

A Dirichlet-to-Neumann Map for the Allen-Cahn Equation on Manifolds with Boundary

Jared Marx-Kuo

January 2023

Abstract

We study the asymptotic behavior of Dirichlet minimizers to the Allen–Cahn equation on manifolds with boundary, and we relate the Neumann data to the geometry of the boundary. We show that Dirichlet minimizers are asymptotically local in orders of ϵ and compute expansions of the solution to high order. A key tool is an improved Schauder estimate for the linearized Allen-Cahn equation. We apply our results to separating hypersurfaces in closed riemannian manifolds. This gives a projection theorem about Allen–Cahn solutions near minimal surfaces, as constructed by Pacard–Ritore.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Background	3
1.2	Motivating Example	4
1.3	Results	4
1.4	Paper Organization	8
1.5	Acknowledgements and Dedication	8
2	Set up	8
2.1	Constants and Definitions	10
3	Normal Derivative for Y	11
3.1	Initial Decomposition	11
3.2	An Almost Orthogonality Lemma	12
3.3	Better tangential behavior	13
3.4	Proof of theorem 1.3	15
4	Higher Order Expansions	16
4.1	Next Order Expansion for $H_Y = 0$	16
4.2	Full characterization of Neumann Data	18
5	Proof of theorem 1.6	23
5.1	Set up	24
5.2	Estimates on ϕ	25
5.3	Proof of theorem 1.6	25
6	Future Work	27
7	Appendix	27
7.1	Lemma on $L^* = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \partial_t^2 - W''(g)$ for $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$	27
7.2	Boundedness of τ in Lemma 3.3	28
7.3	Normal for Y_η	29
7.4	Integrating η equation for normal derivative	29
7.5	Extended Schauder estimates	32
7.6	Existence of solutions to $\ddot{F} - W''(g)F = \varphi$	33
7.7	Manual Expansion for $Y \in C^{4,\alpha}$	34

arXiv:2301.08286v1 [math.DG] 19 Jan 2023

1 Introduction

We work in (M^n, g) , a closed, smooth Riemannian manifold with boundary, $Y = \partial M$ (see 1). We assume that Y is at least $C^{2,\alpha}$ and will state higher regularity when needed.




Figure 1: Image of our set up

For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a nonnegative minimizer of the Allen–Cahn energy [2]

$$E_\epsilon(u) = \int_M \epsilon \frac{|\nabla_g u|^2}{2} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} W(u) \quad (1)$$

such that $u|_Y \equiv 0$. $W(u) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - u^2)^2$ can be take to be the standard double-well potential. Minimizers of this energy functional satisfy the Allen–Cahn equation on the interior of M

$$\epsilon^2 \Delta_g u = W'(u) = u(u^2 - 1) \quad (2)$$

On closed Riemannian manifolds, there is a well-known correspondence between zero sets of solutions to Allen–Cahn and minimal surfaces: Modica and Mortola ([12] [13]) showed that the Allen–Cahn energy functional Γ -converges to perimeter. Under certain geometric constraints, Wang and Wei ([18], Thm 1.1) showed that the level sets of a sequence of stable solutions to (2), $\{u_{\epsilon_i}\}$, converge to a minimal surface with good regularity. Similarly, given a minimal surface $Y \subseteq M$, Pacard and Ritore ([15], theorem 4.1) showed that one can construct solutions to Allen–Cahn with zero sets converging to Y as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (see 2).




Figure 2: Illustration of level set convergence to a minimal hypersurface

In this paper, we split figure 2 and look at solutions on manifolds with boundary. We are concerned with the following questions: given the boundary $Y = \partial M$, how can one see the geometry of Y in a solution, $u_{\epsilon, Y}$ to (2) with 0 level set of Y ? We take $u_{\epsilon, Y} = u_{\epsilon, Y} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be the non-negative minimizer of (1) with zero Dirichlet data on Y . We then show an asymptotic expansion of the Neumann data, $\nu_Y(u_{\epsilon, Y})$, in powers of ϵ , with the coefficients depending on the curvatures of Y . Finally, we apply our results to the setting of (M^n, g) closed with $Y^{n-1} \subseteq M^n$ a separating hypersurface so that $M = M^+ \sqcup_Y M^-$.

1.1 Background

For Y as above, consider the non-negative energy minimizer of (1), $u_{\epsilon, Y}$, with Dirichlet conditions on Y . By standard calculus of variations, this Dirichlet-minimizers exist. By work of Brezis–Oswald ([3], Thm 1), there is at most one such solution to (2) on M with this Dirichlet condition. Moreover, such a solution minimizes (1) among all such functions. We ask, what is $\partial_\nu u_{\epsilon, Y}$? We describe this Neumann data, as well as an expansion of $u_{\epsilon, Y}$ itself **asymptotically in ϵ** , by mimicking the techniques of Wang–Wei [18] and also Mantoulidis [[10], §4].

