

EPSILON-REGULARITY FOR GRIFFITH ALMOST-MINIMIZERS IN ANY DIMENSION UNDER A SEPARATING CONDITION

CAMILLE LABOURIE AND ANTOINE LEMENANT

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove that if (u, K) is an almost-minimizer of the Griffith functional and K is ε -close to a plane in some ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ while separating the ball B in two big parts, then K is $C^{1,\alpha}$ in a slightly smaller ball. Our result contains and generalizes the 2 dimensional result of [4], with a different and more sophisticate approach inspired by [23, 24], using also [20] in order to adapt a part of the argument to Griffith minimizers.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminaries	4
3.	The Extension Lemma	8
3.1.	The Orientation Lemma	9
3.2.	Proof of the Extension Lemma	12
4.	A compactness Lemma	18
5.	Stopping time and control of ω and m	22
5.1.	Decay of the bad mass	25
5.2.	Control of the minimality defect	29
5.3.	Decay of the energy	30
6.	Joint decay and conclusion	37
	Acknowledgements	42
	References	42

1. INTRODUCTION

The variational model of crack propagation introduced by Francfort and Marigo [19] is based upon the idea of Griffith from the early 20th century, saying that the needed energy to produce a crack in an elastic material, is proportional to the surface area of the crack. This is how one can hope to produce mathematically, a crack set depending on time $K(t)$, coming from the quasistatic limit of discrete sets $K_n := K(t_n)$ which minimizes at each time the stationary Griffith energy

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) \cdot e(u) dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K),$$

where $e(u) = (Du + Du^T)/2$ stands for the symmetric gradient of the elastic displacement $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, \mathcal{H}^{N-1} is the Haudorff measure and \mathbb{C} are elliptic coefficients.

Despite of the similarity with the classical Mumford-Shah functional, for which a huge literature gave a thorough description of the minimizers from the 90s, the Griffith functional is more delicate due to the configurations u with vector values, much different from the scalar case. Another difficulty is coming from the fact that the energy with $e(u)$ controls only the symmetric part of the gradient, and not the full gradient Du which implies, in absence of good Korn type inequalities in the non regular domain $\Omega \setminus K$, some major technical problems. This is why the development of the tools to treat Griffith minimizers

Date: November 30, 2022.

appeared relatively recently only, comparing to the standard theory of free-discontinuity problems. To mention a few, the weak existence in *GSBD* by Dal Maso in [9], the strong existence of a minimizer by Chambolle and Crismale [7], in addition to the Ahlfors-regularity by Chambolle Conti and Iurlano [6] using also a previous work by Conti Focardi and Iurlano [8].

The main question that we address in this paper concerns the C^1 regularity of minimizers for the Griffith functional, in any dimension. This question is related to the so called Mumford-Shah conjecture, about the minimizers of the famous Mumford-Shah functional

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus K} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^1(K).$$

The question of Mumford and Shah (1989) which is still open, is to know whether the minimizers K of the Mumford-Shah functional are formed by a finite number of C^1 curves (see for instance the review paper about this problem [25]). Bonnet in [5] showed that the answer is true if K is assumed to be a connected set. Some precise C^1 estimates have also been obtained by David [11], and a famous partial C^1 result in higher dimensions is given by Ambrosio, Fusco, Pallara in [3]. Later, an independent proof and more precise in the special dimension 3 case appeared in [24]. See also [26, 17, 2, 12] for further developments.

However, while trying to attack the Griffith functional with the standard Mumford-Shah tools, we rapidly see that most of the arguments do not work on this variant with $e(u)$. The energy controls only the symmetric part of the gradient which does not control u in general. For instance, the monotonicity of Bonnet does not apply in the vectorial context. Most of the extension technics do not work neither, and the co-area formula cannot be used anymore. All the competitors obtained by truncation or composition are forbidden, which makes the analysis highly difficult. For instance, the Euler-Lagrange formula is not available, which prevents to derive a tilt-excess estimate, a starting point to apply the standard approach of Ambrosio, Fusco and Pallara [3].

Despite of these difficulties, the second author together with Babadjian and Iurlano have recently proved in [4] a partial C^1 result on the singular set of a Griffith minimizer, in dimension 2, with the additional assumption that K is connected. The proof does not extend in higher dimensions for several reasons. Later in [21], the result has been exploited to improve the dimension of the singular set and integrability of the symmetrized gradient in dimension 2.

In the present paper, we extend the results of [4] to any dimension $N \geq 2$, by using a completely different approach. Since connectedness of K has no powerful meaning in higher dimensions, we replace it by a separating assumption: we say that K separates $B(x, r)$ when, possibly after rotating, the north pole and south pole lie in different connected components of $B(x, r) \setminus K$ (see Definition 2.1 for a more precise statement).

Our ε -regularity result uses a quantities that is usually called the bilateral flatness of K defined by

$$\beta_K(x_0, r_0) := r^{-1} \inf_P \max \left\{ \sup_{y \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0)} \text{dist}(y, P), \sup_{y \in P \cap B(x_0, r_0)} \text{dist}(y, K) \right\},$$

where the infimum is over all hyperplanes P passing through x_0 .

Now here is our main result (we refer to (2.3) for the definition of an almost-minimizer with gauge h and to Definition 2.1 for the separating condition).

Theorem 1.1. *We fix a gauge $h(r) = c_h r^\alpha$, where $c_h > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. There exists constants $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in]0, \alpha]$ and $c \in (0, 1)$ (all depending on N, α) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer with gauge h in an open set Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$, K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$ and*

$$\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Then K is a smooth $C^{1, \gamma}$ embedded surface in $B(x_0, cr_0)$.

Let us notice that in dimension 2 when K is connected, then the separating condition holds \mathcal{H}^1 -a.e. on K so that our result contains the one of [4] and generalizes it to almost minimizers instead of minimizers. As a matter of fact, we also extend the results of [21] to almost minimizers as well.

Now in higher dimensions, it is not clear how to prove that, for an almost minimizer (or even a true minimizer), the separating condition holds almost everywhere. Therefore, our result does not directly imply that the singular set of a Griffith minimizer in dimension N is $C^{1,\alpha}$ \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -a.e. This would be probably true for instance if K is known to be uniformly rectifiable, which is a difficult open problem because of the lack of co-area formula for the symmetrized gradient. However, we believe our result to be a step toward the full regularity of minimizer in any dimension.

Next, let us say a few words about the proof. The strategy that we employ is to follow the approach introduced in [23, 24] for the Mumford-Shah functional. The main idea, that was suggested by Guy David to the second author during his thesis, is to use a stopping time argument on the flatness to identify a region where K would be “good” (which means ε -flat at every scale) and another region where K would be “bad” (i.e. stop being flat at some scale), which is performed in Section 5. The main point is then to estimate the size of the bad region, denoted by $m(r)$. This is done by use of a compactness argument (Lemma 4.1) that says that if K stops being flat at some scale, then one can win quantitatively some surface area in that scale, which is one of the key ingredients in the construction of a competitor. In this compactness argument we had to use a different argument compared to the scalar scale [23, 24] to avoid using the uniform concentration property, which is not known for our set K .

Furthermore, the general strategy works by use of another very important ingredient: an extension tool for the function u . Since we control approximatively the geometry of K at every working scale thanks to our stopping time function, we can extend u near K by replacing it with averages and use a partition of unity in order to obtain a well defined function while K has been modified as a competitor. We have written a general statement encoding this procedure in Lemma 3.1, that we use later several times for each competitor that we create.

Gathering together the stopping time argument, the compactness lemma and the extension tool, we are able to prove that the size of the bad set in a ball B_r , denoted by $m(r)$, has a decaying property involving the normalized energy $\omega(r)$ (see Proposition 5.1) defined by

$$\omega(x_0, r_0) = \frac{1}{r_0^{N-1}} \int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

Then we need to prove that the normalized energy has itself a decaying property to bootstrap the estimates. The decay of energy is proved by use of a compactness argument which is the purpose of Proposition 5.3. In this proof we benefit from the separating property in order to use a jump-transfer technic. But we also use the sophisticated extension tool (Lemma 3.1) in a subtle manner in order to gain some closure property of a contradicting sequence. The proof is therefore totally different from the two dimensional argument of [4], which uses the Airy function (available only in dimension 2).

At the end we prove that all the quantities $\omega(r)$ and $m(r)$ are decaying like a power r^α whereas $\beta(r)$ stays small, which implies that K is actually an almost-minimal set with gauge of order r^α , which leads to the conclusion.

As the strategy is similar to the one of [23, 24], it is quite probable that in dimension 3 an analogous ε -regularity result near minimal cones of type \mathbb{Y} and \mathbb{T} would be available using a variant of our work. But for sake of simplicity we have written here only the case of flat cone \mathbb{P} (hyperplane).

Finally let us mention some main differences with the work in [23, 24]. Firstly let us say that our paper is totally self-contained and no statement from [23, 24] has been directly used. Everything has been re-written with full details, sometimes quite differently and simplified, and we hope that the tools developed in here could be useful for other purposes. In addition, most of the time we had to adapt to the Griffith functional in a nontrivial manner some of the arguments used in [23, 24].

For instance, in the scalar case it is known that the Mumford-Shah minimizers have the “uniform concentration” property. Since the proof of that fact relies on the co-area formula, this is a difficult open question for Griffith minimizers, and prevents us to easily obtain semi-continuity behavior of the surface area for a sequence of Griffith minimizers. Since this was one of the key ingredient in the compactness argument in Lemma 4.1, we have used a different strategy following the results of the first author in [20]. Another difference comes in the proof of Proposition 5.3, where we proceed differently in order to avoid competitors of the form $\chi(u_n)$, which is not convenient while dealing with the Griffith energy.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Our working space is an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, where $N \geq 2$. We say that a constant is *universal* when it depends only on N . We introduce a few definitions.

Admissible (coral) pairs. We let $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ denote the set of *admissible pairs*, i.e., of pairs (u, K) where K is a relatively closed subset of Ω and $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus K; \mathbb{R}^N)$. We say that the pair is *coral* if for all $x \in K$ and for all $r > 0$,

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) > 0,$$

where \mathcal{H}^{N-1} is the Hausdorff measure of dimension $N - 1$. We also define $LD(\Omega \setminus K)$ as the set of functions $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus K; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\int_{\Omega \setminus K} |e(u)|^2 dx < +\infty$.

Competitors. Let (u, K) be an admissible pair. Let $x \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$. A *competitor* of (u, K) in $B(x, r)$ is an admissible pair $(v, L) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad L \setminus B(x, r) = K \setminus B(x, r) \quad \text{and} \quad v = u \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \setminus (K \cup B(x, r))$$

Local minimizers and almost-minimizers. In general, a *gauge* is a non-decreasing function $h :]0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} h(t) = 0$. However, in this paper we will only consider gauges of the form $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$, where $c_h > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$.

A *Griffith local almost-minimizer* with gauge h is a coral admissible pair (u, K) such that for all $x \in \Omega$, for all $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and for all competitor (v, L) of (u, K) in $B(x, r)$, we have

$$(2.3) \quad \int_{B(x, r)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \leq \int_{B(x, r)} |e(v)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x, r)) + h(r)r^{N-1},$$

where $e(u)$ is the symmetrized gradient of u ;

$$(2.4) \quad e(u) := \frac{Du + Du^T}{2}.$$

Notice that adding to K a negligible set does not affect the inequality in (2.3). This is why we assume almost-minimizers to be coral by definition, and as we will see later this guarantees the Ahlfors-regularity property mentioned below. On the other hand, a Griffith minimizer obtained via the *GSBD* theory will automatically be coral, as follows from the Ahlfors-regularity property of *GSBD* minimizers. Notice that, contrary to what commonly follows from the standard Mumford-Shah theory, and due to the absence of good L^∞ estimates, it is not known whether Griffith minimizers of a functional with an additional term of the form $\int_{\Omega} |u - g|^2 dx$ with $g \in L^\infty$ is an almost minimizer. However, an example of almost minimizer is for instance a minimizer of a functional of the form

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus K} |e(u) + A|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K)$$

as studied recently in [22], for which the result of the present paper in full generality in dimension 2, is used.

In the case $h = 0$, we say that (u, K) is a *Griffith local minimizer*. We observe that if (u, K) is a Griffith almost-minimizer with gauge h in a ball $B(x_0, r_0)$, then the pair (v, L) given by

$$(2.5) \quad v(x) = r_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} u(x_0 + r_0 x), \quad L = r_0^{-1}(K - x_0)$$

is a Griffith almost-minimizer in $B(0, 1)$ with gauge $\tilde{h}(r) := h(r_0 r)$.

Ahlfors-regularity. It is standard that for all $x \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ with $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r) \leq 1$, we have

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \leq (N\omega_N + 1)r^{N-1},$$

where ω_N is the volume measure of the unit ball. In addition, coral almost-minimizers satisfy a lower density bound, as was proved¹ in [6]; there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ (depending on N, α) such that for all $x \in K$ and $r > 0$ with $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r) \leq 1$, we have

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \geq C^{-1} r^{N-1}.$$

The normalized energy. Let (u, K) be an admissible pair. For any $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$, we define the *normalized energy* of u in $B(x_0, r_0)$ as

$$(2.8) \quad \omega_u(x_0, r_0) = \frac{1}{r_0^{N-1}} \int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

When there is no ambiguity, we write simply $\omega(x_0, r_0)$ instead of $\omega_u(x_0, r_0)$.

Remark 2.1. We see trivially that for all ball $B(x, r) \subset B(x_0, r_0)$, we have

$$(2.9) \quad \omega(x, r) \leq \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{N-1} \omega(x_0, r_0).$$

The normalized energy is invariant under scaling in the sense that if $v(y) := r_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} u(x_0 + r_0 y)$, then we have for all ball $B(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$,

$$(2.10) \quad \omega_v(x, r) = \omega_u(x_0 + r_0 x, r_0 r).$$

The bilateral flatness. Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω . For any $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$, we define the *bilateral flatness* of K in $B(x_0, r_0)$ by

$$(2.11) \quad \beta_K(x_0, r_0) := r^{-1} \inf_P \max \left\{ \sup_{y \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0)} \text{dist}(y, P), \sup_{y \in P \cap B(x_0, r_0)} \text{dist}(y, K) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all hyperplanes P through x_0 . An equivalent definition is that $\beta_K(x_0, r_0)$ is the infimum of all $\varepsilon > 0$ for which there exists an hyperplane P through x_0 such that

$$(2.12a) \quad K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid \text{dist}(y, P) \leq \varepsilon r_0\}$$

$$(2.12b) \quad P \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid \text{dist}(y, K) \leq \varepsilon r_0\}.$$

In fact, it is easy to check that the infimum in (2.11) and (2.12) is always attained. When there is no ambiguity, we write simply $\beta(x_0, r_0)$ instead of $\beta_K(x_0, r_0)$.

Remark 2.2. We see trivially that for all $0 < r \leq r_0$,

$$(2.13) \quad \beta(x_0, r) \leq \frac{r_0}{r} \beta(x_0, r_0)$$

and for all ball $B(x, r) \subset B(x_0, r_0)$ centred on K , we also have

$$(2.14) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq \frac{2r_0}{r} \beta(x_0, r_0).$$

The flatness is invariant under scaling in the sense that if $L := r_0^{-1}(K - x_0)$, then we have for all ball $B(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$ centred on L ,

$$(2.15) \quad \beta_L(x, r) = \beta_K(x_0 + r_0 x, r_0 r).$$

¹To be more precise the statement in [6] deals about minimizers and not almost minimizers. But looking carefully to the proofs, and in particular to the proofs in [8] which have been used to derive the Ahlfors regularity in [6], one sees that everything works identically for an almost minimizer.

Let $(K_i)_i$ and K be relatively closed subsets of Ω containing x_0 such that $(K_i)_i$ converges to K in local Hausdorff distance². Then for all $0 < r < r_0$ such that $B(x_0, 2r_0) \subset \Omega$, we have

$$(2.16) \quad \left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right) \limsup_i \beta_{K_i}(x_0, r) \leq \beta_K(x_0, r_0) \leq \liminf_i \beta_{K_i}(x_0, r_0).$$

At the left-hand side of (2.16), we are forced to work with a radius $r < r_0$ because certain parts of $K_i \cap B(0, r_0)$ could contribute to $\beta_{K_i}(x_0, r_0)$ while converging to $\partial B(0, r_0)$ (so $\beta_K(x_0, r_0)$ won't see them).

The separating condition. The separation in a ball will be fundamental in our analysis. We will consider the situation where $K \cap B(x_0, r_0)$ is contained in a narrow strip of thickness εr_0 for some $\varepsilon \in]0, 1/2]$, i.e., there exists an hyperplane P passing through x such that

$$(2.17) \quad K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid \text{dist}(y, P) \leq \varepsilon r_0\}.$$

We can then define two balls $D^+(x_0, r_0)$ and $D^-(x_0, r_0)$ of radius $r_0/4$ and such that $D^\pm(x_0, r_0) \subset B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$. Indeed, set $x_0^\pm := x_0 \pm (3/4)r_0\nu$, where ν is a normal unit vector to P . We can check that $D^\pm(x_0, r_0) := B(x_0^\pm, r_0/4)$ satisfy the above requirements.

Definition 2.1. Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω , let $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$. We say that K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$ if there exists an hyperplane P through x_0 satisfying

$$(2.18) \quad K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid \text{dist}(x, P) \leq r_0/2\}$$

and such that the corresponding balls $D^\pm(x_0, r_0)$ are contained in distincts connected components of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$.

Remark 2.3 (The separating property does not depend on a particular hyperplane). If K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$ with respect to an hyperplane P passing through x_0 and if Q is another hyperplane passing through x_0 satisfying

$$(2.19) \quad K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid \text{dist}(x, Q) \leq r_0/2\},$$

then K also separates with respect to Q . For the proof, let ν_P and ν_Q be unit normal vectors to P and Q respectively. We orient them in such a way that $\nu_P \cdot \nu_Q \geq 0$. The sets

$$(2.20a) \quad \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (y - x_0) \cdot \nu_P > r_0/2\},$$

$$(2.20b) \quad \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (y - x_0) \cdot \nu_Q > r_0/2\}$$

are connected, disjoint from K and they have a nonempty intersection because $\nu_P \cdot \nu_Q \geq 0$. Therefore, their union U^+ is a connected subset of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$. Similarly, the union of the sets

$$(2.21a) \quad \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (y - x_0) \cdot \nu_P < -r_0/2\},$$

$$(2.21b) \quad \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (y - x_0) \cdot \nu_Q < -r_0/2\},$$

denoted by U^- , is a connected subset of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$. As K separates with respect to P , the sets U^+ and U^- must be contained in distincts connected components of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ and we deduce that K separates with respect to Q .

