compactness principle, which will allow us to deal with the possibility that minimizing sequences can have pieces which get infinitely far away from one another.

To prove this, we will use the concentration compactness principle (Lemma 1.1 in [14]).

**Lemma 5.2** (Concentration Compactness). *Let  $\{\rho_n\}$  be a sequence in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  satisfying*

$$\rho_n \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_n(x) dx = m,$$

for a fixed  $m > 0$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $\{\rho_{n_k}\}$  that satisfies one of the following three properties:

1. (Tightness up to translation) There exists  $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an  $R > 0$ ,

$$\int_{B(y_k, R)} \rho_{n_k}(x) dx \geq m - \epsilon.$$

2. (Vanishing) For all  $R > 0$

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} \int_{B(y, R)} \rho_{n_k}(x) dx = 0.$$

3. (Dichotomy) There exists an  $0 < \alpha < m$ , such that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist  $k_0 \geq 1$ ,  $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , and radii  $R > 0$  and  $R_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$\rho_k^1 = \rho_{n_k}|_{B(y_k, R)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k^2 = \rho_{n_k}|_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(y_k, R_k)}$$

satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_{n_k} - (\rho_k^1 + \rho_k^2)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} &\leq \epsilon, \\ \|\rho_k^1\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} - \alpha &\leq \epsilon, \quad \text{and} \\ \|\rho_k^2\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} - (m - \alpha) &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

for  $k \geq k_0$ .

The statement for the dichotomy case here appears different from the statement [14], but the modification reflects the construction of  $\rho_k^1$ , and  $\rho_k^2$  in [14].

The following Lemma will be used to rule out the vanishing case.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let the kernel  $K$  be bounded and satisfy  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K(r) = 0$ . Suppose  $\{\rho_k\}$  is a sequence in  $\mathcal{A}_m$  that satisfies the vanishing property in the concentration compactness Lemma. Then,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho] = 0$ .*

Note in particular that a minimizing sequence cannot be vanishing, nor can it have a “vanishing part”.

*Proof.* Fix any  $R > 0$ . Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , using the fact that  $\{\rho_k\}$  is vanishing we have for large  $k$

$$\int_{B(y,R)} \rho(x) dx < \epsilon$$

for any  $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . We can now compute

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}[\rho_k]| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x-y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| \leq R} \rho_k(x) \rho_k(y) dx dy \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(|x-y|) \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| > R} \rho_k(x) \rho_k(y) dx dy \right| \\ &\leq \|K\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k(y) \int_{B(y,R)} \rho_k(x) dx dy + m^2 \sup_{r \geq R} K(r) \\ &\leq \|K\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)} m \epsilon + m^2 \sup_{r \geq R} K(r) \end{aligned}$$

The second term of this final sum can be made arbitrarily small since  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K(r) = 0$ .  $\square$

This Lemma is used to extract droplets:

**Lemma 5.4.** *Suppose  $\{\rho_k\}$  is a sequence of densities in  $\mathcal{A}_m$ . If  $\{\rho_k\}$  is tight up to translation, then there is a  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \mathcal{E}[\rho].$$

*Proof.* Follows similar argument as in [6]. By tightness up to translation, there exist  $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a radius  $R > 0$  such that

$$\int_{B(y_k,R)} \rho_k(y) dy \geq m - \epsilon \tag{17}$$



for all  $k$ . By the translation invariance of the energy, without loss of generality we can take  $y_k = 0$  for all  $k$ . Fix any  $1 < q < \infty$ , then  $\{\rho_k\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , so there is a  $\rho \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$  such that  $\rho_k$  converges to  $\rho$  weakly in  $L^q$ .

First, we will verify that  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$ . By (17),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(y) dy = m.$$

To see that  $\rho \geq 0$ , consider the set  $A = \{\rho < 0\}$ . Suppose  $|A| > 0$ , and if  $|A| = \infty$ , replace  $A$  with a subset that has finite measure. Then, by weak convergence we have

$$0 \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_A \rho_k(y) dy = \int_A \rho(y) dy < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore  $|A| = 0$ . Similarly, if we let  $B = \{\rho > 1\}$ , and assume  $|B| > 0$ , we can compute

$$|B| \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_B \rho_k(y) dy = \int_B \rho(y) dy > |B|.$$

Combined, this means that  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$ .