Our main application is the closed setting of this problem. Let (M^n, g) a smooth Riemannian manifold, and $Y^{n-1} \subseteq M^n$ a separating, two-sided hypersurface (see figure 3)




Figure 3: Closed Setting

such that $M = M^+ \sqcup_Y M^-$. One can consider non-negative (resp. non-positive) minimizers of (1) on M^\pm , referred to as $u_{\epsilon, Y}^\pm$. For $\nu = \nu_+$ a normal pointing inward to M^+ , the condition $\partial_\nu u_{\epsilon, Y}^+ = \partial_\nu u_{\epsilon, Y}^-$ means that $u_{\epsilon, Y}^\pm$ can be pasted together to form a smooth solution to Allen–Cahn with level set on Y . In particular, we are motivated by the following theorem of Pacard and Ritore [[15], Thm 1.1]:

Theorem 1.1 (Pacard–Ritore, Theorem 1.1). *Assume that (M, g) is an n -dimensional closed Riemannian manifold and $Y^{n-1} \subset M$ is a two sided, nondegenerate minimal hypersurface. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ there exists u_ϵ solutions to the Allen–Cahn equation such that u_ϵ converges to $+1$ (resp. -1) on compact subsets of $(M^+)^o$ (resp. $(M^-)^o$) and*

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} A(Y)$$

where $A(Y)$ is the $n - 1$ dimensional area of Y .

We’ll prove a theorem about the projection of the solutions constructed by Pacard and Ritore [[15], Thm 4.1] onto a specific kernel.

While Pacard and Ritore showed that one can construct solutions with zero sets converging to Y minimal, Wang and Wei consider a stable sequence of solutions to (2), $\{u_\epsilon\}$, and produce curvature bounds on the level sets [[18], Thm 1.1]. Recall that $B(u_\epsilon)$ denotes the extended second fundamental form on graphical functions (see [18], Eq 1.4)

Theorem 1.2 (Wang–Wei, Theorem 1.1). *For any $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $0 < b_1 \leq b_2 < 1$, and $\Lambda > 0$, there exist two constants $C = C(\theta, b_1, b_2, \Lambda)$ and $\epsilon_* = \epsilon(\theta, b_1, b_2, \Lambda)$ so that the following holds: suppose u_ϵ a stable solution of Allen–Cahn in $B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying*

$$|\nabla u_\epsilon| \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |B(u_\epsilon)| \leq \Lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \{|u_\epsilon| \leq 1 - b_2\} \cap B_1(0)$$

If $n \leq 10$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_$, then for any $t \in [-1 + b_1, 1 - b_1]$, $\{u_\epsilon = t\}$ are smooth hypersurfaces and*

$$[H(u_\epsilon)]_\theta \leq C, \quad \|H(u_\epsilon)\|_{C^0} \leq C\epsilon(\log |\log \epsilon|)^2$$

where $H(u_\epsilon)$ denotes the mean curvature of $\{u_\epsilon = t\}$

we are heavily inspired by the techniques used in their paper, though our results take on a different theme.

1.2 Motivating Example

As mentioned in the previous section, one can construct solutions of (2) by matching Dirichlet and Neumann conditions along a hypersurface. We're motivated by the following example from [[8], Ex. 19]:

Example: Let $M = S^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Define regions $A_\tau = S^n \cap \{|x_{n+1}| < \tau\}$ and $S^n \setminus A_\tau = D_\tau^+ \cup D_\tau^-$, where D_τ^\pm are the discs forming the complement of the annulus A_τ . Consider $u_{\epsilon,\tau}^\pm$ the *nonnegative* energy minimizers of the Allen–Cahn energy on D_τ^\pm . Let $v_{\epsilon,\tau}$ denote the *nonpositive* energy minimizer on A_τ and define

$$\tilde{u}_{\tau,\epsilon}(p) := \begin{cases} u_{\epsilon,\tau}^+(p) & p \in D_\tau^+ \\ u_{\epsilon,\tau}^-(p) & p \in D_\tau^- \\ v_{\epsilon,\tau}(p) & p \in A_\tau \end{cases}$$

see figure 4. This is C^0 and a solution to Allen–Cahn on $S^n \setminus \partial A_\tau$. We aim to find $0 < \tau < 1$ such that \tilde{u}_τ is C^1 across ∂A_τ , i.e. the Neumann data matches on $x_{n+1} = \pm\tau$.




