

DOUBLE-WELL PHASE TRANSITIONS ARE MORE RIGID THAN MINIMAL HYPERSURFACES

CHRISTOS MANTOULIDIS

ABSTRACT. In this short note we see that double-well phase transitions exhibit more rigidity than their minimal hypersurface counterparts.

1. INTRODUCTION

Fix a Riemannian manifold (N, g_N) , which for simplicity we assume to be closed. There is a rich and long history of parallels between the theories of:

- (1) minimal hypersurfaces, which are hypersurfaces that are critical points of the induced area functional

$$A : \{\text{closed hypersurfaces of } N\} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$$

$$A(\Sigma) := \text{Area}_{g_N}(\Sigma),$$

and

- (2) double-well phase transitions (per the van der Waals–Cahn–Hilliard theory), which are critical points of the functional

$$E_\varepsilon : C^\infty(N; [-1, 1]) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

$$E_\varepsilon(u) := \int_M \left(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon |\nabla_{g_N} u|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} W(u) \right) d\mu_{g_N},$$

for some phase transition width parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ and some double-well potential $W \in C^\infty([-1, 1]; [0, \infty))$. (See Definition 1.2.)

The geometric analysis research community has shown a lot of interest in understanding how and when one can go from one theory to the other. In one direction, generating double-well phase transitions out of minimal hypersurfaces, we point the reader to [Mod87, Ste88, KS89, PR03, dPKW08, dPKPW10, dPKWY10, dPKW13]. In the opposite direction, we point the reader to [HT00, Ton05, TW12, Gua18, GG18]. These lists are by no means exhaustive.

In this note we show that not all minimal hypersurfaces give rise to double-well phase transitions. In particular, we show that in the presence ambient symmetry (\mathbf{S}^1 symmetry, in our case) double-well phase transitions exhibit additional rigidity properties that minimal hypersurfaces don't have:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose (M, g_M) is a closed Riemannian manifold and $(N, g_N) := \mathbf{S}^1 \times (M, g_M)$ is its Riemannian product with a unit circle. Let $u_i : N \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ be double-well phase transitions for a potential W as in Definition 1.2 and parameters $\varepsilon_i \searrow 0$ and*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \{u_i = 0\} = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\} \times M =: \Sigma \text{ in the Hausdorff sense,}$$

where $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m \in \mathbf{S}^1$ are distinct. Then:

- (a) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i = \pm 1$ locally uniformly on $N \setminus \Sigma$, with the \pm sign necessarily alternating across each component of Σ (thus, m is even).
- (b) Σ is invariant under a rotation by $\frac{2\pi}{m}$ radians along the \mathbf{S}^1 fiber.

Definition 1.2. A function $W \in C^\infty([-1, 1]; \mathbf{R})$ is a double-well potential if:

- (1) $W(x) \geq 0$ for all x , with equality if and only if $x = \pm 1$.
- (2) $W(x) = W(-x)$ for all x .
- (3) $W''(\pm 1) > 0$.
- (4) $W'(t)/t$ is increasing for $x \in (0, 1)$ and decreasing for $x \in (-1, 0)$.

Theorem 1.1 has various interesting consequences:

- (1) There exist many degenerate minimal hypersurfaces that cannot be limits of double-well phase transitions. Indeed, $\Sigma := \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\} \times M$ is totally geodesic—and therefore minimal—in N for any distinct $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m \in \mathbf{S}^1$, but according to Theorem 1.1 it can only occur as a limiting phase transition when m is even and Σ is $\frac{2\pi}{m}$ -rotationally symmetric along the \mathbf{S}^1 fiber. Thus, the nondegeneracy assumption in Pacard–Ritoré [PR03] (see also Pacard [Pac12], De Philippis–Pigati [DPP22]) cannot be weakened unconditionally. There is a result in the degenerate case, due to Caju–Gaspar [CG19] who assume “strong” integrability for their degenerate minimal hypersurfaces, i.e., that all Jacobi fields must be produced from ambient isometries. By Theorem 1.1, this assumption cannot be weakened to the standard integrability assumption, i.e., that all Jacobi fields arise from nearby minimal hypersurfaces.
- (2) The double-well phase transition set of min-max varifolds, which is contained in the corresponding Almgren–Pitts set (Gaspar–Guaraco [GG18], see also Dey [Dey20]), can be a proper subset. Indeed, any $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\} \times \mathbf{S}^1$, $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbf{S}^1$, can be realized as an Almgren–Pitts width on $\mathbf{S}^1 \times \mathbf{S}^1$, but only those with $\theta_1 = -\theta_2$ will be realized as a phase transition width.