Next, we will prove that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \mathcal{E}[\rho]$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(x) &= K * \rho_k(x), \quad \text{and} \\ G(x) &= K * \rho(x). \end{aligned}$$

By (17),  $\rho_k$  also converges to  $\rho$  weakly in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Then since  $K$  is bounded, this means that  $G_k$  converges to  $G$  pointwise.

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ , and pick  $R > 0$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R)} \rho_k(y) dy \leq \epsilon \tag{18}$$

for all  $k$ . Then compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] - \mathcal{E}[\rho] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_k(x) \rho_k(x) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(x) \rho(x) dx \\ &= \int_{B(0,R)} (G_k(x) - G(x)) \rho_k(x) dx + \int_{B(0,R)} G(x) (\rho_k(x) - \rho(x)) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R)} G_k(x) \rho_k(x) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R)} G(x) \rho(x) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The first term in (19) converges to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  by the bounded convergence theorem. The second term also converges to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  since  $G|_{B(0,R)}$  is an admissible test function, noting that  $\|G\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq m\|K\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ . Thus, for large enough  $k$  we have

$$|\mathcal{E}[\rho_k] - \mathcal{E}[\rho]| \leq 2\epsilon + 2m\|K\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}\epsilon.$$

□

The next Lemma will allow us to separate a minimizing sequence into multiple pieces, in the case where we get a dichotomous subsequence after applying the concentration compactness principle.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Suppose  $\{\rho_k\}$  is a dichotomous sequence in  $\mathcal{A}_m$ . Then, for some  $0 < \alpha < m$  there are sequences  $\{\rho_k^1\}$  and  $\{\rho_k^2\}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{m-\alpha}$ , respectively, such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{E}[\rho_k] - \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^1] - \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^2]) = 0. \quad (20)$$

Moreover if  $\rho_k$  is a minimizing sequence, then

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^1] = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \mathcal{E}[\rho], \quad (21)$$

and

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^2] = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_{m-\alpha}} \mathcal{E}[\rho]. \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* By dichotomy, after perhaps passing to a subsequence, we can find radii  $R_k > 0$  and points  $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$  so that the sequences

$$\rho_k^1 = \rho_k|_{B(y_k, R_k)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k^2 = \rho_k|_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(y_k, R_k + \tilde{R})} \quad (23)$$

satisfy

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int \rho_k^1 = \alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad (24)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int \rho_k^2 = m - \alpha \quad (25)$$

for some  $0 < \alpha < m$ . Note that since  $K(r) = 0$  for  $r \geq R$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}[\rho_k^1, \rho_k^2] = 0.$$

So,

$$\mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^1] + \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^2] + \mathcal{E}[\rho - \rho_k^1 - \rho_k^2] + 2\mathcal{E}[\rho_k^1 + \rho_k^2, \rho - \rho_k^1 - \rho_k^2] \quad (26)$$

Note that as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  the last two terms approach 0 since

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho - \rho_k^1 - \rho_k^2 = m - \alpha - (m - \alpha) = 0.$$

Next, we will apply concentration compactness to  $\{\rho_k^1\}$  and  $\{\rho_k^2\}$ . In order to do this, we must first modify these sequences so that they have constant mass. To do so for  $\rho_k^1$ , we either decrease the radius  $R_k$  if  $\rho_k^1$  has too much mass, or add a small piece far away if  $\rho_k^1$  has too little mass. For each  $k$ , let