Figure 4: Example of matching Neumann data on the sphere

Proof Sketch: One can show that

$$C_{\epsilon,\tau}^\pm := \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon,\tau}^\pm}{\partial x^{n+1}} - \frac{\partial v_{\epsilon,\tau}}{\partial x^{n+1}} \Big|_{x_{n+1}=\pm\tau}$$

varies continuously with τ and is only dependent on ϵ and τ (i.e. these solutions are one dimensional). Note by symmetry that $C_{\epsilon,\tau}^- = -C_{\epsilon,\tau}^+$.

In particular for ϵ fixed and τ sufficiently close to 1, $u_{\epsilon,\tau}^\pm \equiv 0$ while $v_{\epsilon,\tau} < 0$ on $\text{Int}(A_\tau)$. Similarly for τ sufficiently close to 0, $u_{\epsilon,\tau}^\pm > 0$ and $v_{\epsilon,\tau} \equiv 0$, i.e. for some $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |1 - \tau| < \delta &\implies C_{\epsilon,\tau}^+ > 0 \\ |1 - \tau| > 1 - \delta &\implies C_{\epsilon,\tau}^+ < 0 \end{aligned}$$

By continuity of $C_{\epsilon,\tau}^+$ there exists τ such that $C_{\epsilon,\tau}^\pm = 0$, and so that $\tilde{u}_{\tau,\epsilon}$ is a C^1 and hence smooth solution to Allen–Cahn on S^n .

1.3 Results

We recall the classic Dirichlet-to-Neumann map: consider an elliptic operator, L , arising from an energy functional. Given (M, g) a Riemannian manifold and ∂M smooth, consider $f : \partial M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Suppose there exists a unique \tilde{u} such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u} : M &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ L\tilde{u} &= 0 \\ \tilde{u} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} &= f \end{aligned}$$

Then one can formulate a map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} : H^1(\partial M) &\rightarrow L^2(\partial M) \\ \mathcal{D}(f) &= \partial_\nu(\tilde{u}) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

see [[11], §7] for details.

Instead, we investigate the following Dirichlet-to-Neumann type map, where the Dirichlet data is fixed at 0, but the manifold and its boundary, (M, Y) are variable. This is pictured in figure 5 where we think of M as a subset of




Figure 5: Variable boundary visualization

a larger closed manifold. Suppose we take the unique energy minimizer on M such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u} : M &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \epsilon^2 \Delta_g(\tilde{u}) - W'(\tilde{u}) &= 0 \\ \tilde{u}|_M &> 0 \\ \tilde{u}|_Y &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Let ν be the positive normal to Y and define

$$\mathcal{N}(Y) := \partial_\nu(\tilde{u})|_Y$$

$\mathcal{N}(Y)$ is a global term and depends on the geometry of M in a neighborhood of Y , as opposed to just on Y . We prove the following result which expands the Neumann data asymptotically in ϵ :

Theorem 1.3. *For $Y = \partial M$ a $C^{3,\alpha}$ hypersurface, and $u_{\epsilon,Y}$ the positive minimizer of E_ϵ on M with 0 Dirichlet condition on Y , we have that*

$$\partial_\nu u_{\epsilon,Y} = \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{2}}\sigma_0 H_Y + O(\epsilon^{1-\alpha})$$

with error in $C^\alpha(Y)$ and σ_0 constant independent of Y .

Remarks:

- We can posit this more formally as a Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator when M is closed and $Y \subseteq M$ is a separating hypersurface. Let $\mathcal{M}^{2,\alpha}(M)$ denote the space of $C^{2,\alpha}$ two sided, closed hypersurfaces with bounded geometry (cf. equation (8)). For $Y \subseteq \mathcal{M}^{2,\alpha}(M)$, let $U(Y)$ denote a normal neighborhood such that each $Y' \in U$ can be represented as

$$Y' = Y_\eta = F(Y, \eta) := \exp_Y(\eta(p)\nu(p))$$

with $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$ and ν a normal to Y . Define