Remark 2.4 (Equivalence of unilateral flatness and bilateral flatness for separating sets). If $B(x_0, r) \subset \Omega$ and there exists $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/2$ such that

$$(2.22) \quad K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, P) \leq \varepsilon r_0\},$$

and K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$, then we necessarily have

$$(2.23) \quad P \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, K) \leq 2\varepsilon r_0\}.$$

²It means that for all compact set $B \subset \Omega$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists i_0 such that for $i \geq i_0$, $K_i \cap B \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, K) \leq \varepsilon\}$ and $K \cap B \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, K_i) \leq \varepsilon\}$. It is also equivalent to the two equalities

$$K = \{x \in \Omega \mid \liminf_i \text{dist}(x, K_i) = 0\} = \{x \in \Omega \mid \lim_i \text{dist}(x, K_i) = 0\}.$$

Thus, for a separating set, the unilateral and bilateral flatness are equivalent by a factor 2. For the proof, we consider a normal unit vector ν to P . For all $y \in P \cap B(x_0, (1-\varepsilon)r_0)$, the segment $y + [-\varepsilon r_0 \nu, \varepsilon r_0 \nu]$ is contained in $B(x_0, r_0)$ and it must meet K otherwise it can be used to connect $D^\pm(x_0, r_0)$ in $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$. This shows that $\text{dist}(y, K) \leq \varepsilon r_0$. And for all others $y \in P \cap B(x_0, r_0)$, we can find $z \in P \cap B(x_0, (1-\varepsilon)r_0)$ such that $|z - y| \leq \varepsilon r_0$ so $\text{dist}(y, K) \leq 2\varepsilon r_0$.

The following lemma guarantees that when passing from a ball $B(x_0, r_0)$ to a smaller one $B(x_0, r)$, the property of separating is preserved for r varying in a range depending on $\beta(x_0, r_0)$. We will see later a variant of this result, Lemma 3.2, where the range can be arbitrary wide provided that β stays small at all intermediate scales.

Lemma 2.1. *Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω , let $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in [0, 1/2]$, assume that $\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$ and that K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$. Then for all $x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0)$, for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset B(x_0, r_0)$ and $r \geq 4\varepsilon_0 r_0$, we have $\beta(x, r) \leq 1/2$ and K still separates in $B(x, r)$.*

Definition 2.2 (Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$). *Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω , let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1/2]$. We say that K satisfies Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$ if $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and if K satisfies the two following assumptions:*

- i) K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$ (as in Definition 2.1);*
- ii) $\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$.*

In this case we can define $D^\pm(x_0, r_0)$ as in Definition 2.1 and we can also define $\Omega_h(x_0, r_0)$, for $h = 1, 2$ (or simply Ω_h), the two connected components of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ that contains $D^\pm(x_0, r_0)$, respectively.

The set $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ might have other connected components than Ω_1 and Ω_2 but they are contained in a narrow strip of thickness $\varepsilon_0 r$ passing through the center of the ball.

Geometric functions. Geometric functions are Lipschitz functions $\delta : K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4) \rightarrow [0, r_0/4]$ that we will use to build a covering $(B(x_i, \delta(x_i)))_i$ of balls centred in K with proper overlapping properties. We will take advantage of them in Section 3 to build a partition of unity.

Definition 2.3 (Geometric function). *Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω , let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1/2]$ be such that K satisfies Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$. Let $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$ and $\tau \in [8\varepsilon_0, 1/2]$. Then we say that a 100-Lipschitz function $\delta : K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \rightarrow [0, r_0/4]$ is a geometric function with parameters (ρ, τ) if for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and for all $r \in]\delta(x), r_0/4]$, we have*

$$(2.24) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq \tau.$$

Let us make a few comments. As $\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $\tau \geq 8\varepsilon_0$, we already know that for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$,

$$(2.25) \quad \beta(x, r_0/4) \leq 8\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \tau.$$

Thus, a very simple geometric function is just $\delta(x) = r_0/4$ defined on $K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$.

We excluded the case $r = \delta(x)$ in item (2.24) because when $\delta(x) = 0$, the flatness $\beta(x, \delta(x))$ would not be well-defined. That being said, if $\delta(x) > 0$, we have necessarily $\beta(x, \delta(x)) \leq \tau$. For the proof we distinguish cases. If $0 < \delta(x) < r_0/4$, we use the fact that for all $r \in]\delta(x), r_0/4]$,

$$(2.26) \quad \beta(x, \delta(x)) \leq \frac{r}{\delta(x)} \beta(x, r) \leq \frac{r}{\delta(x)} \tau.$$

If $\delta(x) = r_0/4$, we have $\beta(x, \delta(x)) \leq \tau$ as well by (2.25).

Remark 2.5 (The Lipschitz condition). The Lipschitz condition implies that two balls with nonempty intersection have comparable radii. More precisely, let us fix $0 \leq t \leq 1/300$ and let us consider $x, y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $\overline{B}(x, t\delta(x))$ and $\overline{B}(y, t\delta(y))$ meet. Then we have

$$(2.27) \quad |\delta(x) - \delta(y)| \leq 100|x - y| \leq 100(t\delta(x) + t\delta(y)) \leq \frac{1}{3}(\delta(x) + \delta(y))$$

whence

$$(2.28) \quad \frac{1}{2}\delta(x) \leq \delta(y) \leq 2\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad |x - y| \leq 3t\delta(x).$$

In particular, for all $y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \cap \overline{B}(x, t\delta(x))$, we have (2.28) as well.

In Lemma 3.2 below, we will see that the condition 2.24 of geometric functions implies that in each ball $B(x, \delta(x))$, the set K is still flat, it still separates and the two main components of $B(x, t\delta(x)) \setminus K$ are still subsets of Ω_1 and Ω_2 respectively. This differs from Lemma 2.1 as $\delta(x)$ can be arbitrary small (as long as we control the flatness at all scales $r \in]\delta(x), r_0/4[$).

3. THE EXTENSION LEMMA

We start by motivating this section and introducing one of the main techniques of next sections. We consider a Griffith minimizer (u, K) in Ω and $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1/2[$ such that K satisfies Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$. The set K is (relatively) flat in $B(x_0, r_0)$ but we don't know if it is still flat in all the balls $B(x, r)$ where $x \in K \cap B(x_0, 3r_0/4)$ and $0 < r \leq r_0/4$. We name $B(x, r)$ a bad ball when r is the largest radius r for which K is not flat in $B(x, r)$. We want to control the measure of the part of K that is covered by bad balls. For this purpose, we will see later that in any bad ball, one can replace K by a deformation which has less \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -measure in a quantified way. This process yields a deformation L of K in $B(x_0, r_0)$ such that $L = K$ in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r_0)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L)$ is proportional to the measure of the part of $K \cap B(x_0, r_0)$ covered by bad balls. We would also wish to build a function $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus L)$ such that $v = u$ in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r_0)$ and

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} |e(v)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

Thus, (v, L) would be a competitor of (u, K) in $B(x_0, r_0)$ and the minimality of (u, K) would allow to control $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L)$ by $C \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} |e(u)|^2 dx$.

The goal of this section is to build such a function v but our result (Lemma 3.1) will be less convenient than what we wished above. To simplify, we consider that K delimits two sides Ω_1 and Ω_2 . For each $h = 1, 2$, we want to build a function v_h on the union of Ω_h and of bad balls $B(x, r)$ centered on K . We roughly explain the construction of v_1 . For an isolated bad ball $B(x, r)$, we would define v_1 in $B(x, 9r) \cup \Omega_1$ as follow. We set v_1 as a well-chosen rigid motion in $B(x, 9r)$ and then $v_1 = u$ in $\Omega_1 \setminus B(x, 10r)$ whereas the part $\Omega_1 \cap B(x, 10r) \setminus B(x, 9r)$ would be a transition area. Unfortunately, the lack of Korn-Poincaré inequality prevents us from estimating the energy of v_1 in the part of the transition area that is at distance $\leq r$ from K . Therefore, we never consider isolated bad balls but we build v_1 via a partition of unity with respect to a family of bad balls $(B_i)_i$ of centers $x_i \in K$ and radii $r_i > 0$, which have good overlapping properties. Each of these balls is equipped with an orientation ν_i which is a unit vector pointing in the direction of Ω_1 . We want that when two balls B_i and B_j meet, their radii are comparable and their orientation are very close. We also want that for all ball B_i , the part of the transition area $\Omega_1 \cap 10B_i \setminus 9B_i$ at distance $\leq r_i$ from K is covered by balls $9B_j$, with $j \neq i$. In this way, v_1 is an interpolation of rigid motion there and this allows us to estimate its energy without Korn-Poincaré inequality. However, we cannot estimate the energy of v_1 in the balls B_i which meet $\partial B(x_0, r_0)$ because we cannot find other balls $9B_j$ anymore to cover the transition area. This limitation is apparent in item v) of Lemma 3.3. Let us mention finally that there could be other ways to extend v_1 , for example by reflection. However, the technique that we present below can be adapted to other cones than planes and it controls finely the domain where we don't estimate the energy of v_1 .

We are now ready to write the details. Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1/2[$ be such that K satisfies Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$. We consider certain numbers $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$, $\tau > 0$ and a geometric function δ with parameters (ρ, τ) .

$$(3.2) \quad \text{We fix } U := 10^5 \text{ and we assume in addition that } 8\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau \leq 10^{-8}.$$

For $x \in \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$, we set

$$(3.3) \quad r_x := \delta(x)/U$$

and we define B_x as the open ball $B(x, r_x)$, which is possibly empty. We will work with balls like B_x , $10B_x$, $50B_x$ and they are small enough to apply Remark 2.5 because $50 r_x \leq \delta(x)/300$. We define

$$(3.4a) \quad W := \bigcup \{ B_x \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \},$$

$$(3.4b) \quad \widetilde{W} := \bigcup \{ 10 B_x \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \}.$$

They are open subsets of $B(x_0, r_0)$ containing $\{x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid \delta(x) > 0\}$ and by Remark 2.5, they do not contain the points $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $\delta(x) = 0$. We introduce the open set

$$(3.5) \quad Z := \bigcup \{ 10 B_x \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho), 50B_x \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset \}.$$

And finally, we define for $h = 1, 2$,

$$(3.6) \quad V_h := \Omega_h \cup W.$$

It is an open set of $B(x_0, r_0)$ which extends Ω_h by adding the nonempty balls B_x centered on K . One can also deduce from Lemma 3.3 in Section 3.2 that V_1 covers

$$(3.7) \quad \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \setminus (\Omega_2 \cup \{x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid \delta(x) = 0\})$$

and vice-versa with V_2 and Ω_1 . The proof of the following Lemma is the goal of the two next subsections.

Lemma 3.1 (Extension Lemma). *Under the notation above, for all function $u \in LD(B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K)$ and for all $h = 1, 2$, there exists a function $v_h \in LD_{\text{loc}}(V_h)$ and two relatively closed sets F_h, S_h of V_h such that*

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} W &\subset S_h \subset \widetilde{W}, \\ v_h &= u \text{ in } V_h \setminus S_h, \\ S_h \setminus B(x_0, \rho) &\subset F_h \subset S_h \cap Z \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.9) \quad \int_{V_h \cap B(x_0, \rho) \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B(x_0, \rho) \cap \Omega_h} |e(u)|^2 dx,$$

for some universal constant $C \geq 1$.

Note that $S_h \setminus B(x_0, \rho) = F_h \setminus B(x_0, \rho)$ so

$$(3.10) \quad v_h = u \text{ in } V_h \setminus (B(x_0, \rho) \cup F_h)$$

Therefore, we also control the energy of v in the larger domain $V_h \setminus F_h$;

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{V_h \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_h} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

3.1. The Orientation Lemma.

Lemma 3.2 (Orientation Lemma). *Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1/2]$ be such that K satisfies Hypothesis-H(ε_0, x_0, r_0). Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be the connected components of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ introduced in Definition 2.2. We assume that there exists positive numbers $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$, $\varepsilon \in [8\varepsilon_0, 10^{-3}]$ and a function*

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) &\longrightarrow [0, r_0/4] \\ x &\longmapsto r_x \end{aligned}$$

such that for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$, for all $r \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, we have

$$(3.13) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and for all $r \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, there exists a unit vector $\nu_x \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ such that

$$(3.14a) \quad \{y \in B(x, r) \mid (y - x) \cdot \nu_x > \varepsilon r\} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.14b) \quad \{y \in B(x, r) \mid (y - x) \cdot \nu_x < -\varepsilon r\} \subset \Omega_2.$$

and in particular

$$(3.14c) \quad K \cap B(x, r) \subset \{y \in B(x, r) \mid |(y-x) \cdot \nu_x| \leq \varepsilon r\}$$

In addition, whenever for some $x, y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and $t \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, $s \in]r_y, r_0/4]$, we have $B(x, t) \subset B(y, s)$ and $t \geq s/10$, then ν_x and ν_y are close to each other in the sense that

$$(3.15) \quad \nu_x \cdot \nu_y \geq 1 - 100\varepsilon.$$

Finally, we have

$$(3.16) \quad \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \setminus (K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2) \subset \bigcup_{x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho)} B(x, r_x).$$

Proof. We fix $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$. We start by justifying that the property holds in the ball $B(x, r_0/4)$. We proceed as in the usual proof of the inequality $\beta(x, r_0/4) \leq 8\beta(x_0, r_0)$. According to Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$, there exists a unit vector ν_0 such that

$$(3.17a) \quad K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid |(x-x_0) \cdot \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon_0 r_0\}.$$

Moreover, we can orient ν_0 in such a way that

$$(3.17b) \quad \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (y-x_0) \cdot \nu_0 > \varepsilon_0 r_0\} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.17c) \quad \{y \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (y-x_0) \cdot \nu_0 < -\varepsilon_0 r_0\} \subset \Omega_2.$$

Since $x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0)$, we have $|(x-x_0) \cdot \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon_0 r_0$ by (3.17a). For all $y \in B(x, r_0/4)$ such that $(y-x) \cdot \nu_0 > \varepsilon(r_0/4)$, we have $(y-x) > 2\varepsilon_0 r_0$ because $\varepsilon_0 \geq 8\varepsilon$ and we deduce that

$$(3.18) \quad (y-x_0) \cdot \nu_0 = (y-x) \cdot \nu_0 + (x-x_0) \cdot \nu_0$$

$$(3.19) \quad > \varepsilon_0 r_0,$$

whence $y \in \Omega_1$. One can deal similarly with the other side.

Next, we consider two points $x, y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and two radii $t \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, $s \in]r_y, r_0/4]$, such that $B(x, t) \subset B(y, s)$ and $t \geq s/10$. We assume that $B(y, s)$ satisfy the property and we are going to deduce that $B(x, t)$ satisfies it as well. Let ν_y be a unit vector such that

$$(3.20a) \quad K \cap B(y, s) \subset \{z \in B(y, s) \mid |(z-y) \cdot \nu_y| \leq \varepsilon s\}$$

and

$$(3.20b) \quad A_1(y, s) := \{z \in B(y, s) \mid (z-y) \cdot \nu_y > \varepsilon s\} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.20c) \quad A_2(y, s) := \{z \in B(y, s) \mid (z-y) \cdot \nu_y < -\varepsilon s\} \subset \Omega_2.$$

Since $\beta(x, t) \leq \varepsilon$, there also exists a unit vector ν_x such that

$$(3.21) \quad K \cap B(x, t) \subset \{z \in B(x, t) \mid |(z-x) \cdot \nu_x| \leq \varepsilon t\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we orient ν_x so that $\nu_x \cdot \nu_y \geq 0$.

In this paragraph, we use repeatedly the fact that $\varepsilon \leq 10^{-3}$ without mention. As $x \in B(y, s)$, we know that $|(x-y) \cdot \nu_y| \leq \varepsilon s$. For $u \in \nu_y^\perp \cap B(0, (1-20\varepsilon)t)$, the segment

$$(3.22) \quad (x+u) + [-20\varepsilon t, 20\varepsilon t]\nu_y$$

is contained in $B(x, t) \subset B(y, s)$ and it connects $A_1(y, s)$ to $A_2(y, s)$ (here we use $|(x-y) \cdot \nu_y| \leq \varepsilon s$ and $t \geq s/10$). The segment crosses K at some point z otherwise $A_1(y, s)$ and $A_2(y, s)$ would be connected in $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$. Equation (3.21) says that $|(z-x) \cdot \nu_x| \leq \varepsilon t$ and it implies that $|u \cdot \nu_x| \leq 21\varepsilon t$. We conclude by homogeneity of the hyperplane ν_y^\perp that for all $u \in \nu_y^\perp$, we have

$$(3.23) \quad |u \cdot \nu_x| \leq \frac{21\varepsilon}{1-20\varepsilon} |u| \leq 100\varepsilon |u|.$$

Taking in particular $u := \nu_x - (\nu_x \cdot \nu_y)\nu_y$ (the orthogonal projection of ν_x on ν_y^\perp), we obtain

$$(3.24) \quad 1 - (\nu_x \cdot \nu_y)^2 \leq 100\varepsilon.$$

Since $\nu_x \cdot \nu_y \geq 0$, we have

$$(3.25) \quad 1 - (\nu_x \cdot \nu_y)^2 = (1 - (\nu_x \cdot \nu_y))(1 + (\nu_x \cdot \nu_y)) \geq 1 - \nu_x \cdot \nu_y,$$

whence the estimate on $\nu_x \cdot \nu_y$. Next, we want to show that

$$(3.26a) \quad A_1(x, t) := \{z \in B(x, t) \mid (z - x) \cdot \nu_x > \varepsilon t\} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.26b) \quad A_2(x, t) := \{z \in B(x, t) \mid (z - x) \cdot \nu_x < -\varepsilon t\} \subset \Omega_2.$$

The idea is that $A_1(x, t)$ and $A_1(y, s)$ are two connected subsets of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ with a nonempty intersection (try the point $x + (t/2)\nu_x$ with ε small enough). Therefore, the union $A_1(x, t) \cup A_1(y, s)$ is also a connected subset of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$. The union $A_1(x, t) \cup A_1(y, s)$ meets Ω_1 because $A_1(y, s)$ does and since Ω_1 is a connected component of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$, it is completely contained in Ω_1 .

Now we fix $x \in \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and we want to show that for all $r \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, the ball $B(x, r)$ satisfies the property. We can prove it by induction because it holds for $r = r_0/4$ and if it holds for some $r \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, then it also holds for all $r' \in]\max(r_x, r/10), r]$ by the previous paragraph, and we can iterate until we reach r_x .

We come finally to the proof of the inclusion (3.16). It relies on the following intermediate result. Let $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$, let $r > 0$ be such that $B(x, r) \subset B(x_0, r_0)$ and let ν be a unit vector such that

$$(3.27a) \quad \{y \in B(x, r) \mid (y - x) \cdot \nu > \varepsilon r\} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.27b) \quad \{y \in B(x, r) \mid (y - x) \cdot \nu < -\varepsilon r\} \subset \Omega_2.$$

Then, for all $y \in \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \cap \overline{B}(x, 3r/4) \setminus (K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$, there exists a point $x' \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that

$$(3.28) \quad |y - x'| \leq 2\varepsilon r.$$

The assumptions are satisfied for the ball $B(x, r) = B(x_0, r_0)$ and all the balls $B(x, r)$ with $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and $r \in]r_x, r_0/4]$. The proof of the intermediate result relies on a usual argument but we need to make sure that x' stays in $\overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$. We consider $z := y - \varepsilon r(y - x_0)/\rho$, a small translation of y which satisfies $|z - y| \leq \varepsilon r$ and

$$(3.29) \quad \overline{B}(z, \varepsilon r) \subset \overline{B}(x_0, \rho).$$

If $[y, z]$ meet K , then the proof is finished. Otherwise z stays in the same connected component of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ as y so

$$(3.30) \quad z \in B(x, r) \setminus (K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2).$$

The path $z + [-\varepsilon r\nu, \varepsilon r\nu]$ is contained in $B(x, r)$ and, depending whether $(z - x) \cdot \nu \geq 0$ or $(z - x) \cdot \nu \leq 0$, it connects z to Ω_1 or Ω_2 . Since z belongs to a connected component of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ distinct from Ω_1 and Ω_2 , we deduce that the path must cross K . Hence, there exists $x' \in K$ such that $|z - x'| \leq \varepsilon r$ and thanks to (3.29), $x' \in \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$. Then, we also have $|x' - y| \leq 2\varepsilon r$ as wanted.