$$\bar{\rho}_k^1 = \rho_k|_{B(y_k, \bar{R}_k^1)} + \mathbb{1}_{B(x_k, r_k^1)},$$

where  $\bar{R}_k^1 \leq R_k$ ,  $r_k^1 \geq 0$ , and  $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$  are chosen so that  $\bar{\rho}_k^1 \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ , and  $|x_k - y_k| > R_k + r_k^1 + \tilde{R}$ , and  $r_k^1 \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Similarly for  $\rho_k^2$ , we either increase the radius  $R_k$  to decrease the mass, or add a small ball centered at  $y_k$  to increase the mass. That is we let

$$\bar{\rho}_k^2 = \rho_k|_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(y_k, \bar{R}_k^2 + \tilde{R})} + \mathbb{1}_{B(y_k, r_k^2)},$$

where  $\overline{R}_k^2 \geq R_k$ , and  $r_k^2 \geq 0$  are chosen so that  $\overline{\rho}_k^2 \in \mathcal{A}_{m-\alpha}$ , and  $r_k^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . It is straightforward to check, using the fact that  $\|\rho_k^i - \overline{\rho}_k^i\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for  $i = 1, 2$  that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^i] - \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^i] \right) = 0.$$

Then, combining this with (26),

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] - \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^1] - \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^2] \right) = 0. \quad (27)$$

Now, suppose  $\rho_k$  is a minimizing sequence. By subadditivity (Lemma 3.4), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho] \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \mathcal{E}[\rho] + \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_{m-\alpha}} \mathcal{E}[\rho].$$

By (27)

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^1] + \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^2] \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^1] + \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Then we are done since

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^1] \geq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \mathcal{E}[\rho], \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\overline{\rho}_k^2] \geq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_{m-\alpha}} \mathcal{E}[\rho].$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Let  $\{\rho_k\}$  be a minimizing sequence.

Then by concentration compactness (Lemma 5.2), we can pass to a subsequence to obtain a minimizing sequence which, abusing notation slightly, I will also label  $\{\rho_k\}$  that is either tight up to translation, vanishing, or dichotomous. By Lemma [5.3] a minimizing sequence cannot be vanishing since we know  $\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho] < 0$ .

If the sequence is tight up to translation, we can apply Lemma 5.4, and conclude that there is a  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \mathcal{E}[\rho]$ , and so  $\rho$  is a minimizer and we are done.

If the sequence is dichotomous, then by Lemma 5.5 there are  $\rho_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha_1}$ , and  $\rho_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha_2}$ , with  $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = m$ , and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^1] + \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^2] \right).$$

We then apply concentration compactness principle to  $\{\rho_k^1\}$  and  $\{\rho_k^2\}$ , noting that neither can have a vanishing subsequence. Applying Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5, and then concentration again iteratively, we eventually obtain (after passing to subsequences, and some relabelling) sequences  $\rho_k^1, \rho_k^2, \dots, \rho_k^l$ , which are tight up to translation with  $\rho_k^i \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha_i}$ ,  $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_l = m$ , and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^1] + \dots + \mathcal{E}[\rho_k^l] \right).$$

Note that this process of applying concentration compactness iteratively must end after finitely many steps, because the  $\alpha_i$ 's cannot become arbitrarily small. This is because by

Lemma 3.1  $\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \mathcal{E}[\rho]$  is attained by the indicator of a ball if  $\alpha \leq m_0$ . So for any  $\alpha \leq m_0$ , and any dichotomous sequence  $\{\eta_k\}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ , we would have

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\eta_k] > \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \mathcal{E}[\rho],$$

which contradicts Lemma 5.5. To conclude, by Lemma 5.4 there exist  $\rho^1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \rho^l \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha_l}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[\rho_k] = \mathcal{E}[\rho^1] + \dots + \mathcal{E}[\rho^l].$$

Each  $\rho^i$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_i}$ , and so by Lemma 3.3, they each have compact support. So, we can construct a minimizer for the truncated problem by letting  $\rho = \rho(z_1 + \cdot) + \dots + \rho^l(z_l + \cdot)$  for suitably chosen  $z_1, \dots, z_l \in \mathbb{R}^N$ .