$$\begin{aligned} F : Y \times (-\delta, \delta) &\rightarrow M \\ F(p, t) &= \exp_p(t\nu(p)) \\ F_\eta(p, t) &= \exp_p((t + \eta(p))\nu(p)) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N} : U(Y) &\rightarrow C^{1,\alpha}(Y) \\ Y_\eta &\mapsto F_\eta^*(\nu_{Y_\eta} u_{\epsilon, Y_\eta}^+) \Big|_{t=0} \\ &= (F_\eta^{-1})_*(\nu_\eta) F_\eta^*(u_{\epsilon, Y_\eta}^+) \Big|_{t=0} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Now noting that $U(Y) \cong \{\eta\} =: V \subseteq C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$, we can frame $\mathcal{N} : V \rightarrow C^\alpha(Y)$ as a map between functions on Y . In this sense, the variable initial level set, Y_η , is the Dirichlet data, and the normal derivative is the Neumann data, which forms a Dirichlet-to-Neumann type map on Y after pulling back. Our results do not just apply to perturbations of a fixed Y , as all of our theorems (with the exception of theorem 1.6) apply to *any* separating hypersurface of the appropriate regularity and bounded geometry. For this, we use the term ‘‘Dirichlet-to-Neumann type map’’ to describe \mathcal{N}

- As noted in [[8], Ex. 8], for Y fixed, a positive minimizer on M^\pm will exist for ϵ sufficiently small.

Theorem 1.3 is proved in the following manner:

1. Let t denote the signed distance from Y and s a fermi coordinate on Y . We decompose

$$u_{\epsilon, Y}(s, t) = g(t/\epsilon) + \phi(s, t)$$

where $g(t) = \tanh(t/\sqrt{2})$, and we rewrite the Allen–Cahn equation in terms of ϕ

2. We prove a modified Schauder estimate,

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}} \leq \|L\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha}$$

reminiscent of [[14], Prop 3.21]

3. We integrate the Allen–Cahn equation, showing that

$$\partial_t \phi(s, 0) \Big|_{t=0} = H_Y(s) \sigma_0 + \int_0^{-\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} (\Delta_t \phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)$$

4. We show that $\int_0^{-\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} (\Delta_t \phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon$ is small by proving better $C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for $\partial_{s_i} \phi$. This mimics [[18], §7]

We can improve our analysis of the Neumann data when $H_Y = 0$:

Theorem 1.4. *When $Y = \partial M$ is minimal, we have that*

$$\nu^+(u_{\epsilon, Y}^+) = \frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{2}} + \kappa_0 \epsilon [Ric_Y(\nu, \nu) + |A_Y|^2] + O(\epsilon^{2-\alpha})$$

with error in $C^\alpha(Y)$.

In the manifold with boundary setting, we see that as Y is more regular, we can capture more terms in the expansion of $\nu(u_{\epsilon, Y})$. This culminates in our main theorem

Theorem 1.5. *For $Y = \partial M$ a $C^{k+3,\alpha}$ hypersurface, the minimizer of (1) can be expanded as*

$$u_\epsilon(s, t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon^i \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^{M_i} a_{i,j} \left(\{\partial_s^\beta \partial_t^j H_t(s)\}_{j+|\beta| \leq i} \Big|_{t=0} \right) w_{i,j,\epsilon}(t) \right) + \phi \tag{6}$$

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon^{k+1})$$

where $a_{i,j}(s)$ are a collection of polynomials in derivatives of H_t up to a certain order, and $w_{i,j,\epsilon}(t) = w_{i,j}(t/\epsilon)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} w_{i,j} : [0, +\infty) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \|w_{i,j}\|_{C_{loc}^\infty} &= O(1) \end{aligned}$$

and are exponentially decaying in C^∞ .

When $k = 1$ this yields

Corollary 1.1. For u_ϵ a solution to Allen–Cahn with Dirichlet data on Y a $C^{4,\alpha}$ hypersurface, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\epsilon,Y}^+(s,t) &= g_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon H_Y(s) w_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s,t) \\ \|\phi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &= O(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

When Y is minimal (and has no singular set by assumption at beginning of §1)

Corollary 1.2. For $u_{\epsilon,Y}$ a solution to Allen–Cahn with Dirichlet data on Y , a minimal surface, the expansion in (6) exists to any order.

Remark In general, we see that both the expansion of $u_{\epsilon,Y}$ and its neumann derivative are *asymptotically local* in terms of a series expansion in powers of ϵ , despite being global quantities determined by the geometry of all of M , not just the geometry in a neighborhood of Y .

Remark Similar expansions have been done by Wang–Wei [17], Chodosh–Mantoulidis [4], and Mantoulidis [10] among other authors. These works begin with $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a smooth solution to (2) and then expand u about its zero-set. This approach actually gives the zero-set better regularity by a Simons-type equation (see [[17], Lem 8.6]), allowing for more terms in the expansion. By contrast, we start with Y , a prescribed zero set with limited regularity, and $u_{\epsilon,Y}^\pm : M^\pm \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ one sided solutions, for which the Simons-type equation does not apply.