Now, we are ready for the proof of (3.16). We consider $y \in \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \setminus (K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$ and we want to show that there exists $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $|x - y| < r_x$. We start by applying the intermediate result in $B(x, r) = B(x_0, r_0)$. There exists a point $x_1 \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that

$$(3.31) \quad |y - x_1| \leq 2\varepsilon r_0.$$

If $2\varepsilon r_0 < r_{x_1}$, then our claim is proved. Otherwise, the radius $r_1 := (4/3)2\varepsilon r_0$ belongs to $]r_{x_1}, r_0/4]$ and we can apply the intermediate result in the ball $B(x_1, r_1)$; there exists $x_2 \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that

$$(3.32) \quad |y - x_2| \leq (4/3)(2\varepsilon)^2 r_0.$$

If $(4/3)(2\varepsilon)^2 r < r_{x_2}$, then our claim is proved. Otherwise, we iterate as before with the radius $r_2 := (4/3)^2(2\varepsilon)^2 r_0$ which belongs to $]r_{x_2}, r_0/4]$. If the process never stops, there exists a sequence $(x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ in K such that

$$(3.33) \quad |y - x_k| < (4/3)^{k-1}(2\varepsilon)^k r_0$$

so $y \in K$. Contradiction. \square

3.2. Proof of the Extension Lemma.

Proof. Throughout the proof, the letter C is a constant ≥ 1 that depends only N and whose value might change from one line to another. We consider a maximal family $(W_i)_{i \in I}$ in

$$(3.34) \quad \{ B(x, r_x) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho), \delta(x) > 0 \}$$

such that whenever $i \neq j$,

$$(3.35) \quad \frac{1}{10}W_i \cap \frac{1}{10}W_j \neq \emptyset.$$

We let $x_i \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ denotes the center of W_i and $r_i > 0$ its radius ($r_i = r_{x_i}$).

Lemma 3.3. *Here we recall that K satisfies hypothesis-H(x_0, r_0, ε_0), we recall the open sets Ω_1, Ω_2 introduced in Definiton 2.2 and we recall that $U = 10^5$ and $8\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau \leq 10^{-8}$.*

- i) *For all $x, y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $y \in 50B_x$, we have $r_x/2 \leq r_y \leq 2r_x$.*
- ii) *For all $x, y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $50B_x \cap 50B_y \neq \emptyset$, we have $r_x/2 \leq r_y \leq 2r_x$. Moreover, if $10B_x \cap 10B_y \neq \emptyset$, then $|x - y| \leq 30r_x$ and in particular, $10B_y \subset 50B_x$.*
- iii) *For all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$, for all $r \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, we have $\beta(x, r) \leq \tau U$. In particular, there exists a unit vector ν_x such that*

$$(3.36a) \quad K \cap B(x, r) \subset \{ y \in B(x, r) \mid |(y - x) \cdot \nu_x| \leq \tau U r \}$$

and

$$(3.36b) \quad \{ y \in B(x, r) \mid (y - x) \cdot \nu_x > \tau U r \} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.36c) \quad \{ y \in B(x, r) \mid (y - x) \cdot \nu_x < -\tau U r \} \subset \Omega_2.$$

We have also

$$(3.37) \quad \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \setminus (K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2) \subset W.$$

iv) *We have*

$$(3.38a) \quad \{ y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid \delta(y) > 0 \} = \{ y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid y \in \bigcup_i W_i \}$$

$$(3.38b) \quad = \{ y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid \exists x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho), y \in 50B_x \}$$

and for all $t > 0$,

$$(3.38c) \quad \bigcup_{y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)} \overline{B}(y, tr_x) \subset \bigcup_i (2t + 1)W_i.$$

- v) *Let k be an index such that $50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$. Then for all $x \in 10W_k$ such that $\text{dist}(x, K) \leq 2r_k$, there exists an index i such that $x \in 9W_i$.*
- vi) *There exists a universal constant $C \geq 1$ such that for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ with $\delta(x) > 0$, there exists at most C balls $50W_i$ which meet $50B_x$.*
- vii) *The family $(50W_i)_i$ is locally finite in*

$$(3.39) \quad B(x_0, r_0) \setminus \{ x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid \delta(x) = 0 \}.$$

- viii) *There exists a universal constant $C \geq 1$ such that for all $x \in \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$, there at most C balls $50W_i$ which contains x .*

Proof.

Item i) and ii). They are immediate consequences of Remark 2.5.

Item iii). We check that for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and for all $r \in]r_x, r_0/4]$, we have $\beta(x, r) \leq \tau U$. If $r > \delta(x)$, then it holds by definition of the geometric function. Otherwise $r_x < r \leq \delta(x)$ and since $\tau \geq \varepsilon_0$, we get

$$(3.40) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq \frac{\delta(x)}{r_x} \beta(x, \delta(x)) \leq \tau U.$$

The properties stated in this item follows from an application of Lemma 3.2 with $\varepsilon := \tau U \leq 10^{-3}$.

Item iv). For $y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $\delta(y) > 0$, there exists an index i such that the ball $\frac{1}{10}B(y, r_y)$ meet $\frac{1}{10}W_i$. As in Remark 2.5, $|y - x_i| \leq 3r_i/10 < r_i$ so y belongs to W_i . Reciprocally, for $y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that there exists $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ with $y \in 50B_x$, we have $\delta(x) > 0$ (because $50B_x$ is non empty) so $\delta(y) > 0$ by item i). Finally, for all $y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$, we have either $\delta(y) = 0$ and thus $B(y, tr_y) = \emptyset$ or there exists i such that $|y - x_i| < r_i$ and $r_y \leq 2r_i$ so $\overline{B}(y, tr_y) \subset (2t + 1)W_i$.

Item v). We fix k such that $50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$. For $x \in 10W_k$ such that $\text{dist}(x, K) \leq 2r_k$, there exists $y \in K$ such that $|x - y| \leq 2r_k$ and since $y \in 50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$, we have $r_k \leq 2r_y$. We apply iv) to conclude that

$$(3.41) \quad x \in \overline{B}(y, 2r_k) \subset \overline{B}(y, 4r_y) \subset \bigcup_i 9W_i.$$

Item vi). We fix a point $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $\delta(x) > 0$. Whenever a ball $50W_i$ meet $50B_x$, we have $r_i/2 \leq r_x \leq 2r_i$ and $|x - x_i| \leq 50r_i + 50r_x \leq 150r_x$ so $W_i \subset 200B_x$. Thus, the set

$$(3.42) \quad \left\{ \frac{1}{10}W_i \mid 50W_i \cap 50B_x \neq \emptyset \right\}$$

is composed of disjoint balls whose radii are bounded from below by $r_x/20$ and which are contained in $200B_x$. We deduce that the cardinal of (3.42) is bounded by a universal constant.

Item vii). We want to prove that for all

$$(3.43) \quad x \in B(x_0, r_0) \setminus \{x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid \delta(x) = 0\},$$

there exists a neighborhood of x which meet only a finite number of balls $(50W_i)_i$. According to item iv), we have

$$(3.44) \quad B(x_0, r_0) \setminus \{x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \mid \delta(x) = 0\} \\ = (B(x_0, r_0) \setminus [K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)]) \cup \bigcup \{50B_y \mid y \in K \cap B(x_0, \rho)\}.$$

If there exists $y \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $x \in 50B_y$, we must have in particular $\delta(y) > 0$ and then the previous item shows that $50B_y$ has the required property. We now focus on the points $x \in B(x_0, r_0) \setminus [K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)]$. We proceed by contradiction and assume that there is a sequence of distinct elements $(W_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ extracted from (W_i) such that $\text{dist}(x, 50W_{i_k}) \rightarrow 0$ when $k \rightarrow +\infty$. The balls $(1/10)W_{i_k}$ are disjoint and contained in $B(x_0, r_0)$ so their radii must go to 0 as k goes to $+\infty$. We deduce that $\text{dist}(x, x_{i_k}) \rightarrow 0$, where x_{i_k} denotes the center of W_{i_k} . But since the points x_{i_k} belong to $K \cap B(x_0, \rho)$, we must have $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$. Contradiction.

Item viii). In view of the two previous items, it suffices to focus on the points $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $\delta(x) = 0$. But there are no ball $50W_i$ containing x (otherwise $r_x \geq r_i/2 > 0$). \square

Let us draw two consequences of Lemma 3.3. According to item iv), we have

$$(3.45) \quad W \subset \bigcup_i 3W_i,$$

where we recall that $W = \bigcup \{B_x \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)\}$. Next, we observe that according to item vii), the family $(50W_i)$ is locally finite in each open set $V_h = \Omega_h \cup W$.

For every ball W_i , we consider a function $\varphi_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with compact support on $10W_i$, equal to 1 on $9W_i$ and such that $0 \leq \varphi_i \leq 1$. We also choose φ_i so that its Lipschitz constant is $\leq 2r_i^{-1}$. From now on, we fix $h = 1, 2$. Letting $\text{spt}(\varphi_i)$ denote the compact support of φ_i in $10W_i$, we define

$$(3.46) \quad S_h := V_h \cap \bigcup_i \text{spt}(\varphi_i).$$

Since the family $(10W_i)_i$ is locally finite in V_h , the set S_h is a relatively closed subset of V_h . It is also clear that

$$(3.47) \quad W \subset S_h \subset \widetilde{W}.$$

We are going to complete the family $(\varphi_i)_i$ with a function φ_0 to obtain a partition of unity in V_h .

Lemma 3.4. *There is a function $\varphi_0 \in C^\infty(V_h)$ such that $0 \leq \varphi_0 \leq 1$,*

$$(3.48) \quad \varphi_0 = 1 \text{ in } V_h \setminus S_h$$

and

$$(3.49) \quad V_h \cap \{\varphi_0 \neq 0\} \subset \Omega_h \setminus \bigcup_i 9W_i$$

We also have

$$(3.50) \quad \varphi_0 + \sum_{i \geq 1} \varphi_i \geq 1 \text{ in } V_h$$

and there is a universal constant $C \geq 1$ such that for all k , for all $x \in 10W_k$,

$$(3.51) \quad |\nabla \varphi_0(x)| + \sum_{i \in I} |\nabla \varphi_i(x)| \leq Cr_k^{-1}.$$

Proof. The letter C denotes a constant ≥ 1 that depends only on N but whose value might change from one line to another. We define

$$(3.52) \quad \varphi_0(x) = \prod_{i \in I} (1 - \varphi_i).$$

Thanks to item vii) of Lemma 3.3, we know that every point $x \in V_h$ admits a neighborhood which meets a finite number of balls $10W_i$. Therefore, φ_0 is well defined and smooth. We can say more about the Lipschitz constant of φ_0 in a fixed set $10W_k$. According to vi), there exists a universal constant $C \geq 1$ such that at most C balls $10W_i$ meet $10W_k$. Moreover, we have in this case $r_k/2 \leq r_i \leq 2r_k$. So in the set $10W_k$, φ_0 is a product of C functions which are Cr_k^{-1} -Lipschitz and with range in $[0, 1]$ so it itself Cr_k^{-1} -Lipschitz. By the same argument, the sum $\sum_{i \in I} \varphi_i$ is Cr_k^{-1} -Lipschitz in $10W_k$. Property (3.48) is straightforward. It is clear that $\varphi_0 = 0$ in $\bigcup_i 9W_i$ whence

$$(3.53) \quad V_h \cap \{\varphi_0 \neq 0\} \subset V_h \setminus \bigcup_i 9W_i.$$

But $V_h = (\Omega_h \cup W)$ and we have seen in (3.45) that $W \subset \bigcup_i 9W_i$ so we have in fact

$$(3.54) \quad V_h \cap \{\varphi_0 \neq 0\} \subset \Omega_h \setminus \bigcup_i 9W_i.$$

The property (3.50) follows from the observation that for all sequence $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, 1]$, we have

$$(3.55) \quad \prod_k (1 - t_k) + \sum_k t_k \geq 1.$$

It can be proved by induction because for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$, $s(1 - t) + t \geq s$. □

We set for $i \in I$,

$$(3.56) \quad \theta_i = \frac{\varphi_i}{\varphi_0 + \sum_{i \in I} \varphi_i}$$

and

$$(3.57) \quad \theta_0 = \frac{\varphi_0}{\varphi_0 + \sum_{i \in I} \varphi_i}.$$

Now we have a smooth partition of unity on V_h . The information that we have gathered imply easily that for all $k \in I$, the function θ_i is Cr_k^{-1} -Lipschitz in $V_h \cap 10W_k$.

We are ready to build the functions v_h . For each i , there exists an hyperplane P_i passing through x_i such that

$$(3.58) \quad K \cap 10W_i \subset \{x \in 10W_i \mid \text{dist}(x, P_i) \leq 10\tau U r_i\}$$

and a unit normal vector ν_i to P_i such that

$$(3.59a) \quad A_1(x_i, 10r_i) := \{y \in 10W_i \mid (y - x_i) \cdot \nu_i > \tau Ur_i\} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.59b) \quad A_2(x_i, 10r_i) := \{y \in 10W_i \mid (y - x_i) \cdot \nu_i < -\tau Ur_i\} \subset \Omega_2.$$

Now, we define

$$(3.60) \quad a_1^i = x_i + 8r_i \nu_i$$

$$(3.61) \quad a_2^i = x_i - 8r_i \nu_i$$

and $D_h^i = B(a_h^i, r_i)$ for $h = 1, 2$. We also denote by r_h^i the averaged rigid displacement of u on D_h^i ;

$$(3.62) \quad r_h^i : x \mapsto \int_{D_h^i} u(y) \, dy + \left(\int_{D_h^i} \frac{\nabla u(y) - \nabla u(y)^T}{2} \, dy \right) \left(x - \int_{D_h^i} y \, dy \right).$$

Finally, we define on V_h , the function

$$(3.63) \quad v_h(x) := \theta_0(x)u(x) + \sum_{i \in I} \theta_i(x)r_h^i.$$

It is clear that $v_h \in LD_{\text{loc}}(V_h)$ and that $v_h = u$ in $V_h \setminus S_h$, where S_h is the relatively closed subset of V_h defined in (3.46) by

$$(3.64) \quad S_h = V_h \cap \bigcup_i \text{spt}(\varphi_i).$$

We are going to show that for all k such that $50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$, we have

$$(3.65) \quad \int_{V_h \cap 10W_k} |e(v_h)|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_h \cap 50W_k} |e(u)|^2 \, dx.$$

We require $50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$ so that the right-hand side integral in (3.65) does not outreach $B(x_0, \rho)$ but also because we will use crucially the item v) of Lemma 3.3. Thanks to item viii) of Lemma 3.3, the sum of indicators functions $\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{50W_i}$ is bounded by a constant C so we can add up the local inequalities in (3.65) to obtain

$$(3.66) \quad \int_{V_h \cap A} |e(v_h)|^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{B(x_0, \rho) \cap \Omega_h} |e(u)|^2 \, dx,$$

where $A := \bigcup \{10W_i \mid 50W_i \subset B(x_0, \rho)\}$. Setting $F_h := S_h \setminus A$, we thus have

$$(3.67) \quad \int_{V_h \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 \, dx \leq \int_{B(x_0, \rho) \cap \Omega_h} |e(u)|^2 \, dx.$$

It is clear that F_h is relatively closed in V_h and that

$$(3.68) \quad F_h \subset \bigcup \{10W_i \mid 50W_i \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Since $A \subset B(x_0, \rho)$, it is also clear that $F_h \setminus B(x_0, \rho) = S_h \setminus B(x_0, \rho)$, as required in the lemma's statement.

From now on, we fix an index k such that $50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$ and we prove (3.65). We define I_k the set of index $i \in I$ such that $10W_i \cap 10W_k \neq \emptyset$. In particular, we recall that for $i \in I_k$, we have $r_k/2 \leq r_i \leq 2r_k$, $|x_i - x_k| \leq 30r_k$ and $10W_i \subset 50W_k$. We want to show first that for all $i \in I_k$,

$$(3.69) \quad \int_{10W_k} |r_h^i - r_h^k|^2 \, dx \leq Cr_k^2 \int_{\Omega_h \cap 50W_k} |e(u)|^2 \, dx.$$

We cannot apply the Korn-Poincaré inequality in the whole ball $10W_k$ (because the structure of K is a priori unknown) but we will apply it in a Lipschitz regular open subset set D_h of $B(x_0, \rho) \cap \Omega_h$ of diameter $\leq 100r_k$ and which contains all the D_h^i for $i \in I$. We consider an hyperplane P passing through x_k such that

$$(3.70) \quad K \cap 50W_k \subset \{y \in 50W_k \mid \text{dist}(y, P) \leq 50\tau Ur_k\}$$

and a unit normal vector ν to P such that

$$(3.71a) \quad A_1(x_k, 50r_k) := \{y \in 50W_k \mid (y - x_k) \cdot \nu > 50\tau U r_k\} \subset \Omega_1$$

$$(3.71b) \quad A_2(x_k, 50r_k) := \{y \in 50W_k \mid (y - x_k) \cdot \nu < -50\tau U r_k\} \subset \Omega_2.$$

It will be useful to observe, as in Remark 2.4, that for all $x \in P \cap 50W_k$, we have $d(x, K) \leq 100\tau U r_k \leq r_k/2$. Now, we introduce

$$(3.72a) \quad D_1 := \{y \in 49W_k \mid (y - x_k) \cdot \nu > (3/2)r_k\}$$

$$(3.72b) \quad D_2 := \{y \in 49W_k \mid (y - x_k) \cdot \nu < -(3/2)r_k\}.$$

It is clear that $D_h \subset \Omega_h$ because $D_h \subset A_h(x_k, 50r_k)$. We are going to justify that for all $i \in I_k$, the ball $D_h^i = B(a_h^i, r_i)$ is contained in D_h . We fix $i \in I_k$ and we recall that $r_k/2 \leq r_i \leq 2r_k$ and $|x_i - x_k| \leq 30r_k$. By construction, we have $D_h^i \subset 9W_i$ so $D_h^i \subset 48W_k$. Then, we show that $(a_1^i - x_k) \cdot \nu > (7/2)r_k$ and $(a_2^i - x_k) \cdot \nu < -(7/2)r_k$. We only detail the case $h = 1$. Since $x_i \in K \cap 10W_i \subset K \cap 50W_k$, we have $|(x_i - x_k) \cdot \nu| \leq 50\tau U r_k$. By Lemma 3.2, we also know that $\nu_i \cdot \nu \geq 1 - 100\tau U$. Using the formula $a_1^i = x_i + 8r_i\nu_i$, we have

$$(3.73) \quad (a_1^i - x_k) \cdot \nu = 8(\nu_i \cdot \nu)r_i + (x_i - x_k) \cdot \nu$$

$$(3.74) \quad \geq 8(1 - 100\tau U)r_i - 50\tau U r_k$$

$$(3.75) \quad \geq 4(1 - 100\tau U)r_k - 50\tau U r_k$$

$$(3.76) \quad \geq (7/2)r_k,$$

because $\tau U \leq 10^{-3}$. It follows that $D_h^i = B(a_h^i, r_i) \subset B(a_h^i, 2r_k) \subset D_h$. Note also that the diameter of D_h is bounded by $100r_k$ and is comparable to radii of all the balls D_h^i for $i \in I_k$. We estimate the L^2 norm of $r_h^i - r_h^k$ in D_h^k using the Korn-Poincaré inequality,

$$(3.77) \quad \int_{D_h^k} |r_h^i - r_h^k|^2 dx \int_{D_h} |r_h^i - r_h^k|^2 dx$$

$$(3.78) \quad \leq 2 \int_{D_h} |r_h^i - u|^2 dx + 2 \int_{D_h} |u - r_h^k|^2 dx$$

$$(3.79) \quad \leq Cr_k^2 \int_{D_h} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

As $r_h^i - r_h^k$ is an affine function, we have

$$(3.80) \quad \int_{20D_h^k} |r_h^i - r_h^k|^2 dx \leq C \int_{D_h^k} |r_h^i - r_h^k|^2 dx$$

and since $10W_k \subset 20D_h^k$, the estimate (3.69) is now proved.