Finally, assume additionally that  $K$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, a]$ , and  $a + w \leq W - 2w$ . Let  $\rho$  be any minimizing density. By Lemma 5.1, any two points  $x, y$  points in the support of  $\rho$  satisfy the distance condition  $|x - y| \notin [a + w, a + W - w]$ . Then since  $a + w \leq W - 2w = (a + W - w) - (a + w)$ ,  $\text{supp} \rho$  can be decomposed into pieces each with diameter at most  $a + w$ . On each of these pieces, the energy is uniquely minimized (up to translations and modifications on sets of measure zero) by the indicator of a ball.  $\square$

### 5.3 Proof of Theorem 2.2

The following notion of a generalized minimizer comes from [10]. It allows us to deal with the fact that minimizing sequences may have many pieces that become infinitely far apart.

**Definition 5.6.** A *generalized minimizer* of  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_m$  is a collection of densities  $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_M)$ , for some  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , and each  $\rho_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m_i}$  is a minimizer for  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{m_i}$ . Additionally,  $\sum_{i=1}^M m_i = m$ , and

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho] = \sum_{i=1}^M \mathcal{E}[\rho_i]. \quad (28)$$

Let  $\bar{K} = K \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[0, a+w]}$ , and denote

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}[\rho] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \bar{K}(|x - y|) \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy. \quad (29)$$

**Theorem 5.7** (Existence of Generalized Minimizers). *Let  $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded kernel satisfying (K1) – (K5). Further, assume  $K$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, a]$  and  $a + w \leq W - 2w$ . then, generalized minimizers exist and up to sets of measure zero any generalized minimizer has the form*

$$\rho = (\mathbf{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)})_{i=1}^k \quad (30)$$

for some centres  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and radii  $r_i > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{E}[\mathbf{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)}, \mathbf{1}_{B(x_j, r_j)}] = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m$  be a minimizer for the truncated problem. Note that  $\bar{K} \leq K$ , so  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}[\eta] \leq \mathcal{E}[\eta]$ , for any  $\eta \in \mathcal{A}_m$ .

By (1), we may write

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)}, \quad (31)$$

for some centres  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and radii  $r_i > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{E}[\mathbf{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)}, \mathbf{1}_{B(x_j, r_j)}] = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ . From this, we may construct a minimizing sequence for  $\mathcal{E}$ , by picking new centers  $x_{i,l}$  so that  $|x_{i,l} - x_{j,l}| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . So,

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho] = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\rho].$$

So, by taking  $\rho_i = \mathbf{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)}$ , we obtain a generalized minimizer for  $\rho$  □

## 5.4 Linear Growth

We will show that the minimal energy

$$E(m) = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho]$$

grows linearly in  $m$ .

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded kernel satisfying (K1) – (K5). Further, assume  $K$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, a]$  and  $a + w \leq W - 2w$ . For each  $m > 0$ , let  $E(m) = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_m} \mathcal{E}[\rho]$  and  $g(m)$  be the energy of the ball with mass  $m$ . Then*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(m)}{m} = \min_{m > 0} \frac{g(m)}{m}. \quad (32)$$

*Proof.* The first step is to show that the limit in the left hand side of (32) exists. By Fekete's subadditive Lemma (see [11] Theorem 16.2.9) we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(m)}{m} = \inf_{m > 0} \frac{E(m)}{m}.$$

Next, by Theorem 2.2 given any  $m > 0$  we may write  $E(m) = g(m_1) + g(m_2) + \dots + g(m_k)$  for some positive numbers  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  such that  $m_1 + \dots + m_k = m$ . Then,

$$\frac{E(m)}{m} = \frac{g(m_1) + \dots + g(m_k)}{m} \geq \frac{(m_1 + \dots + m_k) \inf_{m > 0} \frac{g(m)}{m}}{m} = \inf_{m > 0} \frac{g(m)}{m}$$