Returning to the setting of M closed and $Y \subseteq M$ a separating hypersurface: take $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$, along with (4)

$$\begin{aligned} F_\eta &: Y \rightarrow U(Y) \subseteq M \\ F_\eta(p, 0) &:= \exp_p(\eta(p)\nu(p)) \\ Y_\eta &= \{F_\eta(p) \mid p \in Y\} \end{aligned}$$

where $U(Y)$ is some open neighborhood of Y in M . Decompose $M = M_\eta^+ \sqcup_{Y_\eta} M_\eta^-$ (see figure 6) and consider the




Figure 6: Perturbation of Y and the corresponding splitting of $M = M_\eta^+ \sqcup_{Y_\eta} M_\eta^-$

(positive) energy minimizers $u_{\epsilon,\eta}^\pm$ on M_η^\pm . By Brezis–Oswald [[3], Thm 1], these are the unique solutions to (2) on M_η^\pm and we can paste them together to form:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\epsilon,\eta} &: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ u_{\epsilon,\eta} &= \begin{cases} u_{\epsilon,\eta}^+(p) & p \in M_\eta^+ \\ -u_{\epsilon,\eta}^-(p) & p \in M_\eta^- \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We now use the map in (5)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}^\pm &: U(Y) \subseteq C^{2,\alpha}(Y) \rightarrow C^{1,\alpha}(Y) \\ \mathcal{N}^\pm(\eta) &= F_\eta^*(\partial_{\nu_{Y_\eta}^\pm} u_{\epsilon,\eta}^\pm)(p) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the Neumann data of $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ matching along Y_η is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{N}^+(\eta) - \mathcal{N}^-(\eta) = 0$$

When this is the case, $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ is a smooth solution to (2) and we can characterize the projection of $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ onto \dot{g}_ϵ , the kernel of $L_\epsilon := \epsilon^2 \partial_t^2 - W''(g_\epsilon)$:

Theorem 1.6. *Let $Y \subseteq M$ a minimal separating hypersurface in a closed, smooth Riemannian manifold. For $u_{\epsilon,\eta} : Y \times (\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon), -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in (7), suppose that $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ is C^1 across Y_η and $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} = O(\epsilon^{1+\beta})$ for some $\beta \geq \alpha$ fixed. Then*

$$\int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt = 2\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

with error holding in $C^\alpha(Y)$. If we further have that Y is non-degenerate, then

$$\int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} u_{\epsilon,\eta}(s,t) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \eta(s) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^2, \eta^2)$$

with error in $C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$

Remark The above theorem tells us that when we perturb $Y \rightarrow Y_\eta$ to find a solution to (2) with zero set Y_η , then we can detect η via the projection of our solution onto \dot{g}_ϵ . Also note that for $u_{\epsilon,\eta}(s,t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s,t)$,

$$\int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} u_{\epsilon,\eta}(s,t) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt = \int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \phi(s,t) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt + O(\epsilon^k)$$

so theorem 1.6 is equivalent to computing the projection of ϕ onto \dot{g}_ϵ . Further note that theorem 1.6 differs from corollary 1.1 in that we compute a two-sided integral for theorem 1.6.

1.4 Paper Organization

This paper is organized as follows:

- In §2, we define notation and recall some known geometric equations and quantities.
- In §3, we pose the initial decomposition of $u_{\epsilon,Y}^\pm = g(t/\epsilon) + \phi$ where g is the heteroclinic. We prove lemma 3.3, which is used to estimate $\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}}$ and $\|\partial_{s_i} \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}}$. We then prove theorem 1.3
- In §4, we prove higher order expansions of the Neumann data, theorem 1.4 and our main result, theorem 1.5. This theorem says that given Y a $C^{k+3,\alpha}$ surface with bounded geometry, we can expand $u_{\epsilon,Y}^\pm$ to order ϵ^k .
- Finally, in §5, we prove theorem 1.6

1.5 Acknowledgements and Dedication

The author would like to thank Otis Chodosh for presenting him with this problem and many fruitful conversations over the course of several months. The author would also like to thank Rafe Mazzeo and Érico Silva for their mathematical perspectives on the project. Furthermore, the author would like to thank Yujie Wu and Shuli Chen for their feedback and companionship.

The author dedicates this project to his grandmother, Shirley Kuo.