We view this rigidity as consistent with the stronger results one has when studying double-well phase transitions versus minimal hypersurfaces. For instance:

- (1) The author and Otis Chodosh proved in [CM20] the multiplicity-one property of all min-max minimal hypersurfaces constructed using double-well phase transition regularization in generic closed Riemannian 3-manifolds. Subsequently, Xin Zhou [Zho20] proved the multiplicity-one conclusion in dimension up to 7 for at least one min-max hypersurface in Almgren–Pitts theory using a different regularization, but which is not characterized by the same rigidity as, e.g., Theorem 1.1.
- (2) The author and Otis Chodosh proved in [CM21] that in all closed Riemannian 2-manifolds, all phase transition min-max stationary geodesic networks give unions of closed geodesics. There is no Almgren–Pitts analog yet, but see Calabi–Cao [CC92], Aiex [Aie19].

Acknowledgments. The author was partially supported by NSF DMS-2147521 and thanks Otis Chodosh and Alessandro Pigatti for stimulating conversations.

2. TWO SIMPLER RESULTS

The proposition below was discussed by the author with Alessandro Pigatti in a meeting in January 2022 as rudimentary evidence for the rigidity of double-well phase transitions as opposed to minimal hypersurfaces. It can be thought of as a stronger version of Theorem 1.1 when M is 0-dimensional.

Proposition 2.1. *Fix $m \in \mathbf{N}$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists at most one double-well phase transition $u : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ with m nodal intervals. If such a u exists, then:*

- (a) *Its nodal intervals are all congruent.*
- (b) *On each nodal interval, u is ± 1 times a fixed positive function that vanishes on its boundary. The \pm sign alternates across each nodal point.*

Proof. By the existence and uniqueness of ODE solutions with given initial position and velocity, u must be odd about each vanishing point. This implies that all intervals in $\{u > 0\}$ and $\{u < 0\}$ are congruent and that u is ± 1 times a positive function that does not change from one interval to the next. By Lemma A.2, this positive function only depends on ε and the length of the nodal interval, but not u . \square

Functions as in Proposition 2.1 will not exist whenever m is odd, or if $\varepsilon > 0$ is large. Conversely, when m is even and $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, functions of the desired form can be produced by a reflection argument from:

Lemma 2.2 (Model solutions). *Fix $\ell > 0$. For sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, depending on ℓ , there is a nonconstant double-well phase transition $u : [-\ell, \ell] \rightarrow (0, 1)$, with parameter ε , so that $u(\pm\ell) = 0$ and $u > 0$ on $(-\ell, \ell)$.*

Proof. First, one minimizes E_ε on $W_0^{1,2}(-\ell, \ell)$. By the evenness of W , one may replace u by $|u|$ to get that the minimizer satisfies $u \geq 0$ a.e. By elliptic regularity and the maximum principle, either $u \equiv 0$ or $u > 0$ in the interior. When $\varepsilon > 0$ is small, the former case is ruled out by an energy comparison argument. \square

This allows us to prove the following special case of Theorem 1.1. The proof of Theorem 1.1 will require a localization of the simpler global argument used below.

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose M, N are as in Theorem 1.1 and let $u_i : N \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ be double-well phase transitions with parameters $\varepsilon_i \searrow 0$ so that, for $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbf{S}^1$ (not necessarily distinct),*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \{u_i = 0\} = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\} \times M =: \Sigma \text{ in the Hausdorff sense.}$$

Then:

- (a) θ_1 and θ_2 are distinct and, in fact, $\theta_2 = -\theta_1$.
- (b) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i = \pm 1$ locally uniformly on $N \setminus \Sigma$, with alternating signs across each component of Σ .