We come back to the estimation of $\int_{V_h \cap 10W_k} |e(v_h)|^2 dx$. Using $e(r_h^i) = 0$, we compute

$$(3.81) \quad e(v_h) = [\nabla\theta_0, u] + \theta_0 e(u) + \sum_{i \geq 1} [\nabla\theta_i, r_h^i],$$

where given two vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$(3.82) \quad [u, v] := \frac{u(v^T) + v(u^T)}{2} \in \mathbb{M}^{N \times N}.$$

Since $(\theta_i)_i$ is a partition of unity, we know that $\theta_0 + \sum_{i \in I} \theta_i = 1$ hence we can subtract r_h^k and obtain

$$(3.83) \quad e(v_h) = [\nabla\theta_0, u - r_h^k] + \theta_0 e(u) + \sum_{i \in I} [\nabla\theta_i, r_h^i - r_h^k].$$

so

$$(3.84) \quad |e(v_h)| \leq |\nabla\theta_0| |u - r_h^k| + |\theta_0 e(u)| + \sum_{i \in I} |\nabla\theta_i| |r_h^i - r_h^k|.$$

To deal with the first term, we show that

$$(3.85) \quad \{x \in V_h \cap 10W_k \mid \nabla\theta_0 \neq 0\} \subset D_h.$$

We observe that by (3.49),

$$(3.86) \quad \{x \in V_h \cap 10W_k \mid \nabla\theta_0 \neq 0\} \subset \Omega_h \cap 10W_k \setminus \bigcup_i 9W_i.$$

Then we recall that $50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$, the item v) of Lemma 3.3 and the fact that for $x \in P \cap 50W_k$, we have $\text{dist}(x, K) \leq r_k/2$ to see that

$$(3.87) \quad \Omega_h \cap 10W_k \setminus \bigcup_i 9W_i \subset \{x \in \Omega_h \cap 10W_k \mid \text{dist}(x, K) > 2r_k\}$$

$$(3.88) \quad \subset \{x \in \Omega_h \cap 10W_k \mid \text{dist}(x, P) > (3/2)r_k\},$$

which is contained in D_h . Then we use the Korn-Poincaré inequality in D_h to estimate

$$(3.89) \quad \int_{V_h \cap 10W_k} |\nabla\theta_0|^2 |u - r_h^k|^2 dx \leq Cr_k^{-2} \int_{D_h} |u - r_h^k|^2 dx$$

$$(3.90) \quad \leq C \int_{D_h} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

For the second term, there is nothing to do thanks to (3.49) and the fact that $|\theta_0| \leq 1$ in V_h . For the last term, remember that there are at most C indices in I_k and that for all $i \in I_k$, we have $|\nabla\theta_i| \leq Cr_k^{-1}$ in $V_h \cap 10W_k$. We apply (3.69) to deduce

$$(3.91) \quad \sum_{i \in I} \int_{V_h \cap 10W_k} |\nabla\theta_i|^2 |r_h^i - r_h^k|^2 dx \leq Cr_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in I_k} |r_h^i - r_h^k|^2 dx$$

$$(3.92) \quad \leq C \int_{D_h} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

□

Remark 3.1. A careful look at the proof reveals that for all k such that $50W_k \subset B(x_0, \rho)$,

$$(3.93) \quad \int_{V_h \cap 10W_k} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega_h \cap D_h} |e(u)|^2 dx,$$

where D_h is defined in (3.72) by

$$(3.94a) \quad D_1 := \{y \in 49W_k \mid (y - x_k) \cdot \nu > (3/2)r_k\}$$

$$(3.94b) \quad D_2 := \{y \in 49W_k \mid (y - x_k) \cdot \nu < -(3/2)r_k\}.$$

The fact that

$$(3.95) \quad K \cap 50W_k \subset \{y \in 50W_k \mid \text{dist}(y, P) \leq r_k/2\},$$

implies that for $y \in D_h$, we have $\text{dist}(y, K) \geq r_k$. We conclude that

$$(3.96) \quad \int_{S_h \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq C \int_D |e(u)|^2 dx,$$

where

$$(3.97) \quad D := B(x_0, \rho) \cap \bigcup \{y \in 50B_x \mid \text{dist}(y, K) \geq r_x\}.$$

This estimation is a bit finer than the Lemma's statement and will be useful for Proposition 5.3.

4. A COMPACTNESS LEMMA

Definition 4.1. Let E be a relatively closed subset of Ω . A deformation of E in an open ball $B \subset \Omega$ is a Lipschitz function $f : E \rightarrow \Omega$ such that $f(E \cap B) \subset B$ and $E \cap \{f \neq \text{id}\} \subset\subset B$. The image of E by a deformation is called a topological competitor of E in B .

It follows in particular that there exists an open ball $B' \subset\subset B$ of same center and of slightly smaller radius such that $f(E) \setminus B' = E \setminus B'$. For the next definition, we recall that a gauge is a non-decreasing function $h :]0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} h(t) = 0$.

Definition 4.2. Let E be a relatively closed subset of Ω with \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -locally finite measure. We say that E is an almost-minimal set in Ω if for all $x \in E$, for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and for all deformation f of E in $B(x, r)$, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(f(E \cap B(x, r))) + h(r)r^{N-1}.$$

Moreover, we say that E is coral if for all $x \in E$ and all $r > 0$, $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(x, r)) > 0$.

As usual, if E is almost-minimal with gauge h in a ball $B(x_0, r_0)$, then the set $r_0^{-1}(E - x_0)$ is almost-minimal in $B(0, 1)$ with gauge $\tilde{h}(r) := h(r_0 r)$.

The following Lemma follows from the standard regularity theory for minimal sets. As we have not found the statement in the litterature, we justify it by using the ideas of Allard's regularity theorem. The reader can skip the proof.

Theorem 4.1. For all $\gamma \in]0, 1[$, there exists $\varepsilon_* \in (0, 1)$ and $c_* \geq 1$ (both depending only on N, γ) such that the following property holds. Let $r_0 > 0$, let E be a coral minimal set in $B(0, r_0)$ such that $0 \in E$. If $\beta(0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_*$, then for all $0 < r \leq r_0$,

$$(4.2) \quad \beta(0, r) \leq c_* \left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right)^\gamma \beta(0, r_0).$$

Proof. We follow the reference [27, Theorem 23.1]. To reduce cumbersome notations, we replace $B(0, r_0)$ by $B(0, 2r_0)$ in the assumptions, i.e., we assume that E is minimal in $B(0, 2r_0)$ and that $\beta(0, 2r_0) \leq \varepsilon_*$.

Our minimal set E induces a stationary n -rectifiable varifold V with multiplicity 1 in $B(0, 2r_0)$ (see [27, §15–16]). In Simon's notation, the letter H stands for the generalized mean curvature of V which is 0, the letter μ stands the weight measure of V which is $\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner E$, the letter θ stands for the multiplicity of V which is 1 and the symbol $\text{spt}(V)$ stands for $\text{spt}(\mu)$ which is the set E (because E is coral).

We let (e_1, \dots, e_N) be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^N . We identify \mathbb{R}^{N-1} with the hyperplane of \mathbb{R}^N generated by the e_1, \dots, e_{N-1} . We decompose each vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as $x = x' + x_N e_N$, where $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ and $x_N \in \mathbb{R}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the hyperplane $P = \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ achieves the minimum in the definition of $\beta(0, 2r_0)$.

For $x \in E \cap B(x_0, r_0)$ and $0 < r \leq r_0$, we introduce

$$(4.3) \quad d(x, r) := \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(x, r))}{\omega_{N-1} r^{N-1}},$$

where ω_{N-1} is the measure of the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^{N-1} . We claim that there exists a universal constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad d(0, r_0) \leq 1 + C\beta(0, 2r_0).$$

If $\beta(0, 2r_0) \geq 1/4$, this is trivial by Ahlfors-regularity of minimal sets ([10, Lemma 2.15]). We pass to the case $\beta(0, 2r_0) \leq 1/4$. We start by introducing the tubular neighborhood

$$(4.5) \quad A := \{x \in B(0, 2r_0) \mid |x_N| \leq \beta(0, 2r_0)r\},$$

which, by definition of $\beta(0, 2r_0)$, contains $E \cap B(0, 2r_0)$. We also consider the set

$$(4.6) \quad F = (\partial B(0, r_0) \cap A) \cup (P \cap B(0, r_0)).$$

One can build a Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(B(0, 2r_0)) &\subset B(0, 2r_0), \\ \{f \neq \text{id}\} &\subset\subset B(0, 2r_0), \\ f(B(0, r_0)) &\subset F \end{aligned}$$

and

$$f = \text{id in } (A \setminus B(0, r_0)).$$

It is a deformation of E in $B(0, 2r_0)$ so

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, 2r_0)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(f(E \cap B(0, 2r_0)))$$

but since $f = \text{id}$ in $E \setminus B(0, r_0)$, we deduce

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, r_0)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(f(E \cap B(0, r_0))).$$

To conclude, we observe that $f(E \cap B(0, r_0)) \subset F$ and

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F) \leq \omega_{N-1} r_0^{N-1} + C\beta(0, 2r_0)r_0^{N-1}.$$

Our claim is proved.

For $x \in E \cap B(0, r_0)$, $0 < r \leq r_0$ and for any (linear) hyperplane T , we introduce the tilt-excess

$$(4.10) \quad E(x, r, T) = r^{1-N} \int_{E \cap B(x, r)} \|p_{T_x} - p_T\|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{N-1},$$

where T_x is the (linear) approximate tangent plane of E at x , p_{T_x} and p_T are the orthogonal projection onto T_x and T respectively and $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm. If we let ν_x denote a unit normal vector to T_x and ν a unit normal vector to T , one can compute that

$$(4.11) \quad \|p_{T_x} - p_T\| = \sqrt{1 - (\nu_x \cdot \nu)^2} = |\sin(\alpha)|,$$

where α is the angle between T_x and T .

According to Caccioppoli inequality for minimal sets ([27, Lemma 22.2]), there exists a universal constant $C \geq 1$ such that for all (linear) hyperplane T in \mathbb{R}^N ,

$$(4.12) \quad E(0, r_0, T) \leq Cr_0^{1-N} \int_{E \cap B(0, 2r_0)} \left(\frac{\text{dist}(y - x, T)}{r} \right)^2 d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}.$$

We have in particular for all T ,

$$(4.13) \quad E(0, r_0, T) \leq C \left(r^{-1} \sup_{y \in E \cap B(0, 2r_0)} \text{dist}(y, T) \right)^2$$

and thus for $T = \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$,

$$(4.14) \quad E(0, r_0, \mathbb{R}^{N-1}) \leq C\beta(0, 2r_0)^2.$$

From now on, we are going to review the proof of [27, Theorem 23.1] to prove the decay of the flatness. Here, $c \geq 1$ is a generic constant that depends only on N and γ , whose value might change without mention. To be consistent with Simon's notation, we define $p := n/(1 - \gamma)$, where $n := N - 1$, so that $\gamma = 1 - n/p$. We consider a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ that will be chosen small enough depending on N and γ . In view of (4.4) and (4.14), we can choose ε_* small enough (depending on N and ε) so that $f(0, r_0) \leq 3/2$ and $E(0, r_0, \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \varepsilon$. Now, provided that ε is small enough (depending on N and p), the assumptions of [27, Theorem 23.1] are satisfied.

The proof of [27, Theorem 23.1], gives at [27, §22 (11)] that there exists an hyperplane S_0 such that for all $0 < r \leq r_0$,

$$(4.15) \quad E(0, r, S_0) \leq c \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^{2(1-n/p)} E(0, r_0, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

We also get at [27, §23 (14) and (19)] that there exists $\sigma \in]0, 1[$ (depending on N and p) and a $C^{1,1-n/p}$ function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(0) = 0$, f is $(1/2)$ -Lipschitz,

$$(4.16) \quad E \cap B(0, \sigma r_0) = \text{graph}(f) \cap B(0, \sigma r_0)$$

and for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n \cap B(0, \sigma r_0)$,

$$(4.17) \quad |\nabla f(h) - \nabla f(0)| \leq c \left(\frac{|h|}{r_0} \right)^{1-n/p} E(0, r_0, \mathbb{R}^n)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} E(0, r, S_0) = 0$ and E is a C^1 surface in a neighborhood of 0, it is easy to see that $T_0 = S_0$, where T_0 is the tangent plane to E at 0. Thus, the vector

$$(4.18) \quad \nu_0 := \frac{-\nabla f(0) + e_N}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla f(0)|^2}}$$

is a unit normal to S_0 . For all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n \cap B(0, \sigma r_0)$, we estimate

$$(4.19) \quad \text{dist}(h + f(h)e_N, S_0) = |(h + f(h)e_N) \cdot \nu_0|$$

$$(4.20) \quad = \sqrt{1 + |\nabla f(0)|^2}^{-1} |f(h) - \nabla f(0) \cdot h|$$

$$(4.21) \quad \leq |f(h) - \nabla f(0) \cdot h|$$

and we deduce by the mean value inequality, (4.17) and (4.14) that

$$(4.22) \quad \text{dist}(h + f(h)e_N, S_0) \leq c|h| \left(\frac{|h|}{r_0} \right)^{1-n/p} E(0, r_0, \mathbb{R}^n)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$(4.23) \quad \leq c|h| \left(\frac{|h|}{r_0} \right)^{1-n/p} \beta(0, 2r_0).$$

It follows that for all $x \in E \cap B(0, \sigma r_0)$,

$$(4.24) \quad \text{dist}(x, S_0) \leq c|x| \left(\frac{|x|}{r_0} \right)^{1-n/p} \beta(0, 2r_0)$$

and thus for all $0 < r \leq \sigma r_0$,

$$(4.25) \quad r^{-1} \sup_{x \in E \cap B(0, r)} \text{dist}(x, S_0) \leq c \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^{1-n/p} \beta(0, 2r_0).$$

This is enough to control the bilateral flatness $\beta(0, r)$ by Remark 2.4 (the set E is a $(1/2)$ -Lipschitz graph passing through 0 so it separates $B(0, r)$). The case $r \in [\sigma r_0, 2r_0]$ is trivial because

$$(4.26) \quad \beta(0, r) \leq \left(\frac{2}{\sigma} \right) \beta(0, 2r_0)$$

and $(r/r_0)^{1-n/p}$ is bounded from below by $\sigma^{1-n/p}$ which depends only on N and p . \square

Here is a new proof of [24, Lemma 31] which avoids the ‘‘uniform concentration property’’ (not yet available in Griffith setting) by exploiting the limiting properties of minimizing sequences (see [13], [15], [?], [14] or [20]).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\varepsilon_* \in (0, 1)$, $c_* \geq 1$ be the universal constants introduced in Theorem 4.1 for $\gamma = 1/2$. Let E be a relatively closed subset of $B(0, 1)$ such that $0 \in E$ and, for some constant $C \geq 1$, for all $x \in E$, for all $t > 0$ with $B(x, t) \subset B(0, 1)$, we have*

$$(4.27) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(x, t)) \geq C^{-1}t^{N-1}.$$

For all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_*$ and for all $0 < a \leq 1/2$, there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ (depending on N, C, ε, a) such that if

$$(4.28a) \quad \beta_E(0, 1) \leq \varepsilon$$

$$(4.28b) \quad \beta_E(0, a) \geq 4c_*\sqrt{a}\varepsilon,$$

then there is a topological competitor F of E in $B(0, 1)$ satisfying

$$(4.29) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F) \geq \eta.$$

Proof. We proceed by contradiction. We assume that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a relatively closed set E_i of $B(0, 1)$ such that $0 \in E_i$, such that for all $x \in E_i$, for all $t > 0$ with $B(x, t) \subset B(0, 1)$ we have

$$(4.30) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_i \cap B(x, t)) \geq C^{-1}t^{N-1}$$

and such that

$$(4.31a) \quad \beta_{E_i}(0, 1) \leq \varepsilon$$

$$(4.31b) \quad \beta_{E_i}(0, a) \geq 4c_*\sqrt{a}\varepsilon$$

but for all deformation f in $B(0, 1)$,

$$(4.32) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_i) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(f(E_i)) + 2^{-i}.$$

We can already deduce that the sequence has a uniformly bounded measure in $B(0, 1)$. Indeed, fix an index i , consider a point $x_0 \in B(0, 1) \setminus E_i$ (at least one exists because $\beta_{E_i}(0, 1) < 1$) and an open ball B_0 such that $x_0 \in B_0 \subset\subset B(0, 1)$. We let $f : E_i \cap B_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be the radial projection onto ∂B_0 centered on x_0 and we extend it by the identity map on $E_i \setminus B_i$. This defines a deformation of E_i in $B(0, 1)$ and we deduce that

$$(4.33) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_i \cap B) \leq C \text{diam}(B)^{N-1} + 1,$$

for some universal constant $C \geq 1$. Then, we consider the sequence of measures $(\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner E_i)_i$ in $B(0, 1)$. Since it is locally uniformly, a subsequence converges to a Radon measure μ in $B(0, 1)$. According to [20, Corollary 4.1], the minimality property (4.32) implies that $\mu = \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner E$, where E is the support of μ in $B(0, 1)$. In particular, E is a coral set but [20, Corollary 4.1] says moreover that E is minimal in the sense that for all deformation f of E in $B(0, 1)$, one has

$$(4.34) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(f(E)).$$

We also mention [16, Theorem 1.7] as an alternative to [20]. It is itself the conclusion of a series of works on limits of minimizing sequences [13], [15], [14].