On the other hand,  $E(m) \leq g(m)$  for all  $m$ , so

$$\inf_{m > 0} \frac{E(m)}{m} = \inf_{m > 0} \frac{g(m)}{m}.$$

To conclude we need to show that the infimum on the right is actually a minimum. Note that  $g$  is continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ , and is positive for large values of  $m$ . Also, since  $K(r) \geq K(0)$  for all  $r > 0$ ,

$$g(m) \geq K(0)m^2.$$

Then, using the squeeze theorem, and the fact that  $g$  is negative for small values of  $m$ ,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{g(m)}{m} = 0.$$

□

## 6 Size of droplets

Theorem 5.7 says that generalized minimizers are tuples of indicators of balls. The linear growth estimate (32) suggests that when  $m$  is larger enough, the droplets should all be relatively close in size. In this section we will consider kernels that are power laws near 0, to further explore the question of droplet size. We will see that generalized minimizers for such kernels consist of many indicators of balls of one size, and possibly one ball of a smaller size.

Let

$$K(r) = \begin{cases} r^p - d, & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq a, \\ f(r), & \text{if } r > a, \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where  $f : (a, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a non-negative function such that  $f(r) \geq a^p + d$  for all  $a < r \leq w + a$  and such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) = 0$ . To understand generalized minimizers for such a kernel, we first compare the indicator of one ball versus two balls.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $g(m) = \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_{ball}]$ , and set  $f(t) = g(tm) + g((1-t)m)$  for  $0 \leq t \leq 1/2$ . Then, there are numbers  $0 < m_0 < m_1$  such that*

1. *If  $0 < m \leq m_0$ , then  $f$  is minimized at  $t = 0$*
2. *If  $m_0 < m < m_1$   $f$  is minimized at some  $0 < t_0 < 1/2$*
3. *If  $m \geq m_1$ , then  $f$  is minimized at  $t = 1/2$ .*

Moreover,

$$m_0 = \left( \frac{2d}{C_{n,p}(2 + p/n)} \right)^{n/p}, \text{ and} \quad (34)$$

$$m_1 = \left( \frac{2^{1+p/n}d}{C_{n,p}(2 + p/n)(1 + p/n)} \right)^{n/p}, \quad (35)$$

where

$$C_{n,p} = \frac{1}{|B_1|^{2+p/n}} \int_{B_1} \int_{B_1} |x - y|^p dx dy.$$

*Proof.* Let  $m > 0$  and  $r > 0$  such that  $m = |B_r|$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} g(m) &= \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{1}_{B_r}] = \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} (|x - y|^p - d) dx dy \\ &= r^{2n+p} \int_{B_1} \int_{B_1} |x - y|^p dx dy - dm^2 \\ &= C_{n,p} m^{2+p/n} - dm^2. \end{aligned}$$

We seek to minimize  $f(t) = g(tm) + g((1-t)m)$  for  $t \in [0, 1/2]$ . Compute

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) &= m^2 (C_{n,p}(2 + p/n)m^{p/n}(t^{1+p/n} - (1-t)^{1+p/n}) - 2d(2t - 1)) \\ f''(t) &= m^2 (C_{n,p}(2 + p/n)(1 + p/n)m^{p/n}(t^{p/n} + (1-t)^{p/n}) - 4d) \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that  $t \mapsto t^{p/n} + (1-t)^{p/n}$  is decreasing on  $[0, 1/2]$  if  $p/n > 1$ . So,  $f''$  is decreasing, which means  $f'$  is concave. Note that  $f'(1/2) = 0$ , so  $f$  can have at most one critical value in the interval  $(0, 1/2)$ . To determine whether such a critical value exists, we need to look at the signs of  $f'(0)$  and  $f''(1/2)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} f'(0) &= m^2 C_{n,p}(2 + p/n)(m_0^{p/n} - m^{p/n}), \\ f''(1/2) &= 2^{1-p/n} m^2 C_{n,p}(2 + p/n)(1 + p/n)(m^{p/n} - m_1^{p/n}). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $m_0$  and  $m_1$  be as defined in Lemma 6.1. Then,