Proof of Proposition 2.3. We first prove (a). Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $\theta_1 \neq -\theta_2$. By the Hausdorff convergence $\{u_i = 0\} \rightarrow \{\theta_1, \theta_2\} \times M$, one can rotate \mathbf{S}^1 to guarantee that

$$\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Gamma_+ := \{z \in \mathbf{S}^1 \subset \mathbf{C} : \operatorname{Re} z > 0\}$$

and, after possibly replacing u_i 's with $-u_i$'s, that for all large i ,

$$\{u_i \geq 0\} \subset \Gamma_+ \times M. \tag{2.1}$$

Passing to larger i if necessary, let

$$\bar{u}_i : N (= \mathbf{S}^1 \times M) \rightarrow [-1, 1]$$

be obtained by applying Lemma 2.2 with $\ell = \frac{1}{2}\pi$ and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_i$, defining it on Γ_+ using the arclength parametrization $t \mapsto e^{it}$, extending to \mathbf{S}^1 with an odd reflection, and extending trivially across M .

By Lemma A.2, (2.1) implies

$$u_i < \bar{u}_i \text{ on } \{u_i \geq 0\} \cup ((\mathbf{S}^1 \setminus \Gamma_+) \times M).$$

This trivially extends to

$$u_i < \bar{u}_i \text{ on } N, \tag{2.2}$$

since $u_i < 0 < \bar{u}_i$ in the complementary portion of N . Inequality (2.2) leads to a contradiction as we may rotate \bar{u} until it eventually touches u_i , violating the maximum principle. Therefore, $\theta_1 = -\theta_2$, yielding (a).

In what follows, we may assume that $\theta_1 = 1 \in \mathbf{S}^1 \subset \mathbf{C}$, $\theta_2 = -1 \in \mathbf{S}^1 \subset \mathbf{C}$.

We now prove (b). By Lemma A.1, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |u_i| = 1$ on $N \setminus \Sigma$. Let us suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i = -1 \text{ on } N \setminus \Sigma. \quad (2.3)$$

The other case is ruled out by replacing u_i 's with $-u_i$'s.

Passing to larger i if necessary, let

$$\check{u}_i : N(= \mathbf{S}^1 \times M) \rightarrow [-1, 1]$$

be obtained by applying Lemma 2.2 with $\ell = \frac{1}{4}\pi$ and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_i$ and using the arclength parametrization $t \mapsto e^{it}$, extending to \mathbf{S}^1 with three odd reflections, and extending trivially across M . By repeating the argument above, (2.3) implies

$$u_i \leq \check{u}_i \text{ on } N,$$

for large i . This leads to a contradiction similarly as before, yielding (b). \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In what follows, we assume $m > 2$, otherwise Proposition 2.3 yields the result. The proof is, in spirit, a unique continuation-type proof like the one-dimensional proof in Proposition 2.1, but it relies on the maximum principle similarly to the proof of Proposition 2.3, which must now be localized.

We lift our solutions and Σ to the covering space

$$\mathbf{R} \times M \rightarrow N(= \mathbf{S}^1 \times M)$$

where, without loss of generality, we may suppose that the angles $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2k}$ lift to real numbers $0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_{2k} < 2\pi$. We will still denote our solutions by u_i .

We first prove (a). Recall that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |u_i| = 1$ away from Σ , by Lemma A.1. We may suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i = -1 \text{ near (not necessarily on) } \{\theta_2\} \times M. \quad (3.1)$$

The other cases are ruled out by replacing u_i 's with $-u_i$'s.

Let $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{6} \min\{\theta_2 - \theta_1, \theta_3 - \theta_2\})$. It follows from the Hausdorff convergence assumption on our nodal sets that, for all large i ,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{Haus}}(\{u_i = 0\}, \Sigma) < \delta \quad (3.2)$$

and from (3.1), (3.2) it follows that

$$\Omega_i := \{u_i \geq 0\} \cap [\theta_1 + \delta, \theta_3 - \delta] \times M \subset (\theta_2 - \delta, \theta_2 + \delta) \times M \quad (3.3)$$

Passing to larger i if necessary, let

$$\check{u}_i : [\theta_2 - 3\delta, \theta_2 + 3\delta] \times M \rightarrow [-1, 1]$$

be obtained by applying Lemma 2.2 with $\ell = \delta$, $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_i$, translating to the right by θ_2 , extending by an odd reflection to the left and the right, and finally extending trivially along M . It follows from (3.3) and Lemma A.2 that

$$u_i < \check{u}_i \text{ on } \{u_i \geq 0\} \cup ([\theta_2 - 3\delta, \theta_2 - \delta] \cup [\theta_2 + \delta, \theta_2 + 3\delta]) \times M.$$

Since $u_i < 0 < \check{u}_i$ in the remainder of $\text{domain}(\check{u}_i)$, this implies

$$u_i < \check{u}_i \text{ on } \text{domain}(\check{u}_i).$$

We can now contradict the strong maximum principle by sliding \check{u}_i to the left along the \mathbf{R} factor: due to (3.2), the first touching point has to occur before sliding by 2δ and cannot occur on the boundary of (the slid version of) $\text{domain}(\check{u}_i)$. This yields (a). Note that, in particular, this improves $m > 2$ to $m > 3$.