Next, we justify that $(E_i)_i$ converges to E in local Hausdorff distance in $B(0, 1)$. For all $x \in E$, and for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$, we have

$$(4.35) \quad 0 < \mu(B(x, r)) \leq \liminf_i \mathcal{H}^d(E_i \cap B(x, r))$$

so for i big enough, $\mathcal{H}^d(E_i \cap B(x, r)) > 0$. This proves that $\lim_i \text{dist}(x, E_i) = 0$. For $x \in B(0, 1)$ such that $\liminf_i \text{dist}(x, E_i) = 0$, there exists a subsequence $(E_j)_j$ and a sequence of points $(x_j)_j$ which converges to x and such that for all j , we have $x_j \in E_j$. For all $r > 0$ small enough, we have $B(x_j, r/2) \subset B(x, r)$ and $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$, so using (4.30), we get

$$(4.36) \quad \mu(\overline{B}(x, r)) \geq \limsup_i \mathcal{H}^d(E_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r))$$

$$(4.37) \quad \geq \limsup_i \mathcal{H}^d(E_i \cap \overline{B}(x_i, r/2))$$

$$(4.38) \quad \geq C^{-1}(r/2)^{N-1}.$$

This proves that $x \in E$. We have shown that $(E_i)_i$ converges to E in local Hausdorff distance in $B(0, 1)$ and Remark 2.2 allows us to deduce that

$$(4.39a) \quad \beta_E(0, 1) \leq \liminf_i \beta_{E_i}(0, 1)$$

$$(4.39b) \quad \beta_E(0, 2a) \geq \frac{1}{2} \limsup_i \beta_{E_i}(0, a)$$

so

$$(4.40a) \quad \beta_E(0, 1) \leq \varepsilon$$

$$(4.40b) \quad \beta_E(0, 2a) \geq 2c_*\sqrt{a}\varepsilon.$$

Since E is a minimal set in $B(0, 1)$ which satisfies (4.40a), we can apply Theorem 4.1 with $\gamma = 1/2$, $r_0 = 1$, $r = 2a$;

$$(4.41) \quad \beta_E(0, 2a) \leq c_*\sqrt{2a}\beta_E(0, 1) < 2c_*\sqrt{a}\varepsilon.$$

Contradiction. □

5. STOPPING TIME AND CONTROL OF ω AND m

We are now ready to proceed with our stopping time argument. We start by fixing some constants. Let $\varepsilon_* \in (0, 1)$, $c_* \geq 1$ and be the universal constants of Theorem 4.1 for $\gamma = 1/2$. We then define the universal constants

$$(5.1) \quad \tau := \min(\varepsilon_*, 10^{-9}), \quad A_0 := \max((4c_*)^2, U) \geq 10^5 \quad \text{and} \quad A = A_0^2 \geq 10^{10}.$$

Here, U is the constant $U = 10^5$ defined in Section 3.

The bad mass Let K be a relatively closed subset of Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \tau/(8A)$. For $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \frac{3}{4}r_0)$, we set

$$(5.2) \quad d(x) := \inf \{ r > 0 \mid \beta(x, t) \leq \tau \text{ for all } t \in [r, r_0/4] \}$$

and then we define the *bad mass* of K in $B(x_0, r_0)$ by

$$(5.3) \quad m_K(x_0, r_0) := \frac{1}{r_0^{N-1}} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap R(x_0, r_0)),$$

where

$$(5.4) \quad R(x_0, r_0) := \bigcup \{ B(x, Ad(x)) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \frac{3}{4}r_0) \text{ such that } d(x) > 0 \}.$$

When there is no ambiguity, we write $m(x_0, r_0)$ instead of $m_K(x_0, r_0)$.

For all $x \in \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$ and $0 < t \leq r_0/4$, we have

$$(5.5) \quad \beta(x, t) \leq (2r_0/t)\beta(x_0, r_0)$$

so

$$(5.6) \quad d(x) \leq 2\tau^{-1}\beta(x_0, r_0)r_0.$$

We deduce that $d(x) \leq r_0/(4A)$ and that

$$(5.7) \quad m(x_0, r_0) \leq \frac{1}{r_0^{n-1}} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)).$$

If the density of K is bounded from above by a constant C , then the bad mass is also bounded by C .

It is immediate from the definition of d that for all $t \in]d(x), r_0/4]$, we have $\beta(x, d(x)) \leq \tau$. But if $d(x) > 0$, one can also use the usual scaling property (2.13) to justify that

$$(5.8) \quad \beta(x, d(x)) = \tau.$$

Remark 5.1. Let $x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0)$ and $r > 0$ be such that $B(x, 3r/4) \subset B(x_0, 3r_0/4)$ and such that $\beta(x, r) \leq \tau/(8A)$. Then one can see that $R(x, r) \subset R(x_0, r_0)$ and

$$(5.9) \quad m(x, r) \leq \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0).$$

These conditions are satisfied for any $x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0/4)$ and $r = r_0/4$ if $\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \tau/(64A)$. The bad mass is invariant under scaling in the sense that if $L = r_0^{-1}(K - x_0)$, then we have

$$(5.10) \quad m_L(0, 1) = m_K(x_0, r_0).$$

Let us consider a Griffith almost-minimizer (u, K) in Ω with gauge $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$. In this section, the choice of the gauge does not really matter except that we need Ahlfors-regularity and most of our constants will depend on the Ahlfors-regularity constant of K (so they will depend on N and α). Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1/2]$ be such that K satisfies Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$ and $h(r_0) \leq 1$. We also assume ε_0 is small enough so that

$$(5.11) \quad 200A\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau.$$

The condition (5.11) gives in particular $d(x) \leq r_0/(100A)$.

The function d is nearly a geometric function for K in $B(x_0, r_0)$ but it may not be Lipschitz. Since we want to use the extension result in Lemma 3.1, we will work with a slightly modified version as suggested below. From the family of open balls

$$(5.12) \quad \left\{ B(x, Ad(x)) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}\left(x_0, \frac{3}{4}r_0\right) \text{ such that } d(x) > 0 \right\},$$

the Vitali covering Lemma yields a countable disjoint subfamily $(B_i)_{i \in I}$ such that

$$(5.13) \quad \bigcup_i B_i \subset R(x_0, r_0) \subset \bigcup_i 4B_i.$$

We let $x_i \in \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$ and $r_i = Ad(x_i)$ denote the center and the radius of B_i , that is $B_i = B(x_i, r_i)$. By construction, we always have $r_i > 0$. According to (5.6), we have

$$(5.14) \quad r_i \leq 2A \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{\tau}\right) r_0 \leq C\varepsilon_0 r_0,$$

where $C = 2A/\tau$ is a universal constant. The condition (5.11) gives in particular

$$(5.15) \quad r_i \leq r_0/100 \quad \text{and} \quad 10\overline{B}_i \subset B\left(x_0, \frac{9}{10}r_0\right).$$

We also introduce the smaller balls $D_i := B(x_i, A_0 d(x_i)) \subset\subset B_i$. We observe that by Ahlfors-regularity of K ,

$$(5.16) \quad m(x_0, r_0) \simeq \frac{1}{r_0^{N-1}} \sum_{i \in I} r_i^{N-1}$$

and, for the same reason,

$$(5.17) \quad m(x_0, r_0/4) \lesssim \frac{1}{r_0^{N-1}} \sum_{i \in I'} r_i^{N-1},$$

where $I' = \{i \in I \mid 4B_i \cap B(x_0, r_0/4) \neq \emptyset\}$.

Finally, we consider the function $\delta : K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4) \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ defined by

$$(5.18) \quad \delta(x) := \inf_{i \in I} \left\{ |x - x_i| + r_i \right\} \wedge \text{dist} \left(x, K \setminus \bigcup_i 9B_i \right),$$

where \wedge denotes the minimum.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$. Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be such that (5.11) holds, K satisfies Hypothesis- $H(\varepsilon_0, x_0, r_0)$ and $h(r_0) \leq 1$. Then the function δ defined in (5.18) is 1-Lipschitz and*

- (1) for all k , $\delta(x_k) = r_k$;
- (2) for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$, $\delta(x) \leq \max_k(10r_k) \leq r_0/4$;

(3) for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$ and for all $r \in]\delta(x), r_0/4]$, we have $\beta(x, r) \leq 4\tau$.

Thus, δ is a geometric function with parameters $(3r_0/4, 4\tau)$.

Proof. It is readily seen that δ is 1-Lipschitz and that $\delta(x_k) \leq r_k$. One can see that $\delta(x_k) = r_k$ using the fact that the balls $(B_i)_i$ are disjoint, i.e., for all $i \neq k$,

$$(5.19) \quad |x_i - x_k| \geq r_i + r_k,$$

and that

$$(5.20) \quad \text{dist}(x_k, K \setminus \bigcup_i 9B_i) \geq \text{dist}(x_k, \mathbb{R}^N \setminus 9B_k) \geq 9r_k.$$

Next, we justify that for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$, we have $\delta(x) \leq r_0/4$. If $x \notin \bigcup_i 9B_i$, then $\delta(x) = 0$. Otherwise, there exists k such that $x \in 9B_k$ and thus $\delta(x_k) \leq |x - x_k| + r_k \leq 10r_k \leq r_0/4$. Finally, we prove that for all $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$ and for all $r \in]\delta(x), r_0/4]$, we have $\beta(x, r) \leq 4\tau$. If $d(x) = 0$, this is trivial by definition of δ . Otherwise, there exists k such that $x \in 4B_k$ because $(4B_i)_i$ covers $R(x_0, r_0)$. In this case,

$$(5.21) \quad \inf_{i \in I} |x - x_i| + r_i \leq |x - x_k| + r_k \leq 5r_k$$

whereas

$$(5.22) \quad \text{dist}(x, K \setminus \bigcup_i 9B_i) \geq \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^N \setminus 9B_k) \geq 5r_k$$

so $\delta(x) = \inf_{i \in I} |x - x_i| + r_i$. If $r \in]\delta(x), r_0/8]$, there exists i such that $|x - x_i| + r_i \leq r$ so $B(x, r) \subset B(x_i, 2r)$ and $r \geq r_i > d(x_i)$. As $2r \in]d(x_i), r_0/4]$, we have $\beta(x_i, 2r) \leq \tau$ and we deduce that

$$(5.23) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq 4\beta(x_i, 2r) \leq 4\tau.$$

If $r \in [r_0/8, r_0/4]$, we use $\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau/16$ to get directly

$$(5.24) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq \frac{2r_0}{r} \beta(x_0, r_0) \leq 16\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau.$$

□

Lemma 5.2 (Selection of good radii). *Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$. Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be such that (5.11) holds, K satisfies Hypothesis-H(ε_0, x_0, r_0) and $h(r_0) \leq 1$. Then there exists $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{r_0^{N-1}} \sum_{i \in I(\rho)} r_i^{N-1} \leq C_0 \varepsilon_0 m(x_0, r_0),$$

for some constant $C_0 \geq 1$ (depending on N, α) and where

$$(5.25) \quad I(\rho) := \{i \in I \mid 10B_i \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, the letter C is a constant ≥ 1 that depends only N, α and whose value might change from one line to another. We select a radius $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$ such that the mass of the balls $(10B_i)_i$ that are meeting $\partial B(0, \rho)$ is less than average. More precisely, we choose $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$ such that

$$(5.26) \quad \sum_{i \in I(\rho)} r_i^{N-1} \leq \frac{4}{r_0} \int_{r_0/2}^{3r_0/4} \left(\sum_{i \in I(t)} r_i^{N-1} \right) dt,$$

where

$$(5.27) \quad I(t) := \{i \in I \mid 10B_i \cap \partial B(0, t) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then we use Fubini's theorem and $r_i \leq C\varepsilon_0 r_0$ to compute

$$(5.28) \quad \int_{r_0/2}^{3r_0/4} \sum_{i \in I(t)} r_i^{N-1} dt \leq \sum_{i \in I} \int_{\{t | i \in I(t)\}} r_i^{N-1} dt$$

$$(5.29) \quad \leq C \sum_{i \in I} r_i^N$$

$$(5.30) \quad \leq C\varepsilon_0 r_0^N m(x_0, r_0).$$

□

The crucial fact to estimate the quantity $m(x_0, r_0)$ is that in each bad ball, we can find a topological competitor of K which has less measure in a quantified way. This process will yield a deformation L of K in $B(x_0, r_0)$ such that $L = K$ in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r_0)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L)$ is proportional to the measure of the part of $K \cap B(x_0, r_0)$ covered by bad balls.

Lemma 5.3 (Win of bad mass). *Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$. Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be such that (5.11) holds, K satisfies Hypothesis-H(ε_0, x_0, r_0) and $h(r_0) \leq 1$. Then there exists a $\eta_0 > 0$ (depending on N, α) such that for all i , there exists a topological competitor L of K in D_i such that*

$$(5.31) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap D_i) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap D_i) \geq \eta_0 r_i^{N-1},$$

where $D_i = B(x_i, A_0 d(x_i)) \subset B_i$.

Proof. We recall that by (5.1), we have $0 < \tau \leq \varepsilon_*$. We apply Lemma 4.1 with

$$(5.32) \quad \varepsilon := \tau \quad \text{and} \quad a := \frac{1}{A_0} \leq \frac{1}{(4c_*)^2}$$

and we obtain a constant $\eta_0 > 0$ (depending on N, α) such that the following holds. Whenever $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4)$ and $0 < r \leq r_0/4$ are such that

$$(5.33a) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq \tau$$

$$(5.33b) \quad \beta(x, A_0^{-1}r) \geq \tau,$$

then there is a topological competitor L of K in $B(x, r)$ satisfying

$$(5.34) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x, r)) \geq \eta_0 r^{N-1}.$$

By definition of $d(x_i)$ and since $A_0 d(x_i) \in]d(x_i), r_0/4]$, we have $\beta(x_i, d(x_i)) = \tau$ and $\beta(x_i, A_0 d(x_i)) \leq \tau$. The assumptions (5.33) are thus satisfied in the ball $D_i = B(x_i, A_0 d(x_i))$ and this yields a topological competitor L of K in D_i such that

$$(5.35) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap D_i) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap D_i) \geq \eta_0 (A_0 d(x_i))^{N-1} \geq \eta_0 A_0^{1-N} r_i^{N-1}.$$

□

5.1. Decay of the bad mass.

Proposition 5.1 (Decay of the bad mass). *Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$. Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be such that (5.11) holds, K satisfies Hypothesis-H(ε_0, x_0, r_0) and $h(r_0) \leq 1$. Then we have*

$$(5.36) \quad m(x_0, r_0/4) \leq C_1 [\omega(x_0, r_0) + \beta(x_0, r_0)m(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0)],$$

for some constant $C_1 \geq 1$ (depending on N, α).

Proof. Throughout the proof, the letter C is a constant ≥ 1 that depends only N, α and whose value might change from one line to another. We recall that

$$(5.37) \quad m(x_0, r_0/4) \leq \frac{C}{r_0^{N-1}} \sum_{i \in I'} r_i^{N-1},$$

where $I' = \{i \in I \mid 4B_i \cap B(x_0, r_0/4) \neq \emptyset\}$. Let us note that for $i \in I''$, we have $\overline{B}_i \subset B(x_0, r_0/2)$ (because $r_i < r_0/100$). We find more convenient to work with a finite number of balls so we consider a finite subset $I'' \subset I'$ such that

$$(5.38) \quad m(x_0, r_0/4) \leq \frac{C}{r_0^{N-1}} \sum_{i \in I''} r_i^{N-1}.$$

For all $i \in I''$, Lemma 5.3 yields a competitor L_i of K in the ball $D_i = B(x_i, A_0 d(x_i)) \subset B_i$ such that

$$(5.39) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap D_i) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap D_i) - \eta_0 r_i^{N-1}.$$

We introduce

$$(5.40) \quad L := \left(K \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I''} D_i \right) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I''} (L_i \cap D_i).$$

For each $i \in I''$, there exists a deformation f_i of K in D_i such that $L_i = f_i(K)$. The balls $(\overline{D}_i)_{i \in I''}$ are mutually disjoint and contained in $B(x_0, r_0/2)$ so we can glue the deformation f_i to obtain a deformation f of K in $B(x_0, r_0/2)$ such that $L = f(K)$. Let us note that L coincides with K outside $B(x_0, r_0/2)$. We recall that there exists a hyperplane P_0 (of unit vector ν_0) passing through x_0 such that $K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{ \text{dist}(\cdot, P_0) \leq \varepsilon_0 \}$ and such that the sets

$$(5.41) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 > \varepsilon_0 r_0 \} \\ & \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 < -\varepsilon_0 r_0 \} \end{aligned}$$

belong to different connected component of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$, denoted by Ω_1 and Ω_2 . According to theory of Borsuk maps ([18, Chap. XVII]), the sets

$$(5.42) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 > r_0/2 \} \\ & \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 < -r_0/2 \} \end{aligned}$$

also lie in different connected component of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus L$, denoted by X_1 and X_2 respectively, and we have for $h = 1, 2$,

$$(5.43) \quad X_h \subset \Omega_h \cup \bigcup_{i \in I''} D_i.$$

Let us note that $X_h \setminus B(x_0, r_0/2) = \Omega_h \setminus B(x_0, r_0/2)$. To conclude this paragraph, we use (5.39) and (5.38) to estimate

$$(5.44) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) - \eta_0 \sum_{i \in I''} r_i^{N-1}$$

$$(5.45) \quad \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) - \eta_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0/4).$$

We would like to build a function $v \in LD(B(x_0, r_0) \setminus L)$ such that (v, L) is a competitor of (u, K) in $B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$ and the energy of v is under control, i.e.,

$$(5.46) \quad \int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus G} |e(v)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

But since the extension v_h built in Lemma 3.1 is not define in a certain set F_h , we will brutally set $v_h = 0$ in an open set V containing F_h and we will add the topological boundary of V in the crack. The goal of the next paragraph is to choose V wisely so as to control $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial V)$ and to define the new crack set $G = L \cup \partial V$.