1. If  $0 < m \leq m_0$ , then  $f'(0) \geq 0$ , and so  $f$  has no critical values in  $(0, 1/2)$ . Moreover,  $f'(t) \geq 0$  for all  $t \in [0, 1/2]$ . So,  $f$  has its minimum at  $t = 0$ .
2. If  $m_0 < m < m_1$ , then  $f'(0) < 0$  and  $f''(1/2) < 0$ . Then there is a point  $0 < t_0 < 1/2$  where  $f(t_0) = 0$ . Moreover,  $f'(t) < 0$  on  $(0, t_0)$  and  $f'(t) > 0$  on  $(t_0, 1/2)$ . So,  $f$  has its minimum at  $t = t_0$ .
3. If  $m \geq m_1$ , then  $f''(1/2) \geq 0$ , which means  $f'(t) \leq 0$  for all  $t \in [0, 1/2]$ . Thus  $f$  has its minimum at  $t = 1/2$ .

Note, it is straightforward to check that  $m_0 < m_1$

□

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $m > 0$  and  $(\rho_i)_{i=1}^k$  be a generalized minimizer. Then there exist radii  $r_1, r_2 > 0$  such that each  $\rho_i = \mathbb{1}_{B_{r_1}}$  or  $\mathbb{1}_{B_{r_2}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $m > 0$   $(\rho_i)_{i=1}^k$  be a generalized minimizer. Consider the minimization problem

$$\min_{\substack{t_1 + \dots + t_{k-1} < 1 \\ t_i > 0}} g(t_1 m) + \dots + g(t_{k-1} m) + g((1 - t_1 - \dots - t_{k-1})m). \quad (36)$$

Then,  $(\rho_i)_{i=1}^k$  corresponds to a minimizer  $(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1})$  of (36). Computing the gradient yields

$$m g'(t_i m) - m g'((1 - t_1 - \dots - t_{k-1})m) = 0$$

for each  $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ . In particular this means that

$$g'(t_i m) = g'(t_j m)$$

for each  $i \neq j$ . Note that  $g'$  strictly decreasing then increasing on  $[0, \infty)$ , so for any  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  the equation  $g'(x) = y$  has at most two solutions.

□

Note that the only thing we used was that  $g$  is concave then convex so this argument applies more generally than to just the power law kernels.

**Lemma 6.3.** *Generalized minimizers have the form  $(\mathbb{1}_{B_s}, \mathbb{1}_{B_r}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{B_r})$ , for some  $s \leq r$ .*

*Proof.* In the previous Lemma we saw that generalized minimizers will consist of indicators of balls having at most two different sizes.

Let  $m_0$  and  $m_1$  be the thresholds from Lemma 6.1.

The claim follows by induction on the number of balls in a generalized minimizer. First, for a given  $m > 0$  assume that a generalized minimizer consists of four balls, two of which have mass  $M$ , and the other two have size  $N$ . Then, by Lemma 6.1  $2M \geq m_1$ ,  $2N \geq m_1$ , and  $M + N \leq m_1$ . So,

$$2m_1 \leq 2M + 2N \leq 2m_1,$$

which means  $M = N$ .

For the inductive step, assume the claim is true for generalized minimizers that consist of  $k$  balls. Then, let  $(\rho_i)_{i=1}^{k+1}$  be a generalized minimizer that consists of  $k+1$  indicator balls,  $k_M > 1$  of mass  $M$  and  $k_N$  of mass  $N$ . Then, removing one of the balls of mass  $M$  will give a generalized minimizer for the problem with smaller mass, and so  $k_N = 1$ .