It remains to prove (b). We may suppose that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i = -1 \text{ on } (\theta_2, \theta_3) \times M, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\theta_4 - \theta_3 > \theta_3 - \theta_2. \quad (3.5)$$

The remaining cases can be ruled out by replacing u_i 's with $-u_i$'s and possibly reflection across the \mathbf{R} axis.

Fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4} \min\{\theta_2 - \theta_1, \theta_3 - \theta_2, \theta_4 - \theta_3\})$. It follows from the Hausdorff convergence assumption on our nodal sets that, for all large i ,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{Haus}}(\{u_i = 0\}, \Sigma) < \delta. \quad (3.6)$$

It follows from (3.4), (3.6) that for large i ,

$$\{u_i \leq 0\} \cap (\theta_1 + \delta, \theta_4 - \delta) \times M \subset (\theta_2 - \delta, \theta_3 + \delta) \times M. \quad (3.7)$$

Passing to larger i if necessary, let

$$\bar{u}_i : [\theta_2 - \delta, \theta_3 + \delta + (\theta_3 - \theta_2 + 2\delta)] \times M \rightarrow [-1, 1]$$

be obtained by applying Lemma 2.2 with $\ell = \theta_3 - \theta_2 + 2\delta$, $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_i$, translating to the right by $\theta_3 + \delta$, extending by an odd reflection to the left, and finally extending trivially along M .

It follows from (3.7) and Lemma A.2 that

$$\bar{u}_i < u_i \text{ on } \{u_i \leq 0\} \cup [\theta_3 + \delta, \theta_3 + \delta + (\theta_3 - \theta_2 + 2\delta)] \times M$$

Since $\bar{u}_i < 0 < u_i$ in the remainder of $\text{domain}(\bar{u}_i)$, this implies

$$\bar{u}_i < u_i \text{ on } \text{domain}(\bar{u}_i).$$

We can now contradict the strong maximum principle by sliding \bar{u}_i to the left along the \mathbf{R} factor: due to (3.6), the first touching point has to occur before sliding

by 2δ and cannot occur on the boundary of (the slid version of) $\text{domain}(\bar{u}_i)$. This yields (a).

APPENDIX A. THE MAIN TOOLS

Lemma A.1 ([Gui12, Proposition 2.2]). *Suppose u is a double-well phase transition with parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ on a closed Riemannian manifold. There exist constants $C > 0$, $\kappa > 0$, depending only on the ambient manifold and the double-well potential W , such that*

$$|u^2 - 1| \leq Ce^{-\kappa \text{dist}(\cdot, \{u=0\})}.$$

The statement of [Gui12, Proposition 2.2] in the reference is for \mathbf{R}^2 but the proof is local and adapts in the obvious way to any closed Riemannian manifold.

Lemma A.2 ([GMN19, Corollary 7.4]). *Suppose u, v are double-well phase transitions with parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ on a compact domain Ω . If $u > 0$ on Ω and $v = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, then $u > v$.*

The statement of [GMN19, Corollary 7.4] in the reference also asks that $\partial\Omega$ be smooth, but this is not used in the proof. The reference also assumed $W(x) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - x^2)^2$, but only the properties assumed in Definition 1.2 were needed in the proof (see [GMN19, Lemma 7.3]).