2 Set up

We first describe the manifold with boundary setting. Let (M^n, g) a Riemannian manifold with $Y = \partial M$ a $C^{k,\alpha}$ surface for some $k \geq 2$. Throughout this paper, we'll assume uniform bounds on the geometry of Y , i.e. we fix a $C > 0$ (independent of ϵ) such that

$$\|A_Y\|_{C^{k-2,\alpha}} \leq C \tag{8}$$

We define $u_{\epsilon, Y}$ (also notated as u_ϵ) to be the energy minimizer of (1) on M with Dirichlet conditions on Y . Let $p \in Y$ a base point, $\{E_i\}$ an orthonormal frame for TY at p , and ν a normal on Y with respect to g . We coordinatize a tubular neighborhood of Y via the following maps

$$G : B_1(0)^{n-1} \rightarrow Y \quad (9)$$

$$G(s) = \exp_p^Y(s^i E_i)$$

$$F : B_1(0)^{n-1} \times [0, \delta_0] \rightarrow M \quad (10)$$

$$F(s, t) := \exp_{G(s)}^M(\nu(G(s))t)$$

for any $\omega > 5$ fixed and finite. Here, $\exp_p^Y : B_1(0) \rightarrow Y$ denotes the exponential map into Y , and $\exp^M : Y \times [0, \delta_0] \rightarrow M$ is the M -exponential map. We can coordinatize $u = u(s, t)$ in an ϵ -neighborhood of Y via the above. In this neighborhood, we can expand the metric and second fundamental form, $g_{ij}(s, t)$ and $A_{ij}(s, t)$, in coordinates, smoothly in t from the following equations

$$g_{ij}(s, t) = g_{ij}(s, 0) - 2t \sum_{k=1}^n A_i^k(s, 0)g_{jk}(s, 0) + t^2 \sum_{k, \ell=1}^n A^2(\partial_i, \partial_j) - \text{Rm}_g(\partial_i, \partial_t, \partial_t, \partial_j) + O(t^3) \quad (11)$$

$$A(s, t) = A(s, 0) + t [A^2|_{(s, r)} - \text{Rm}(\cdot, \partial_t, \partial_t, \cdot)|_{(s, r)}] + O(t^2) \quad (12)$$

$$H(s, t) = H(s, 0) + t[-|A|^2|_{(s, t)} - \text{Ric}_g(\partial_t, \partial_t)|_{(s, t)}] + O(t^2) \quad (13)$$

Here, $g(s, 0)$, $A(s, 0)$, and $H(s, 0)$ denote the corresponding geometric quantities on Y . Moreover, A^2 denotes a single trace of $A \otimes A$ (see [4] A.1, A.2). We can decompose the laplacian on M in a neighborhood of Y via

$$\Delta_g = \Delta_t - H_t \partial_t + \partial_t^2 \quad (14)$$

where $\Delta_t = \Delta_{Y+t\nu}$ is the laplacian on the surface $Y + t\nu = \{p \mid d_{\text{signed}}(p, Y) = t\}$ and H_t denotes the mean curvature of $Y + t\nu$. See [[18], §3] for details. In light of this notation, $H_t|_{t=0} = H_0 = H_Y$ and we'll use H_0 and H_Y interchangeably. Similarly, $\Delta_t|_{t=0} = \Delta_0 = \Delta_Y$ and we'll use these two interchangeably as well. While the above expansions hold on $t \in [0, \delta_0]$, we will often restrict u to $t \in [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]$ as the behavior of u is well-understood for $t > -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)$. In the closed setting for which $Y \subseteq M$ is separating, we decompose $M = M^+ \sqcup_Y M^-$ and use the above framework for $(M^+, Y = \partial M^+)$ and $(M^-, Y = \partial M^-)$ respectively.

We also define

$$g_\epsilon := \epsilon^{-2}g \quad (15)$$

along with the geometric Hölder spaces with respect to g_ϵ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{C_\epsilon^{0, \alpha}} &:= \|f\|_{C^0} + [f]_{0, \alpha, \epsilon} \\ [f]_{k, \alpha, \epsilon} &:= \sup_{\beta \text{ s.t. } |\beta|=k} \sup_{(s_1, t_1) \neq (s_2, t_2)} \frac{|D^\beta f(s_1, t_1) - D^\beta f(s_2, t_2)|}{\text{dist}_{g_\epsilon}[(s_1, t_1), (s_2, t_2)]^\alpha} \\ \|f\|_{C_\epsilon^{k, \alpha}} &:= \sum_{j=0}^k \|D^j f\|_{C_\epsilon^{0, \alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

Note that equation (2) becomes

$$\Delta_{g_\epsilon} u = W'(u)$$

i.e. by rescaling the metric, we can set $\epsilon = 1$. In accordance with this, we can define the following blow up maps:

$$G_\epsilon : B_{\epsilon^{-1}}(0)^{n-1} \rightarrow Y \quad (16)$$

$$G_\epsilon(\sigma) := \exp_{p, g_\epsilon}^Y(\sigma^i E_i)$$

$$F_\epsilon : B_{\epsilon^{-1}}(0)^{n-1} \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon)] \rightarrow M$$

$$F_\epsilon(\sigma, \tau) := \exp_{G_\epsilon(\sigma), g_\epsilon}^{NY}(\nu(G_\epsilon(\sigma))\tau)$$

for any $\omega > 5$ fixed and finite. We may refer to (σ, τ) as ‘‘scaled’’ fermi coordinates, as opposed to (s, t) , the actual fermi coordinates.