We use Lemma 5.2 to select a radius $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$ such that

$$(5.47) \quad \sum_{i \in I(\rho)} r_i^{N-1} \leq C \varepsilon_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0),$$

where

$$(5.48) \quad I(\rho) = \{ i \in I \mid 10B_i \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset \}.$$

Then we introduce

$$(5.49) \quad G := L \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} \partial(10B_i).$$

We observe that

$$(5.50) \quad G \setminus B(x_0, \frac{9}{10}r_0) = K \setminus B(x_0, \frac{9}{10}r_0)$$

because L coincides with K outside $B(x_0, r_0/2)$ and for all i , $10\overline{B}_i \subset B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$. Next, we are going to justify that G is relatively closed in Ω . The family of spheres $(\partial(10B_i))_{i \in I(\rho)}$ might have accumulation points but we are going to see that they can only be located on $K \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho)$, which is a subset of L and thus of G . For

$$(5.51) \quad x \in \overline{\bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} \partial(10B_i)} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} \partial(10B_i),$$

we can extract a sequence of distinct elements $(10B_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ from the family $(10B_i)_{i \in I(\rho)}$ such that $\text{dist}(x, 10\overline{B}_{i_k}) \rightarrow 0$ when $k \rightarrow +\infty$. The balls $(B_{i_k})_k$ are disjoint and contained in $B(x_0, r_0)$ so their radii must go to 0 as k goes to $+\infty$. We deduce that $\text{dist}(x, x_{i_k}) \rightarrow 0$, where x_{i_k} denotes the center of B_{i_k} . But since the points x_{i_k} belong to K and the balls $10B_{i_k}$ meet $\partial B(x_0, \rho)$ by definition of $I(\rho)$, we must have $x \in K \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \subset L$. This proves that we have in fact

$$(5.52) \quad G = L \cup \overline{\bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} \partial(10B_i)}.$$

To conclude this paragraph, we use (5.47) and (5.45) to estimate

$$(5.53) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(G \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x_0, r_0)) + \sum_{i \in I(\rho)} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial(10B_i))$$

$$(5.54) \quad \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) - \eta_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0/4) + C \varepsilon_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0).$$

Now, we build a function $v \in LD(B(x_0, r_0) \setminus G)$ such that (v, G) is a competitor of (u, K) in $B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$ and the energy of v is under control, i.e.,

$$(5.55) \quad \int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus G} |e(v)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

We apply Lemma 3.1 with respect to the geometric function δ defined in (5.18) and the radius $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$ selected above. We obtain functions $v_h \in LD_{\text{loc}}(V_h)$ (for $h = 1, 2$) and relatively closed subsets F_h, S_h of V_h such that

$$(5.56) \quad \begin{aligned} W &\subset S_h \subset \widetilde{W}, \\ v_h &= u \text{ in } V_h \setminus S_h, \\ S_h \setminus B(x_0, \rho) &\subset F_h \subset S_h \cap Z \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(5.57) \quad \int_{V_h \cap B(x_0, \rho) \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B(x_0, \rho) \cap \Omega_h} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

We recall that

$$(5.58) \quad W = \bigcup \{ B(x, \delta(x)/U) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \}$$

$$(5.59) \quad \widetilde{W} = \bigcup \{ B(x, 10\delta(x)/U) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho) \}$$

and

$$(5.60) \quad Z := \bigcup \{ B(x, 10\delta(x)/U) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho), B(x, 50\delta(x)/U) \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset \}$$

and for $h = 1, 2$,

$$(5.61) \quad V_h = \Omega_h \cup W.$$

We are going to justify that

$$(5.62) \quad X_h \subset V_h$$

and

$$(5.63) \quad Z \subset \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i.$$

The inclusion (5.62) is a rather easy implication of (5.43) and the fact that, since $\delta(x_i) = r_i = Ad(x_i)$, $A = A_0^2$ and $A_0 \geq U$, we have

$$(5.64) \quad D_i = B(x_i, A_0 d(x_i)) \subset B(x_i, \delta(x_i)/U).$$

Now, we consider $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $B(x, 50\delta(x)/U) \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset$. As x belongs to $K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ and is such that $\delta(x) > 0$, there must exist i such that $x \in 9B_i$ so

$$(5.65) \quad \delta(x) \leq |x - x_i| + r_i \leq 10r_i.$$

In addition, recall that $U = 10^5$ so $B(x, 50\delta(x)/U) \subset 10B_i$. We have proved (5.63). As a consequence, let us note that

$$(5.66) \quad F_h \subset \bigcup_i 10B_i.$$

In this last paragraph, we are going to use repeatedly and without mention the fact that when $V \subset B(x_0, r_0)$ is an open set that is disjoint from $K \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho)$ (we think mainly of the case $V \subset X_h$), then the set $V \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i$ is open. This is not straightforward because $\bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i$ may not be closed but we have already seen this kind of argument: for the points

$$(5.67) \quad x \in \overline{\bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i,$$

we can show that $x \in K \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho)$ so $x \notin V$. This proves that

$$(5.68) \quad V \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i = V \setminus \overline{\bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i}.$$

We are ready to define our function v . According to (5.62), we see first that $v_h \in LD_{\text{loc}}(X_h)$. By (5.66) and the comment just below Lemma 3.1, we actually have

$$(5.69) \quad v \in LD \left(X_h \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right)$$

and

$$(5.70) \quad v_h = u \quad \text{in} \quad X_h \setminus \left(B(x_0, \rho) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right).$$

We finally define $v \in LD(B(x_0, r_0) \setminus G)$ by

$$(5.71) \quad v = \begin{cases} v_1 & \text{in } X_1 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \\ v_2 & \text{in } X_2 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \\ u & \text{in } B(x_0, r_0) \setminus \left(L \cup X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right) \\ 0 & \text{in } \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i. \end{cases}$$

This is a well-defined function in $LD(B(x_0, r_0) \setminus G)$ because the piecewise domains in the construction are disjoint open sets which cover $\Omega \setminus G$. We have $v = u$ outside $B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$ because $B(x_0, \rho) \subset$

$B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$ and for all i , $10\overline{B}_i \subset B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$. The pair (v, G) is thus a competitor of (u, K) in $B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$ and we can compare their energies (with (5.54) and (5.55)) to obtain

$$(5.72) \quad \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \leq C \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \\ - \eta_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0/4) + C\varepsilon_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) r_0^{N-1}.$$

Of course, we can apply the whole proof with $\varepsilon_0 = \beta(x_0, r_0)$. □

5.2. Control of the minimality defect.

Proposition 5.2 (Control of the minimality defect). *Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$. Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be such that (5.11) holds and K satisfies Hypothesis-H(ε_0, x_0, r_0). Then for all topological competitor L of K in $B(x_0, \sigma r_0)$, we have*

$$(5.73) \quad r_0^{1-N} [\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0)) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0))] \\ \leq C_2 [\omega(x_0, r_0) + \beta(x_0, r_0) m(x_0, r_0)] + h(r_0),$$

for some constant $C_2 \geq 1$ (depending on N, α) and $\sigma = 10^{-6}$.

Proof. Throughout the proof, the letter C is a constant ≥ 1 that depends only on N, α and whose value might change from one line to another. The proof is very similar to the proof of Proposition 5.1 but instead of deforming K in small balls D_i , we will deform K in a single large ball at the center. This will force us to enlarge the geometric function δ at the center. Most of the technical details are the same as in the proof Proposition 5.1 so we will often skip them.

We will work with the geometric function $\delta_1 : K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, 3r_0/4) \rightarrow [0, r_0/4]$ defined by

$$(5.74) \quad \delta_1(x) := \max \{ r_0/4 - |x - x_0|, \delta(x) \}.$$

It is still a 1-Lipschitz geometric function with parameters $(3r_0/4, 4\tau)$ but now we have $\delta_1(x_0) = r_0/4$. We recall that $U = 10^5$ and we observe that for $\sigma = 1/(10U) = 10^{-6}$, we have $B(x_0, \sigma r_0) \subset B(x_0, \delta_1(x_0)/U)$.

We fix f be a deformation of K in $B(x_0, \sigma r_0)$ and we introduce $L := f(K)$. We note that L coincides with K outside $B(x_0, \sigma r_0) \subset B(x_0, r_0/2)$. We recall that there exists an hyperplane P_0 (of unit vector ν_0) passing through x_0 such that $K \cap B(x_0, r_0) \subset \{ \text{dist}(\cdot, P_0) \leq \varepsilon_0 \}$ and such that the sets

$$(5.75) \quad \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 > \varepsilon_0 r_0 \} \\ \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 < -\varepsilon_0 r_0 \}$$

belong to different connected component of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$, denoted by Ω_1 and Ω_2 . According to the theory of Borsuk maps ([18, Chap. XVII]), the sets

$$(5.76) \quad \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 > r_0/2 \} \\ \{ x \in B(x_0, r_0) \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu_0 < -r_0/2 \}$$

also lie in different connected component of $B(x_0, r_0) \setminus L$, denoted by X_1 and X_2 respectively, and we have

$$(5.77) \quad X_h \subset \Omega_h \cup B(x_0, \sigma r_0).$$

We note that $X_h \setminus B(x_0, r_0/2) = \Omega \setminus B(x_0, r_0/2)$.

We use Lemma 5.2 to select a radius $\rho \in [r_0/2, 3r_0/4]$ such that

$$(5.78) \quad \sum_{i \in I(\rho)} r_i^{N-1} \leq C\varepsilon_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0),$$

where

$$(5.79) \quad I(\rho) = \{ i \in I \mid 10B_i \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset \}.$$

Then we define

$$(5.80) \quad G := L \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} \partial(10B_i).$$

We observe that G is relatively closed in Ω and

$$(5.81) \quad G \setminus B(x_0, \frac{9}{10}r_0) = K \setminus B(x_0, \frac{9}{10}r_0).$$

We apply Lemma 3.1 with respect to the geometric function δ_1 defined in (5.74). We obtain functions $v_h \in LD_{\text{loc}}(V_h)$ (for $h = 1, 2$) and relatively closed subsets F_h, S_h of V_h such that

$$(5.82) \quad \begin{aligned} W &\subset S_h \subset \widetilde{W}, \\ v_h &= u \text{ in } V_h \setminus S_h, \\ S_h \setminus B(x_0, \rho) &\subset F_h \subset S_h \cap Z \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(5.83) \quad \int_{V_h \cap B(x_0, \rho) \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B(x_0, \rho) \cap \Omega_h} |e(u)|^2 dx.$$

We check that

$$(5.84) \quad X_h \subset V_h$$

and

$$(5.85) \quad Z \subset \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i.$$

The proof of Proposition 5.1 does not apply directly because δ_1 is larger than δ . The inclusion (5.84) still works thanks to (5.77) and because we have chosen σ so that $B(x_0, \sigma r_0) \subset B(x_0, \delta_1(x_0)/U)$. We pass to (5.85). For $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$ such that $B(x, 50\delta_1(x)/U) \cap \partial B(x_0, \rho) \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$(5.86) \quad |x - x_0| \geq \rho - 50\delta_1(x)/U \geq r_0/2 - 50r_0/(4U) \geq r_0/4$$

so $\delta_1(x) = \delta(x)$ and from there, we can follow the proof of Proposition 5.1.

We can finally define $v \in LD(B(x_0, r_0) \setminus G)$ by

$$(5.87) \quad v = \begin{cases} v_1 & \text{in } X_1 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \\ v_2 & \text{in } X_2 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \\ u & \text{in } B(x_0, r_0) \setminus \left(L \cup X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right) \\ 0 & \text{in } \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $v = u$ outside $B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$. The pair (v, G) is a competitor of (u, K) in $B(x_0, 9r_0/10)$ so we can compare their energies and obtain

$$(5.88) \quad \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \leq C \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \\ + C\varepsilon_0 r_0^{N-1} m(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) r_0^{N-1}.$$

□

5.3. Decay of the energy.

Proposition 5.3. *Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge $h(t) = c_h t^\alpha$. Let $x_0 \in K$, let $r_0 > 0$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$, $h(r_0) \leq 1$ and K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$. For all $0 < b \leq 1$, there exists $\varepsilon_e > 0$ (depending on N, α, b) such that if*

$$\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_e \quad \text{and} \quad m(x_0, r_0)\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_e \omega(x_0, r_0),$$

then

$$\omega(x_0, br_0) \leq C_3 b \omega(x_0, r_0),$$

for some universal constant $C_3 \geq 1$.

Proof. Throughout the proof, the letter C is a universal constant ≥ 1 whose value might change from one line to another. The case $1/2 \leq b \leq 1$ is trivial so we will focus on the case $0 < b < 1/2$. By scaling, it also suffices to prove the result in the open ball $B := B(0, 1)$. Then, the argument is by contradiction and compactness. If the Lemma is false for some $\alpha > 0$, $b \in (0, 1/2)$ and $C_3 \geq 1$, then there exists a sequence of Griffith almost-minimizers (v_n, K_n) with gauge $h_n(t) = c_{h,n}t^\alpha$ in B such that $0 \in K_n$, $h_n(1) \leq 1$, K_n separates in the ball B , $\beta_{K_n}(0, 1) \rightarrow 0$,

$$(5.89) \quad \omega_{v_n}(0, 1)^{-1} [\beta_{K_n}(0, 1)m_{v_n}(0, 1) + h_n(1)] \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$(5.90) \quad \omega_{v_n}(0, b) > C_3 b \omega_{v_n}(0, 1).$$

Notice that (5.90) directly implies $\omega_{v_n}(0, 1) \neq 0$. Up to apply a sequence of rotations we may assume that K_n is $\beta_{K_n}(0, 1)$ -close to the horizontal plane P_0 , where $P_0 := \mathbf{e}_N^\perp$. We decompose $\mathbb{R}^N = P_0 \times P_0^\perp$ and we use the notation $x = (x', x_N)$ for an element of \mathbb{R}^N . We normalize the energy by setting

$$u_n(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{e_n}} v_n(x),$$

where

$$e_n := \int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(v_n)|^2 dx.$$

In summary, for all n , we have $u_n \in LD(B \setminus K_n)$ and the following properties:

for all competitor (v, L) for (u_n, K_n) in B we have

$$(5.91) \quad \int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(u_n)|^2 dx + e_n^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_n) \leq \int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(v)|^2 dx + e_n^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L) + e_n^{-1} h_n(1),$$

$$(5.92) \quad \int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(u_n)|^2 dx = 1,$$

$$(5.93) \quad 0 \in K_n \text{ and } \varepsilon_n := \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in K_n \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)} \text{dist}(x, P_0), \sup_{x \in P_0 \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)} \text{dist}(x, K_n) \right\} \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(5.94) \quad \int_{B(0, b) \setminus K_n} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \geq C_3 b^N.$$

The strategy of the proof is to be able, by some sort of Γ -convergence technique, to prove that u_n admits a limit u which is a minimizer in $B \setminus P_0$ with energy 1 in B , for which an inequality of the type (5.94) would be false (for a too big C_3) by elliptic regularity. To get a contradiction with that approach, the main issue is to prove a strong convergence in L^2 for $e(u_n)$. This convergence is false in general, but here it follows from the minimality property (5.91) of (u_n, K_n) and the fact that K_n separates.

In the sequel we shall need to extract several subsequences of u_n , that we will still denote by u_n , for simplicity.

Step 1. Convergence locally in $B \setminus P_0$. We first extract a subsequence such that $e(u_n)$ converges weakly in L^2 to some $e \in L^2(B; \mathbb{M}^{N \times N})$, thanks to the energy bound in (5.92). We next show that e is the symmetric gradient of some displacement. To this aim, we fix $0 < \delta < 1/10$ and we introduce the Lipschitz domain

$$A_\delta := \{x \in B \mid \text{dist}(x, P_0) > \delta\} = A_\delta^+ \cup A_\delta^-,$$

where A_δ^\pm are the connected components of A_δ . Note that for such δ , $D^\pm := B((0, \pm \frac{3}{4}), \frac{1}{4}) \subset A_\delta^\pm$ and $K_n \cap A_\delta = \emptyset$ for n large enough (depending on δ). Denoting by

$$R_n^\pm(x) := \frac{1}{|D^\pm|} \int_{D^\pm} u_n(y) dy + \left(\frac{1}{|D^\pm|} \int_{D^\pm} \frac{\nabla u_n(y) - \nabla u_n(y)^T}{2} dy \right) \left(x - \frac{1}{|D^\pm|} \int_{D^\pm} y dy \right),$$

the rigid body motion associated to u_n in D^\pm , by virtue of the Poincaré-Korn inequality [1, Theorem 5.2], we get that

$$\|u_n - R_n^\pm\|_{H^1(A_\delta^\pm; \mathbb{R}^N)} \leq c \|e(u_n)\|_{L^2(A_\delta^\pm; \mathbb{M}^{N \times N})},$$

for some constant $c > 0$ that does not depend on δ since $0 < \delta < 1/10$.

Thanks to a diagonalisation argument, for a further subsequence (not relabeled), we obtain a function $u \in H^1(B \setminus P_0; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $u_n - R_n^\pm \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $H^1(A_\delta^\pm; \mathbb{R}^N)$, for any $0 < \delta < 1/10$. In particular, we must have $e = e(u)$. This shows that

$$e(u_n) \rightharpoonup e(u) \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(B; \mathbb{M}^{N \times N}),$$

and

$$(5.95) \quad \int_{B \setminus P_0} |e(u)|^2 dx \leq \liminf \int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(u_n)|^2 dx = 1.$$

Step 2. The limit is a minimizer. At this stage, we are able to prove that the limit u is an energy minimizer in $B \setminus P_0$, thus is the weak solution of an elliptic system with Neumann boundary conditions on P_0 . Indeed, let $\varphi \in H^1(B \setminus P_0; \mathbb{R}^N)$ be any test function with $\varphi = 0$ on ∂B . We want to compare u with the competitor $u + \varphi$. For that purpose, we will use a jump transfer argument, relying on the fact that K_n separates: we denote by C_n^\pm the connected components of $B \setminus K_n$ that contains the point $(0, \pm 1/2)$ and we define a function $\varphi_n \in H^1(B \setminus K_n; \mathbb{R}^N)$ by

$$(5.96) \quad \varphi_n(x) := \begin{cases} \varphi(x', |x_N|) & \text{in } C_n^+ \\ \varphi(x', -|x_N|) & \text{in } C_n^- \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, one can check that $\varphi_n = 0$ on $\partial B \setminus K_n$ and that $\varphi_n(x) = \varphi(x)$ for $x \in B$ such that $|x_N| \geq \varepsilon_n$. By (5.93), $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ so $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi$ strongly in $L^2(B; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and $e(\varphi_n) \rightarrow e(\varphi)$ strongly in $L^2(B; \mathbb{M}^{N \times N})$. Therefore, using the minimality property (5.91) satisfied by u_n , we infer that

$$\int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \leq \int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(u_n + \varphi_n)|^2 dx + e_n^{-1} h_n(1),$$

which implies, by expanding the squares, that

$$0 \leq 2 \int_{B \setminus K_n} e(u_n) : e(\varphi_n) dx + \int_{B \setminus K_n} |e(\varphi_n)|^2 dx + e_n^{-1} h_n(1).$$

Using that $e_n^{-1} h_n(1) \rightarrow 0$, that $e(\varphi_n) \rightarrow e(\varphi)$ strongly in $L^2(B; \mathbb{M}^{N \times N})$ and $e(u_n) \rightharpoonup e(u)$ weakly in $L^2(B; \mathbb{M}^{N \times N})$, we can pass to the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ to get that

$$0 \leq 2 \int_{B \setminus P_0} e(u) : e(\varphi) dx + \int_{B \setminus P_0} |e(\varphi)|^2 dx,$$

or still

$$\int_{B \setminus P_0} |e(u)|^2 dx \leq \int_{B \setminus P_0} |e(u + \varphi)|^2 dx.$$

As a consequence, u is a smooth function in $B \setminus P_0$. Moreover, due to the Korn inequality in both connected components of $B \setminus P_0$ (which are Lipschitz domains), we get that $u \in H^1(B \setminus P_0; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and it is the weak solution of an elliptic system with Neumann boundary conditions of P_0 . We deduce from elliptic regularity, and using also (5.95), that

$$(5.97) \quad \int_{B(0,b) \setminus P_0} |e(u)|^2 dx \leq C b^N \int_{B \setminus P_0} |e(u)|^2 dx \leq C b^N.$$

Step 3. Strong convergence of the symmetrized gradients and conclusion. To arrive at a contradiction, i.e., to show that (5.97) is in contradiction with (5.94), we need to prove the convergence of $e(u_n)$ to $e(u)$

strongly in $L^2(B(0, 1/2))$, and not only weakly. For that purpose, we consider the sequence of measures

$$\mu_n := |e(u_n)|^2 \mathcal{L}^N.$$

From (5.92) we obtain $\mu_n(B) \leq 1$, thus we can extract a subsequence such that $\mu_n \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ in B , for some measure μ .

We claim that, up to use again a diagonal subsequence, we can assume that $e(u_n)$ converges strongly in $L^2(A)$ for all compact sets $A \subset B \setminus P_0$. Indeed, by weak convergence of $e(u_n)$ in L^2 and by lower semicontinuity of the energy with respect to weak convergence, we already have the inequality, for any ball $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset B \setminus P_0$,

$$\int_{B(x, r)} |e(u)|^2 dx \leq \liminf_n \int_{B(x, r)} |e(u_n)|^2 dx.$$

To prove the strong convergence in L^2 , it suffice to prove the reverse inequality, with a limsup. To this aim, we consider a small $\eta > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r + \eta) \subset B \setminus P_0$ and a cut-off function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, r + \eta))$ such that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ and $\varphi = 1$ on $B(x, r)$.