To see that the single ball must have smaller mass, consider a generalized minimizer  $(\mathbb{1}_{B_s}, \mathbb{1}_{B_r}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{B_r})$ , for some  $s \neq r$ . By Lemma 6.1,  $|B_s| + |B_r| < m_1$  and  $2|B_r| \geq m_1$ , so  $|B_s| < |B_r|$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] D. Balagué et al. “Dimensionality of local minimizers of the interaction energy”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 209.3 (2013), pp. 1055–1088. ISSN: 0003-9527. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-013-0644-6.
- [2] A. J. Bernoff and C. M. Topaz. “Nonlocal aggregation models: A primer of swarm equilibria”. In: *SIAM Review* 55.4 (2013), pp. 709–747. DOI: 10.1137/130925669.
- [3] A. Burchard, R. Choksi, and I. Topaloglu. “Nonlocal shape optimization via interactions of attractive and repulsive potentials”. In: *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 67.1 (2018), pp. 375–395. DOI: 10.1512/iumj.2018.67.6234.
- [4] J. A. Carrillo, M. G. Delgadino, and A. Mellet. “Regularity of Local Minimizers of the Interaction Energy Via Obstacle Problems”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 343.3 (May 2016), pp. 747–781. ISSN: 0010-3616, 1432-0916. DOI: 10.1007/s00220-016-2598-7.
- [5] J. A. Carrillo, A. Figalli, and F. S. Patacchini. “Geometry of minimizers for the interaction energy with mildly repulsive potentials”. In: *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 34.5 (2017), pp. 1299–1308. ISSN: 0294-1449.
- [6] R. Choksi, R. C. Fetecau, and I. Topaloglu. “On minimizers of interaction functionals with competing attractive and repulsive potentials”. In: *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Analyse Non Linéaire* 32.6 (2015), pp. 1283–1305. DOI: 10.1016/j.anihpc.2014.09.000.
- [7] R. Frank and E. Lieb. “A “liquid-solid” phase transition in a simple model for swarming, based on the “no flat-spots” theorem for subharmonic functions”. In: *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 67.4 (2018), pp. 1547–1569. ISSN: 0022-2518. DOI: 10.1512/iumj.2018.67.7398.



- [8] R. Frank and E. Lieb. *Proof of spherical flocking based on quantitative rearrangement inequalities*. 2019. arXiv: 1909.04595 [math.AP].
- [9] D. D. Holm and V. Putkaradze. “Aggregation of Finite-Size Particles with Variable Mobility”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 95.22 (Nov. 2005), p. 226106. ISSN: 0031-9007, 1079-7114. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.226106.
- [10] H. Knüpfner, C. B. Muratov, and M. Novaga. “Low Density Phases in a Uniformly Charged Liquid”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 345.1 (2016), pp. 141–183. DOI: 10.1007/s00220-016-2654-3.
- [11] M. Kuczma. *An introduction to the theory of functional equations and inequalities*. Second. Cauchy’s equation and Jensen’s inequality, Edited and with a preface by Attila Gilányi. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009, pp. xiv+595. ISBN: 978-3-7643-8748-8.
- [12] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss. *Analysis*. Second. Vol. 14. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001, pp. xxii+346. ISBN: 0-8218-2783-9. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/014.
- [13] T. Lim and R. J. McCann. “Isodiametry, variance, and regular simplices from particle interactions”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 241.2 (2021), pp. 553–576. ISSN: 0003-9527. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-021-01632-9.
- [14] P.L. Lions. “The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case, part 1”. In: 1.2 (1984), pp. 109–145.
- [15] O. Lopes. “Uniqueness and radial symmetry of minimizers for a nonlocal variational problem”. In: *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* 18.5 (2019), pp. 2265–2282. ISSN: 1534-0392. DOI: 10.3934/cpaa.2019102.
- [16] A. Mogilner et al. “Mutual interactions, potentials, and individual distance in a social aggregation”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 47.4 (Sept. 2003), pp. 353–389. ISSN: 0303-6812, 1432-1416. DOI: 10.1007/s00285-003-0209-7.
- [17] C. M. Topaz, A. L. Bertozzi, and M. A. Lewis. “A Nonlocal Continuum Model for Biological Aggregation”. In: *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 68.7 (Sept. 2006), pp. 1601–1623. ISSN: 0092-8240, 1522-9602. DOI: 10.1007/s11538-006-9088-6.
- [18] D. J. Wales. “Energy Landscapes of Clusters Bound by Short-Ranged Potentials”. In: *ChemPhysChem* 11.12 (Aug. 2010), pp. 2491–2494. ISSN: 14394235. DOI: 10.1002/cphc.201000233.