For $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$ non-negative, define the perturbed graph

$$Y_\eta := \{F(s, \eta(s)) \mid s \in Y\} \quad (17)$$

where $F(s, \eta(s))$ (see (10)) is the unique point a signed distance of $\eta(s)$ away from $G(s) \in Y$. As with Y , $Y_\eta = \partial M_\eta$, where M_η consists of all points a non-negative distance from Y_η . We then define $u_{\eta,\epsilon}$, the minimizer of E_ϵ on M_η with 0 Dirichlet condition on Y_η .

For the closed setting, we have (M^n, g) a closed riemannian manifold, and $Y^{n-1} \subseteq M^n$, a separating, two-sided hypersurface. In this case η in (17) is real-valued. Moreover, Y_η divides M into M_η^+ and M_η^- . We then define $u_{\eta,\epsilon}^\pm$, the non-negative (resp. non-positive minimizers) of E_ϵ on M_η^\pm with 0 Dirichlet condition on $Y_\eta = \partial M_\eta^\pm$ (see figure 6)

2.1 Constants and Definitions

We recall the 1-dimensional solution to equation (2), the *heteroclinic solution*, denoted by

$$g(t) := \tanh(t/\sqrt{2})$$

and \dot{g}, \ddot{g} denote the first and second derivatives of the heteroclinic. We further denote

$$g_\epsilon(t) := g(t/\epsilon), \quad \dot{g}_\epsilon := \dot{g}(t/\epsilon), \quad \ddot{g}_\epsilon(t) := \ddot{g}(t/\epsilon)$$

Define the constants

$$\sigma_0 := \int_0^\infty \dot{g}^2 dt = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}, \quad \kappa_0 := \int_0^\infty t \dot{g}^2 dt = \frac{1}{6}[4 \ln(2) - 1]$$

Similarly, consider $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the solution to

$$w''(t) - W''(g)w(t) = \dot{g}(t) \quad (18)$$

$$w(0) = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w(t) = 0 \quad (20)$$

which exists and is unique by section §7.6 in the appendix (see also [[1], Lemma B.1, remark B.3]). We note that $\dot{w}(0) < 0$. As with g_ϵ , let $w_\epsilon(t) := w(t/\epsilon)$ and similar for \dot{w}_ϵ and \ddot{w}_ϵ .

We also define big O and \tilde{O} notation to capture the size of error terms. We write $E = O(\epsilon^m)$ or $\|E\|_{C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}} = O(\epsilon^m)$ to denote

$$\|E\|_{C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}} \leq C\epsilon^m$$

for some C independent of ϵ . Similarly, $E = \tilde{O}(f_1, f_2, \dots)$ denotes error depending on functions:

$$E = \tilde{O}(f_1, f_2, \dots) \implies \|E\|_{C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}} \leq C \sum_i \|f_i\|_{C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}} \quad (21)$$

for some C independent of ϵ and the $\{f_i\}$.

Finally, we establish a definition for exponentially decaying functions:

Definition 2.1. *A function, $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is exponentially decaying if there exists $\gamma > 0$, $C > 0$, $t_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\forall t > t_0, \quad |f(t)| \leq Ce^{-\gamma t}$$

Moreover, f is exponentially decaying in C^k if such a bound holds for all k derivatives of f . f is exponentially decaying in C^∞ if there exists such an γ_k, C_k, t_k such that the above holds for each derivative of f .

3 Normal Derivative for Y

In this section we work in the manifold with boundary setting. The goal is to show theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3. *For $Y = \partial M$ a $C^{3,\alpha}$ hypersurface, and $u_{\epsilon,Y}$ the positive minimizer of E_ϵ on M with 0 Dirichlet condition on Y , we have that*

$$\partial_\nu u_{\epsilon,Y} = \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{2}}\sigma_0 H_Y + O(\epsilon^{1-\alpha})$$

with error in $C^\alpha(Y)$ and σ_0 constant independent of Y .