We can compare u_n with the competitor $R_n^\pm + u\varphi + (1 - \varphi)(u_n - R_n^\pm)$. The latter has a symmetrized gradient whose norm is bounded by

$$(5.98) \quad \varphi|e(u)| + (1 - \varphi)|e(u_n)| + |\nabla\varphi||u_n - R_n^\pm - u|$$

Then using the elementary inequality

$$(a + b)^2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)a^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon})b^2 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0$$

and the convexity of $t \mapsto t^2$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B |e(u_n)|^2 dx &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_B (\varphi|e(u)| + (1 - \varphi)|e(u_n)|)^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}) \int_B |\nabla\varphi|^2 |u_n - R_n^\pm - u|^2 dx, \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_B \varphi|e(u)|^2 + (1 - \varphi)|e(u_n)|^2 dx + (1 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}) \int_B |\nabla\varphi|^2 |u_n - R_n^\pm - u|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\int_{B(x_0, r)} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{B(x_0, r + \eta)} |e(u)|^2 + \varepsilon \int_B |e(u_n)|^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}) \int_B |\nabla\varphi|^2 (u_n - R_n^\pm - u)^2 dx.$$

But since $\int_B |e(u_n)|^2 = 1$ and $u_n - R_n^\pm \rightarrow u$ in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(B \setminus P_0)$, letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ yields

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x_0, r)} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{B(x_0, r + \eta)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \varepsilon.$$

The parameters $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ are arbitrary so

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x_0, r)} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \leq \int_{B(x_0, r)} |e(u)|^2 dx,$$

as desired, which proves the strong convergence of $e(u_n)$ in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(B \setminus P_0)$.

It follows that $\mu \llcorner (B \setminus P_0) = |e(u)|^2 \mathcal{L}^N$ and therefore the singular part of μ is concentrated on P_0 . To prove the strong convergence in $L^2(B(0, 1/2))$ for $e(u_n)$, it is therefore enough to prove that

$$(5.99) \quad \mu(P_0 \cap B(0, \frac{1}{2})) = 0.$$

Some of the following quantities will depend over n but we will sometimes not specify this dependence to lighten the notation. By use of Lemma 5.2, we select a radius $\rho_n \in [1/2, 3/4]$ such that

$$(5.100) \quad \sum_{i \in I(\rho_n)} r_i^{N-1} \leq C_0 \varepsilon_n m_n$$

for some constant $C_0 \geq 1$ (which depends on N, α) and where

$$(5.101) \quad I(\rho_n) = \{i \in I \mid 10B_i \cap \partial B(0, \rho_n) \neq \emptyset\}, \quad m_n := m_{K_n}(0, 1).$$

We can extract a subsequence so that $(\rho_n)_n$ converges to some $\rho_\infty \in [1/2, 3/4]$. We would also like that $\mu(\partial B(0, \rho_\infty)) = 0$ but we cannot guarantee this property directly. We are going to refine our procedure.

Let us fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$ and let S be the finite set of radii $\rho \in [1/2, 3/4]$ such that $\mu(\partial B(0, \rho)) \geq \varepsilon$. According to the proof of Lemma 5.2, there exists a constant $C_0^* \geq 1$ (depending on N, α) such that

$$(5.102) \quad \int_{1/2}^{3/4} \sum_{i \in I(t)} r_i^{N-1} dt \leq C_0^* \varepsilon_n m_n$$

so for any $C_0 \geq 1$, the set

$$(5.103) \quad \left\{ t \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4} \right] \left| \sum_{i \in I(t)} r_i^{N-1} dt \geq C_0 \varepsilon_n m_n \right. \right\}$$

has \mathcal{L}^1 measure $\leq C_0^{-1} C_0^*$. We take C_0 big enough (depending on N, α) such that $C_0^{-1} C_0^* < 1/8$. Since S is finite, we can also consider a small radius $r > 0$ such that the set

$$(5.104) \quad \left\{ t \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4} \right] \mid \text{dist}(t, S) < r \right\}$$

has \mathcal{L}^1 measure $< 1/8$. In this way, it is clear that the two bad sets (5.103) and (5.104) cannot cover $[1/2, 3/4]$ so we can find $\rho_n \in [1/2, 3/4]$ such that $\text{dist}(\rho_n, S) \geq r$ and

$$(5.105) \quad \sum_{i \in I(\rho_n)} r_i^{N-1} dt \leq C_0 \varepsilon_n m_n.$$

We can extract a subsequence so that $(\rho_n)_n$ converges to some $\rho_\infty \in [1/2, 3/4]$ and we have moreover, $\text{dist}(\rho_\infty, S) \geq r$. In particular, $\rho_\infty \notin S$ so

$$(5.106) \quad \mu(\partial B(0, \rho_\infty)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

It will suffice to make $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ at the end of the proof.

Now we fix n and we write $\rho = \rho_n$, $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ to lighten the notation. We introduce

$$(5.107) \quad G := K_n \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} \partial(10B_i).$$

We observe that G is relatively closed in Ω and that

$$(5.108) \quad G \setminus B(0, \frac{\rho}{10}) = K_n \setminus B(0, \frac{\rho}{10}).$$

We fix some $0 < \eta \leq 1/4$ and we consider the function $f : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ defined by

$$(5.109) \quad f(t) = \begin{cases} \eta & \text{for } t \leq \rho - \eta \\ \rho - t & \text{for } \rho - \eta \leq t \leq \rho \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq \rho. \end{cases}$$

We will work with geometric function $\delta_2 : K \cap \overline{B}(0, 3/4) \rightarrow [0, 1/4]$ defined by

$$(5.110) \quad \delta_2(x) := \max \{ f(|x|), \delta(x) \},$$

We recall that according to Lemma 5.1, we have $\delta(x) \leq \max_k(10r_k) \leq 10C_0\varepsilon$, whereas $f(|x|) \leq \eta$ by construction. We assume n big enough such that $10C_0\varepsilon \leq \eta$ and in particular, $\delta_2(x) \leq \eta$, with equality at points $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho - \eta)$.

We apply Lemma 3.1 with respect to the geometric function δ_2 defined in (5.110). We obtain functions $v_h \in LD_{\text{loc}}(V_h)$ (for $h = 1, 2$) and relatively closed subsets F_h, S_h of V_h such that

$$(5.111) \quad \begin{aligned} W &\subset S_h \subset \widetilde{W}, \\ v_h &= u \text{ in } V_h \setminus S_h, \\ S_h \setminus B(0, \rho) &\subset F_h \subset S_h \cap Z \end{aligned}$$

and, according to Remark 3.1,

$$(5.112) \quad \sum_{h=1,2} \int_{S_h \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq C \int_D |e(u)|^2 dx,$$

where

$$(5.113) \quad D := B(0, \rho) \cap \bigcup \{ B(x, 50\delta_2(x)/U) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho), \text{dist}(y, K) \geq \delta_2(x)/U \}.$$

Here, we also recall that that

$$(5.114) \quad W = \bigcup \{ B(x, \delta_2(x)/U) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho) \}$$

$$(5.115) \quad \widetilde{W} = \bigcup \{ B(x, 10\delta_2(x)/U) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho) \}$$

and

$$(5.116) \quad Z := \bigcup \{ B(x, 10\delta_2(x)/U) \mid x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho), B(x, 50\delta_2(x)/U) \cap \partial B(0, \rho) \neq \emptyset \}$$

and for $h = 1, 2$,

$$(5.117) \quad V_h = \Omega_h \cup W.$$

Let us check that

$$(5.118) \quad Z \subset \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i.$$

It is easy to see that for all $0 \leq t \leq \rho$, we have $t + f(t) \leq \rho$ so for $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho)$, we have $B(x, 50f(|x|)/U) \subset B(0, \rho)$. In the case where $B(x, 50\delta_2(x)/U) \cap \partial B(0, \rho) \neq \emptyset$, we have necessarily $\delta_2(x) = \delta(x)$ and from there, we can follow the proof of Proposition 5.1.

In order to use (5.112), we will to replace the sets $S_h \setminus F_h$ and D by simpler domains. We introduce

$$(5.119) \quad C(\eta) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \text{dist}(y, P_0 \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho - 2\eta)) < \eta/(2U) \}$$

and we are going to prove that whenever $\varepsilon < \eta/(2U)$, we have

$$(5.120) \quad C(\eta) \subset \left(\bigcup_{h=1,2} \Omega_h \cap S_h \right) \cup B(0, \rho) \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$$

and

$$(5.121) \quad D \subset \overline{B}(0, \rho) \cap \{ \text{dist}(\cdot, P_0) \leq \eta \} \setminus C(\eta).$$

Let's start with (5.120). It is already clear that $C(\eta) \subset B(0, \rho)$. For $y \in C(\eta) \cap \Omega_h$, let us show that $y \in S_h$. By definition of $C(\eta)$, there exists $x_0 \in P_0 \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho - 2\eta)$ such that $|x_0 - y| < \eta/(2U)$. Since $\varepsilon < \eta/(2U)$, there also exists $x \in K$ such that $|x_0 - x| < \eta/(2U)$. Notice that $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho - \eta)$ so $\delta_2(x) = \eta$. Then it follows by triangular inequality that $y \in B(x, \delta_2(x)/U)$ and thus $y \in W \subset S_h$. We pass to (5.121). For $y \in D$, there exists $x \in K \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho)$ such that $y \in B(x, 50\delta_2(x)/U)$ and $\text{dist}(y, K) \geq \delta_2(x)/U$. As $|y - x| \leq 50\eta/U$ and $\text{dist}(x, P_0) \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$(5.122) \quad \text{dist}(y, P_0) \leq 50\eta/U + \varepsilon \leq \eta.$$

We check that $y \notin C(\eta)$ by contradiction. We assume that there exists $x_0 \in P_0 \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho - 2\eta)$ such that $|y - x_0| < \eta/(2U)$. As $\text{dist}(x_0, K) \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$(5.123) \quad \text{dist}(y, K) < \eta/(2U) + \varepsilon < \eta/U.$$

Recalling that $|x - y| \leq 50\eta/U$, we also have $x \in \overline{B}(0, \rho - \eta)$ by the triangular inequality and thus $\delta_2(x) = \eta$. But then, our initial assumption on y means $\text{dist}(y, K) \geq \eta/U$. Contradiction !

We make a last observation before defining our competitor v . We recall that according to Lemma 3.3, we have

$$(5.124) \quad \overline{B}(0, \rho) \setminus (K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2) \subset W$$

so in particular

$$(5.125) \quad \partial B(0, \rho) \setminus (K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2) \subset Z \subset \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i.$$

As we have seen in Proposition 5.1, the set

$$(5.126) \quad B(0, 1) \setminus \left(K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right)$$

is open and from (5.125) we deduce that its connected components are either contained in $B(x_0, \rho)$, or contained in $B(0, 1) \setminus \overline{B}(x_0, \rho)$. We will set our competitor to be $v = 0$ in the first case and $v = u$ in the second case. We thus define $v \in LD(B(0, 1) \setminus G)$ by

$$(5.127) \quad v = \begin{cases} v_1 & \text{in } \Omega_1 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \\ v_2 & \text{in } \Omega_2 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \\ u & \text{in } B(0, 1) \setminus \left(K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \overline{B}(0, \rho) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right) \\ 0 & \text{in } B(0, \rho) \setminus \left(K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right) \\ 0 & \text{in } \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i. \end{cases}$$

The pair (v, G) is a competitor of (u_n, K_n) in $B(0, 9/10)$ so we can compare their energies using (5.91) and obtain

$$(5.128) \quad \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \leq \int_{B(0,1)} |e(v)|^2 dx + CC_0 e_n^{-1} \varepsilon_n m_n + e_n^{-1} h_n(1).$$

To lighten the notation, we write $B_\rho = \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10B_i$. We observe that in $\Omega_h \setminus \left(S_h \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right)$ and in

$$(5.129) \quad B(0, 1) \setminus \left(K \cup \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \overline{B}(0, \rho) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I(\rho)} 10\overline{B}_i \right),$$

we have $e(v) = e(u_n)$ so (5.128) is equivalent to

$$(5.130) \quad \sum_{h=1,2} \int_{\Omega_h \cap S_h \setminus B_\rho} |e(u_n)|^2 + \int_{B_\rho} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \\ + \int_{B(0,\rho) \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup B_\rho)} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \leq \sum_{h=1,2} \int_{\Omega_h \cap S_h \setminus B_\rho} |e(v_h)|^2 dx + h_n(1).$$

We use $F_h \subset Z \subset B_\rho$ and (5.112) to bound

$$(5.131) \quad \sum_{h=1,2} \int_{\Omega_h \cap S_h \setminus B_\rho} |e(v_h)|^2 dx \leq \sum_{h=1,2} \int_{S_h \setminus F_h} |e(v_h)|^2 dx$$

$$(5.132) \quad \leq C \int_D |e(u_n)|^2 dx.$$

Then we come back to the notation $\rho = \rho_n$ and we set

$$(5.133a) \quad C_n(\eta) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \text{dist}(y, P_0 \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho_n - 2\eta)) < \eta/(4U) \}$$

$$(5.133b) \quad C_\infty(\eta) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \text{dist}(y, P_0 \cap \overline{B}(0, \rho_\infty - 2\eta)) < \eta/(4U) \}.$$

We rely on the inclusions (5.120) and (5.121) to simplify the domains of integration;

$$(5.134) \quad \int_{C_n(\eta)} |e(u_n)|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\overline{B}(0, \rho_n) \cap \{ \text{dist}(\cdot, P_0) \leq \eta \} \setminus C_n(\eta)} |e(u_n)|^2 + CC_0 e_n^{-1} \varepsilon_n m_n + e_n^{-1} h_n(1).$$

We let $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and get

$$(5.135) \quad \mu(C_\infty(\eta)) \leq \mu(\overline{B}(0, \rho_\infty) \cap \{ \text{dist}(\cdot, P_0) \leq \eta \} \setminus C_\infty(\eta)).$$

This yields in particular

$$(5.136) \quad \mu(P_0 \cap B(0, \rho_\infty - 2\eta)) \leq \mu(\overline{B}(0, \rho_\infty) \cap \{ \text{dist}(\cdot, P_0) \leq \eta \} \setminus P_0 \cap B(0, \rho_\infty - 2\eta))$$

and we finally make $\eta \rightarrow 0$ to get

$$(5.137) \quad \mu(P_0 \cap B(0, \rho_\infty)) \leq \mu(P_0 \cap \partial B(0, \rho_\infty)).$$

According to the way we built ρ_∞ (see (5.106)), this implies $\mu(P_0 \cap B(0, \rho_\infty)) \leq \varepsilon$. Here, ρ_∞ might depend on ε but since $\rho_\infty \geq 1/2$ anyway, we conclude that

$$(5.138) \quad \mu(P_0 \cap B(0, \frac{1}{2})) = 0.$$

□

6. JOINT DECAY AND CONCLUSION

Lemma 6.1. *We fix a gauge $h(r) = c_h r^\alpha$, where $c_h > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. There exists constants $C \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_0^* \in]0, 1]$, $\gamma \in]0, \alpha]$ (all depending on N, α) such that the following property holds. Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer with gauge h in Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$. For all $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, \varepsilon_0^*]$, there exists $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ (that depends on N, α, ε_0) such that if*

$$(6.1) \quad \beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{and} \quad h(r_0) + m(x_0, r_0) + \omega(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon,$$

then for all $0 < r \leq r_0$, K separates in $B(x_0, r)$ and

$$(6.2) \quad \beta(x_0, r) \leq C\varepsilon_0, \quad m(x_0, r) + \omega(x_0, r) \leq C \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^\gamma \varepsilon_0.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_* \in (0, 1)$ and $c_* \geq 1$ be the constants of Theorem 4.1 for $\gamma = 1/2$. Let $C_1 \geq 1$ be the constant of Proposition 5.1. Let $C_2 \geq 1$ and $\sigma = 10^{-6}$ be the constants of Proposition 5.2. Let $C_3 \geq 1$ be the constant of Proposition 5.3. We consider a constant $b_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $C_3 b_0 \leq 1/2$ and we set

$$(6.3) \quad b := \min \left\{ b_0, \frac{\sigma^3}{(4c_*)^2}, 2^{-1/\alpha} \right\} \leq \frac{\sigma}{2},$$

which depends on N, α . We let $\varepsilon_e \in]0, 1]$ be the constant given by Proposition 5.3 with this choice of b . We consider some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ that satisfies (5.11), that is

$$(6.4) \quad 200A\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau,$$

where A and τ are universal constants defined in (5.1). This will allow us to apply the Propositions 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. We additionally need to assume that

$$(6.5) \quad \varepsilon_0 \leq \min \left\{ \sigma\varepsilon_*, \frac{b^N \varepsilon_e}{4C_1}, \frac{b\tau}{8A} \right\} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{b}{2C_1}, \frac{b}{4}, \varepsilon_e \right\}.$$

We prove first an intermediate result; if $\varepsilon_1 \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$ is small enough (depending on N, α, ε_0) and if we set

$$(6.6) \quad \varepsilon_2 := \frac{b}{C_1} \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_3 := \frac{b^{N-1} \varepsilon_e}{4} \varepsilon_2,$$

then the fact that K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$ and that

$$(6.7) \quad \beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad m(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_1, \quad \omega(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_2, \quad h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_3$$

implies that K separates in $B(x_0, br_0)$ and

$$(6.8) \quad \beta(x_0, br_0) \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad m(x_0, br_0) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}, \quad \omega(x_0, br_0) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}, \quad h(br_0) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_3}{2}.$$

In fact, it is already straightforward from the condition $b \leq 2^{-1/\alpha}$ in (6.3) that $h(br_0) \leq h(r_0)/2$. From our condition on ε_0 given in (6.5) and the choice of $\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$, we can draw the following two inequalities:

$$(6.9) \quad \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_3 \leq \left(\frac{b^N \varepsilon_e}{4C_1} \right) \left(\frac{C_1}{b} \varepsilon_2 \right) + \frac{b^{N-1} \varepsilon_e}{4} \varepsilon_2 \leq \frac{b^{N-1} \varepsilon_e}{2} \varepsilon_2$$

and

$$(6.10) \quad \frac{C_1}{4b} (\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3) \leq \frac{C_1}{4b} \left(\varepsilon_0 + \frac{b}{C_1} + \frac{b^N \varepsilon_e}{4C_1} \right) \varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}.$$

We have $\varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_e$ by (6.5) so two alternatives can occur. Either $\beta(x_0, r_0)m(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_e \omega(x_0, r_0)$ and then we are in position to apply Proposition 5.3 which gives that

$$(6.11) \quad \omega(x_0, br_0) \leq \frac{1}{2}\omega(x_0, r_0) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}.$$

Or at the contrary, we have $m(x_0, r_0)\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) > \varepsilon_e \omega(x_0, r_0)$ but then

$$(6.12) \quad \omega(x_0, br_0) \leq \frac{1}{b^{N-1}}\omega(x_0, r_0) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_e b^{N-1}}(\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_3) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}$$

thanks to (6.9). We pass to the bad mass. Since $\varepsilon_0 \leq b\tau/(8A)$, the bad mass $m(x_0, br_0)$ is well-defined and we have

$$(6.13) \quad m(x_0, br_0) \leq \frac{1}{4b}m(x_0, r_0/4).$$

Then Proposition 5.1 and the bound (6.10) give

$$m(x_0, br_0) \leq \frac{C_1}{4b}(\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}.$$

We are left to show that $\beta(x_0, br_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$. We apply Lemma 4.1 in the ball $B(x_0, \sigma r_0)$ with

$$(6.14) \quad \varepsilon := \sigma^{-1}\varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_* \quad \text{and} \quad a := \sigma^{-1}b \leq 1/2,$$

where ε_0 is small enough by (6.5) and b is small enough by (6.3). We have

$$(6.15) \quad \beta(x_0, \sigma r_0) \leq \sigma^{-1}\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon.$$

and Lemma 4.1 gives a constant $\eta > 0$ (depending on N, α, ε_0) such that if

$$(6.16) \quad \beta(x_0, br_0) = \beta(x_0, a\sigma r_0) \geq 4c_*\sqrt{a}\varepsilon,$$

then there exists a competitor L in $B(x_0, \sigma r_0)$ such that

$$(6.17) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0)) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0)) \geq \eta(\sigma r_0)^{N-1}.$$

But Proposition 5.2 says that for all competitor L in $B(x_0, \sigma r_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0)) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0)) &\leq C_2(\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3)r_0^{N-1} \\ &\leq C_2(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3)r_0^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As ε_2 and ε_3 depends on ε_1 by a multiplicative factor, we can assume ε_1 small enough (depending on N, α, ε_0) so that

$$(6.18) \quad C_2(\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_3) \leq \frac{1}{2}\eta\sigma^{1-N}$$

and thus for all competitor L in $B(x_0, r_0)$,

$$(6.19) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0)) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, \sigma r_0)) \leq \frac{1}{2}\eta(\sigma r_0)^{N-1}.$$

This contradicts (6.17) and proves that

$$\beta(x_0, br_0) \leq 4c_*\sqrt{a}\varepsilon = 4c_*\sqrt{a}\sigma^{-1}\varepsilon_0.$$

Substituting $a = \sigma^{-1}b$ and using the fact that b is small enough by (6.3), we have $4c_*\sigma^{-1}\sqrt{a} \leq 1$ and thus $\beta(x_0, br_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$. Finally, Lemma 2.1 shows that K separates in $B(x_0, br_0)$ because K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$, $\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $br_0 \geq 4\varepsilon_0 r_0$, i.e., $\varepsilon_0 \leq b/4$. Our intermediate result is proved.