REFERENCES

- [Aie19] Nicolau Sarquis Aieix, *The width of ellipsoids*, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **27** (2019), no. 2, 251–285. MR 4003008
- [CC92] Eugenio Calabi and Jian Guo Cao, *Simple closed geodesics on convex surfaces*, *J. Differential Geom.* **36** (1992), no. 3, 517–549. MR 1189495
- [CG19] R. Caju and P. Gaspar, *Solutions of the Allen-Cahn equation on closed manifolds in the presence of symmetry*, *arXiv Mathematics e-prints* (2019), arXiv:1906.05938 [math.DG].
- [CM20] O. Chodosh and C. Mantoulidis, *Minimal surfaces and the Allen-Cahn equation on 3-manifolds: index, multiplicity, and curvature estimates*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **191** (2020), no. 1, 213–328. MR 4045964
- [CM21] ———, *The p -widths of a surface*, *arXiv Mathematics e-prints* (2021), arXiv:2107.11684 [math.DG].
- [Dey20] A. Dey, *A comparison of the Almgren-Pitts and the Allen-Cahn min-max theory*, *arXiv Mathematics e-prints* (2020), arXiv:2004.05120 [math.DG].
- [dPKPW10] M. del Pino, M. Kowalczyk, F. Pacard, and J. Wei, *Multiple-end solutions to the Allen-Cahn equation in \mathbb{R}^2* , *J. Funct. Anal.* **258** (2010), no. 2, 458–503. MR 2557944
- [dPKW08] M. del Pino, M. Kowalczyk, and J. Wei, *The Toda system and clustering interfaces in the Allen-Cahn equation*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **190** (2008), no. 1, 141–187. MR 2434903

- [dPKW13] ———, *Entire solutions of the Allen-Cahn equation and complete embedded minimal surfaces of finite total curvature in \mathbb{R}^3* , J. Differential Geom. **93** (2013), no. 1, 67–131. MR 3019512
- [dPKWY10] M. del Pino, M. Kowalczyk, J. Wei, and J. Yang, *Interface foliation near minimal submanifolds in Riemannian manifolds with positive Ricci curvature*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **20** (2010), no. 4, 918–957. MR 2729281
- [DPP22] G. De Philippis and A. Pigati, *Non-degenerate minimal submanifolds as energy concentration sets: a variational approach*, 2022, p. arXiv:2205.12389 [math.DG].
- [GG18] P. Gaspar and M. A. M. Guaraco, *The Allen-Cahn equation on closed manifolds*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **57** (2018), no. 4, Paper No. 101, 42. MR 3814054
- [GMN19] M. A. M. Guaraco, F. C. Marques, and A. Neves, *Multiplicity one and strictly stable Allen-Cahn minimal hypersurfaces*, 2019, p. arXiv:1912.08997 [math.DG].
- [Gua18] M. A. M. Guaraco, *Min-max for phase transitions and the existence of embedded minimal hypersurfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **108** (2018), no. 1, 91–133. MR 3743704
- [Gui12] Changfeng Gui, *Symmetry of some entire solutions to the Allen-Cahn equation in two dimensions*, J. Differential Equations **252** (2012), no. 11, 5853–5874. MR 2911416
- [HT00] J. E. Hutchinson and Y. Tonegawa, *Convergence of phase interfaces in the van der Waals-Cahn-Hilliard theory*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **10** (2000), no. 1, 49–84. MR 1803974
- [KS89] R. V. Kohn and P. Sternberg, *Local minimisers and singular perturbations*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **111** (1989), no. 1-2, 69–84. MR 985990
- [Mod87] L. Modica, *The gradient theory of phase transitions and the minimal interface criterion*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **98** (1987), no. 2, 123–142. MR 866718
- [Pac12] F. Pacard, *The role of minimal surfaces in the study of the Allen-Cahn equation*, Geometric analysis: partial differential equations and surfaces, Contemp. Math., vol. 570, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012, pp. 137–163. MR 2963598
- [PR03] F. Pacard and M. Ritoré, *From constant mean curvature hypersurfaces to the gradient theory of phase transitions*, J. Differential Geom. **64** (2003), no. 3, 359–423. MR 2032110
- [Ste88] P. Sternberg, *The effect of a singular perturbation on nonconvex variational problems*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **101** (1988), no. 3, 209–260. MR 930124
- [Ton05] Y. Tonegawa, *On stable critical points for a singular perturbation problem*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **13** (2005), no. 2, 439–459. MR 2154826
- [TW12] Y. Tonegawa and N. Wickramasekera, *Stable phase interfaces in the van der Waals-Cahn-Hilliard theory*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **668** (2012), 191–210. MR 2948876
- [Zho20] X. Zhou, *On the multiplicity one conjecture in min-max theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **192** (2020), no. 3, 767–820. MR 4172621

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005

Email address: christos.mantoulidis@rice.edu