It is clear that it can be iterated and thus we obtain that for all $n \geq 0$, K separates in $B(x_0, b^n r_0)$ and

$$(6.20) \quad \beta(x_0, b^n r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad m(x_0, b^n r_0) \leq 2^{-n}\varepsilon_1, \quad \omega(x_0, b^n r_0) \leq 2^{-n}\varepsilon_2.$$

Now, for all $0 < r \leq r_0$, there exists $n \geq 0$ such that $b^{n+1}r_0 \leq r \leq b^n r_0$ so

$$(6.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta(x_0, r) &\leq b^{-1}\beta(x_0, b^n r_0) \leq b^{-1}\varepsilon_0, \\ m(x_0, r) &\leq b^{1-N}m(x_0, b^n r_0) \leq b^{1-N}(2^{-n}\varepsilon_1), \\ \omega(x_0, r) &\leq b^{1-N}\omega(x_0, b^n r_0) \leq b^{1-N}(2^{-n}\varepsilon_2). \end{aligned}$$

As before, Lemma 2.1 shows that K separates in $B(x_0, r)$. Notice that $2^{-1} = b^\gamma$, where $\gamma = -\ln(2)/\ln(b)$, so

$$(6.22) \quad 2^{-n} \leq \left(\frac{r}{br_0}\right)^\gamma$$

and we can rewrite (6.21) as

$$(6.23) \quad \beta(x_0, r) \leq C\varepsilon_0, \quad m(x_0, r) \leq C \left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right)^\gamma \varepsilon_1, \quad \omega(x_0, r) \leq C \left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right)^\gamma \varepsilon_2$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$ that depends on N, α . □

Remember that the energy and the bad mass are bounded from above by a universal constant (assuming $h(r_0) \leq 1$). We can then use Proposition 5.3 to say that if the flatness is sufficiently small, then the energy is small enough in a smaller ball and we can use Proposition 5.1 to deduce that the bad mass is small enough as well. This allows to drop the requirements on m and ω in Lemma 6.1. Once we know that the flatness stays small at all scales, there is actually no bad mass. With a null bad mass and the energy under control, Proposition 5.2 shows that K is an almost-minimal set. We gather these observations in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *We fix a gauge $h(r) = c_h r^\alpha$, where $c_h > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. There exists a constant $\gamma \in]0, \alpha]$ (depending on N, α) such that the following properties holds. Let (u, K) be a Griffith almost-minimizer with gauge h in Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and K separates in $B(x_0, r_0)$. For all $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists $c \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ (both depending on N, α, ε_0) such that if*

$$(6.24) \quad \beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon,$$

then for all $x \in K \cap B(x_0, cr_0)$ and for all $0 < r \leq cr_0$, we have

$$(6.25) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad m(x, r) = 0, \quad \omega(x, r) \leq \left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right)^\gamma \varepsilon_0$$

and K is an almost-minimal set in $B(x_0, cr_0)$ with gauge $\tilde{h}(r) = (r/r_0)^\gamma \varepsilon_0$.

Proof. Let $C \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_0^* \in]0, 1]$, $\gamma \in]0, \alpha]$ be the constants (which depend on N, α) given by Lemma 6.1. Let A and τ be the universal constant defined in (5.1). We consider some $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \varepsilon_0^*)$ such that

$$(6.26) \quad 200A\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad C\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau.$$

The first part of the proof is dedicated to showing that for all $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, there exists $c \in (0, 1)$ (depending on N, ε_1) and $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$ (depending on N, α, ε_1) such that if

$$(6.27) \quad \beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon,$$

then for all $x \in B(x_0, cr_0)$,

$$(6.28) \quad \beta(x, cr_0) + \omega(x, cr_0) + m(x, cr_0) \leq \varepsilon_1.$$

Then, we will choose ε_1 appropriately small (depending on N, α, ε_0) so as to apply Lemma 6.1 in these balls $B(x, cr_0)$.

We start by controlling the energy ω under the assumption (6.27). For all $0 < b < 1$, Proposition 5.3 yields a parameter $\varepsilon_e \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ such that if

$$(6.29) \quad \beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_e \quad \text{and} \quad m(x_0, r_0)\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_e \omega(x_0, r_0),$$

then

$$(6.30) \quad \omega(x_0, br_0) \leq C_3 b \omega(x_0, r_0),$$

for some universal constant $C_3 \geq 1$. As the quantities $\omega(x_0, r_0)$ and $m(x_0, r_0)$ are bounded from above by a universal constant, we can draw the following simplified statement. For all $0 < b < 1$, there exists a parameter $\varepsilon_e \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ such that if $\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_e \omega(x_0, r_0)$, then

$$(6.31) \quad \omega(x_0, br_0) \leq C_4 b,$$

for some universal constant $C_4 \geq 1$. Now, we fix $0 < b < 1$ (depending on N, ε_1) such that $C_4 b \leq \varepsilon_1/2$. We distinguish two cases. Either $\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_e \omega(x_0, r_0)$ and then

$$(6.32) \quad \omega(x_0, br_0) \leq \varepsilon_1/2.$$

Or $\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \geq \varepsilon_e \omega(x_0, r_0)$, but then

$$(6.33) \quad \omega(x_0, br_0) \leq b^{1-N} \omega(x_0, r_0) \leq b^{1-N} \varepsilon_e^{-1} (\beta(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0))$$

and we can assume ε small enough (depending on N, α, ε_1) so that $\omega(x_0, br_0) \leq \varepsilon_1/2$. In addition, we can again choose ε small enough so that

$$(6.34) \quad \beta(x_0, br_0) + h(br_0) \leq \varepsilon_1/2$$

and K separates in $B(x_0, br_0)$. At this stage, we arrived at the fact for the radius $r_1 := br_0$, we have

$$(6.35) \quad \beta(x_0, r_1) + \omega(x_0, r_1) + h(r_1) \leq \varepsilon_1$$

and K separates in $B(x_0, r_1)$. We are left to deal with the bad mass. We use Proposition 5.1 and the fact that the bad mass is bounded by a universal constant, to get a constant $C_1 \geq 1$ (depending on N, α) such that

$$(6.36) \quad m(x_0, r_1/4) \leq C_1 (\beta(x_0, r_1) + \omega(x_0, r_1) + h(r_1)) \leq C_1 \varepsilon_1.$$

We assume ε_1 small enough so that for all $x \in B(x_0, r_1/16)$, the set K separates in $B(x, r_1/16)$ and the bad mass is well-defined in $B(x, r_1/16)$ and can be estimated by the scaling property (see Remark 5.1). Thus, we have for all $x \in B(x_0, r_1/16)$,

$$(6.37) \quad \beta(x, r_1/16) + \omega(x, r_1/16) + m(x, r_1/16) + h(r_1/16) \leq C_1 \varepsilon_1,$$

with a bigger constant C_1 . We finally fix $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ small enough (depending on N, α, ε_0) so that Lemma 6.1 applies and yields that for all $x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_1/16)$ and for all $0 < r \leq r_1/16$,

$$(6.38) \quad \beta(x, r) \leq C \varepsilon_0, \quad \omega(x, r) \leq C \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^\gamma \varepsilon_0$$

and K separate in $B(x, r)$. We don't lose generality by assuming ε_0 smaller (depending on N, α) so that $C \varepsilon_0 \leq \tau$. Then it follows directly from the definition of the bad mass that for all $x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_1/32)$ and for all $0 < r \leq r_1/32$, we have $m(x, r) = 0$.

The second part of the proof consists in showing that K is an almost-minimal set in a smaller ball centred in x_0 . We work with the radius $r_2 := r_1/32$ to simplify the notations. Let $x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_2)$ and $0 < r \leq r_2$. We assume $200AC\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau$ so that

$$(6.39) \quad 200A\beta(x, r) \leq 200AC\varepsilon_0 \leq \tau$$

and thus we can apply Proposition 5.2 in $B(x, r)$. There exists a constant $C_2 \geq 1$ (depending on N, α) such that for all topological competitor L in $B(x, \sigma r)$,

$$(6.40) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, \sigma r)) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x, \sigma r)) \leq C_2 [\omega(x, r) + \beta(x, r)m(x, r) + h(r)] r^{N-1}$$

$$(6.41) \quad \leq C_2 [\omega(x, r) + c_h r^\alpha].$$

By assumption, $h(r_0) = c_h r_0^\alpha \leq \varepsilon_0$ so we can bound

$$(6.42) \quad c_h r^\alpha \leq \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^\alpha \varepsilon_0$$

and then

$$(6.43) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, \sigma r)) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x, \sigma r)) \leq C_2(C+1) \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^\gamma \varepsilon_0.$$

All open ball $B \subset B(x_0, \sigma r_2)$ can be written $B = B(x, \sigma r)$ for some $x \in B(x_0, r_2)$ and $r \leq r_2$, so K is almost-minimal in $B(x_0, \sigma r_2)$ with gauge $\tilde{h}(r) = C_2(C+1)(\sigma^{-1}r/r_0)^\gamma \varepsilon_0$. We can apply the proof with a rescaled ε_0 to get rid of the multiplicative constants. \square

The conclusion of Lemma 6.1 gives us a set K which is almost-minimal in $B(x_0, cr_0)$ with gauge $\tilde{h}(r) = (r/r_0)^\gamma \varepsilon_0$. Moreover, it has a small flatness and error term there because

$$(6.44) \quad \beta(x_0, cr_0) \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}(cr_0) \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

If ε_0 is small enough (depending on N, α), then K is a smooth surface in a smaller ball thanks to the ε -regularity theorem for almost-minimizers below. The exact statement can be found in [11, Theorem 12.25] for two dimensional sets, but holds in higher dimensions as well.

Theorem 6.1. *We fix a gauge $h(r) = c_h r^\alpha$, where $c_h > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. There exists constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, and $\gamma \in]0, \alpha[$ (depending on N, α) such that the following holds. Let $r_0 > 0$, let E be a coral almost-minimal set with gauge h in $B(0, 200r_0)$ such that $0 \in E$. If*

$$(6.45) \quad \beta(0, 100r_0) + h(100r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

then for all $0 < r \leq r_0$, there is a $C^{1,\gamma}$ diffeomorphism

$$(6.46) \quad \phi: B(0, 2r) \longrightarrow \phi(B(0, 2r))$$

such that $\phi(0) = 0$, $|\phi(y) - y| \leq 10^{-2}r$ for all $y \in B(0, 2r)$ and

$$(6.47) \quad E \cap B(0, r) = \phi(P \cap B(0, 2r)) \cap B(0, r),$$

where P is an hyperplane which achieves the minimum in the definition of $\beta(0, 100r_0)$.

Proof. Actually, David does not require (6.45) but

$$(6.48) \quad f(100r_0) + \beta(100r_0) + h(100r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

where

$$(6.49) \quad f(r) = \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, r))}{\omega_{N-1} r^{N-1}} - \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, r))}{\omega_{N-1} r^{N-1}}$$

is the density excess. Here, the right-hand side limit exists because for a coral almost-minimal set E containing 0, the density $r \mapsto r^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, r))$ is nearly non-decreasing ([10, Proposition 5.24]). Let us justify that (6.45) implies (6.48). We show first that

$$(6.50) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, r))}{r^{N-1}} \geq \omega_{N-1}.$$

Let θ denotes the value of the limit in (6.50). We have necessarily $\theta > 0$ because almost-minimal sets are Ahlfors-regular ([10, Lemma 2.15]). According to [10, Proposition 7.21], there exists a coral minimal cone F centered at the origin (take any blow-up of E at 0 in local Hausdorff distance) such that $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F \cap B(0, 1)) = \theta$. The set F is a cone centred at the origin so for all $r > 0$,

$$(6.51) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F \cap B(0, r)) = r^{N-1} \theta.$$

The set F is also minimal in \mathbb{R}^N so for all $x \in F$, the fonction $r \mapsto r^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F \cap B(x, r))$ is non-decreasing. We deduce that for all $x \in F$ and for all $r > 0$,

$$(6.52) \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F \cap B(x, r)) \leq \theta r^{N-1}.$$

As a minimal set is rectifiable, we should have for \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -a.e. $x \in F$,

$$(6.53) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F \cap B(x, r))}{\omega_{N-1} r^{N-1}} = 1.$$

And since $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F) > 0$, there exists a least one point such that (6.53) holds. In combination with (6.52), this proves that $\theta \geq \omega_{N-1}$. With (6.50) at hand, we see that

$$(6.54) \quad f(r) \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, r))}{\omega_{N-1} r^{N-1}} - 1$$

and we have already see in (4.4) that

$$(6.55) \quad \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(0, r))}{\omega_{N-1} r^{N-1}} \leq 1 + C\beta(0, 2r).$$

It is now clear that (6.45) implies (6.48) (at a smaller scale but it does not really matter). \square

Theorem 1.1 is a simple application of Lemma 6.1 and Theorem 6.1, as we have discussed just above the latter.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

C. Labourie was funded by an internal research grant from the University of Cyprus and the DFG project FR 4083/3-1. He gratefully acknowledges their support.

REFERENCES

- [1] Giovanni Alessandrini, Antonino Morassi, and Edi Rosset. The linear constraints in Poincaré and Korn type inequalities. *Forum Math.*, 20(3):557–569, 2008.
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and John E. Hutchinson. Higher integrability of the gradient and dimension of the singular set for minimisers of the Mumford-Shah functional. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 16(2):187–215, 2003.
- [3] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [4] Jean-François Babadjian, Flaviana Iurlano, and Antoine Lemenant. Partial regularity for the crack set minimizing the two-dimensional Griffith energy. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(7):2443–2492, 2022.
- [5] A. Bonnet. On the regularity of edges in image segmentation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 13(4):485–528, 1996.
- [6] Antonin Chambolle, Sergio Conti, and Flaviana Iurlano. Approximation of functions with small jump sets and existence of strong minimizers of Griffith’s energy. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 128:119–139, 2019.
- [7] Antonin Chambolle and Vito Crismale. Existence of strong solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the Griffith energy. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 58(4):Paper No. 136, 27, 2019.
- [8] Sergio Conti, Matteo Focardi, and Flaviana Iurlano. Existence of strong minimizers for the Griffith static fracture model in dimension two. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 36(2):455–474, 2019.
- [9] Gianni Dal Maso. Generalised functions of bounded deformation. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 15(5):1943–1997, 2013.
- [10] Guy David. Hölder regularity of two-dimensional almost-minimal sets in \mathbb{R}^n . *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 18(1):65–246, 2009.
- [11] Guy David. $C^{1+\alpha}$ -regularity for two-dimensional almost-minimal sets in \mathbb{R}^n . *J. Geom. Anal.*, 20(4):837–954, 2010.
- [12] C. De Lellis and M. Focardi. Higher integrability of the gradient for minimizers of the 2d Mumford-Shah energy. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 100(3):391–409, 2013.
- [13] C. De Lellis, F. Ghiraldin, and F. Maggi. A direct approach to Plateau’s problem. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 19(8):2219–2240, 2017.
- [14] Camillo De Lellis, Antonio De Rosa, and Francesco Ghiraldin. A direct approach to the anisotropic Plateau problem. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 12(2):211–223, 2019.
- [15] G. De Philippis, A. De Rosa, and F. Ghiraldin. A direct approach to Plateau’s problem in any codimension. *Adv. Math.*, 288:59–80, 2016.
- [16] Guido De Philippis, Antonio De Rosa, and Francesco Ghiraldin. Existence results for minimizers of parametric elliptic functionals. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 30(2):1450–1465, 2020.
- [17] Guido De Philippis and Alessio Figalli. Higher integrability for minimizers of the Mumford-Shah functional. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 213(2):491–502, 2014.
- [18] James Dugundji. *Topology*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Mass., 1966.
- [19] G. A. Francfort and J.-J. Marigo. Revisiting brittle fracture as an energy minimization problem. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 46(8):1319–1342, 1998.
- [20] Camille Labourie. Weak limits of quasiminimizing sequences. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 31(10):10024–10135, 2021.
- [21] Camille Labourie and Antoine Lemenant. Regularity improvement for the minimizers of the two-dimensional griffith energy. *preprint*, 2021.
- [22] A. Lemenant and R. Pakzad. The bi-harmonic optimal support problem. *in preparation*, 2023.
- [23] Antoine Lemenant. Energy improvement for energy minimizing functions in the complement of generalized Reifenberg-flat sets. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 9(2):351–384, 2010.
- [24] Antoine Lemenant. Regularity of the singular set for Mumford-Shah minimizers in \mathbb{R}^3 near a minimal cone. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 10(3):561–609, 2011.
- [25] Antoine Lemenant. A selective review on Mumford-Shah minimizers. *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital.*, 9(1):69–113, 2016.
- [26] Séverine Rigot. Big pieces of $C^{1,\alpha}$ -graphs for minimizers of the Mumford-Shah functional. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 29(2):329–349, 2000.
- [27] Leon Simon. *Lectures on geometric measure theory*, volume 3 of *Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University*. Australian National University, Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983.

(C. Labourie) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FRIEDRICH-ALEXANDER UNIVERSITÄT ERLANGEN-NÜRNBERG. CAUERSTR. 11, D-91058 ERLANGEN, GERMANY

Email address: `camille.labourie@fau.de`

(A. Lemenant) UNIVERSITÉ DE LORRAINE – CNRS, UMR 7502 IECL, BP 70239 54506 VANDOEUVRE-LÈS-NANCY, FRANCE

Email address: `antoine.lemenant@univ-lorraine.fr`