3.1 Initial Decomposition

Define

$$L_\epsilon := \epsilon^2 \Delta_g - W''(g_\epsilon)$$

and

$$u_\epsilon(s, t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s, t) \tag{22}$$

with the above holding on a tubular neighborhood of Y in normal coordinates i.e. $Y \times [0, \delta_0)$. We recall the following initial bound that $\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}} = o(1)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

Lemma 3.1. *Let Y be a $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ surface. For $\phi(s, t) : Y \times [0, \delta_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in (22), we have that for all $\mu > 0$, there exists an $\epsilon_0(\mu)$ such that for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$,*

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}(Y \times [0, \delta_0))} \leq \mu$$

Proof: Note that $\phi : B_1(0)^{n-1} \times [0, \delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth away from the boundary and $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ near the boundary (i.e. about $t = 0$, see [[7], Lemma 6.18]). Decompose our t domain of $[0, \delta) = [0, \epsilon R] \cup (\epsilon R, \delta_0) = I_1 \cup I_2$. On I_1 we have

$$\phi = o(1) \in C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}(Y \times [0, \epsilon R]) \tag{23}$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This follows by

- Blowing up our sequence of u_ϵ on (M, g_ϵ) , to get a C^{k+1} solution, $u_\infty : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to (2) with $\epsilon = 1$
- Considering the odd reflection of u_∞ , to get $\tilde{u}_\infty : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a smooth solution on the whole space (the dirichlet and neumann data match at $t = 0$!)
- Using a classification of solutions to Allen–Cahn on \mathbb{R}^n with $u^{-1}(0) = \{x_n = 0\}$ [[9], Thm 3]

This gives us C_{loc}^{k+1} convergence on $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$, which when we restrict to $t \in [0, R]$ gives uniform convergence in t for any $B_r(p) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ fixed. Bounding $C^{k,\alpha}$ norms by C^{k+1} norms, translating this back to the unscaled setting of $Y \times [0, \epsilon R]$, and noting that Y is closed, we see that (23) holds. On I_2 , we recall that for u_ϵ a solution to (2) with $u_\epsilon^{-1}(0) = Y$, we have the following decay estimate from [[8], Exercise 10, Remark] for any $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\alpha > 0$,

$$\|\phi\|_{C^{\ell,\alpha}} = \|u_\epsilon(s, t) - g(t/\epsilon)\|_{C^{\ell,\alpha}} \leq C e^{-\sigma t/\epsilon} \tag{24}$$

where $C = C(\ell, \alpha)$ and $\sigma > 0$ independent of ϵ , ℓ , α . This holds for all t , and on $I_2 = (\epsilon R, \delta_0)$ for R sufficiently large,

$$\|\phi\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(Y \times I_2)} \leq C e^{-\sigma R} \leq \mu$$

for some ϵ sufficiently small. □

Having given an initial bound on ϕ , we write a PDE describing it

Lemma 3.2. *For $\phi(s, t)$ as in (22), we have*

$$L_\epsilon(\phi) = \epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon + Q_0(\phi) \tag{25}$$

where $Q_0(\phi) = \tilde{O}(\phi^2)$

Proof: In this decomposition, the Allen–Cahn equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon^2 \Delta_g u &= -\epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon + \ddot{g}_\epsilon + \epsilon^2 [\Delta_t \phi - H_t \phi_t + \phi_{tt}] \\ W'(u) &= W'(g_\epsilon) + W''(g_\epsilon) \phi + Q_0(\phi^2) \\ \implies 0 &= \epsilon^2 \Delta_g u - W'(u) \\ &= -\epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon + L_\epsilon(\phi) + Q_0(\phi^2)\end{aligned}$$

For

$$Q_0(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2} W'''(g) \phi^2 - \phi^3 = \tilde{O}(\phi^2)$$

□

3.2 An Almost Orthogonality Lemma

In this section, we now prove the following lemma for the differential operator, L_ϵ :

Lemma 3.3. *Let Y a $C^{2,\alpha}$ surface and suppose $f : Y \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in $C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y)$ satisfies $f(s, 0) \equiv 0$. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0$,*

$$\|f\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \leq K \|L_\epsilon f\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])}$$

for K independent of ϵ .

Proof: By using boundary Schauder estimates with respect to g_ϵ as in (15) on all of $B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]$ and scaled fermi coordinates $\sigma = \epsilon^{-1}s$, $\tau = \epsilon^{-1}t$ (along with (16)), we have

$$\|f(\sigma, \tau)\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(B_{(\epsilon^{-1})/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \leq K (\|L_\epsilon f(\sigma, \tau)\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\epsilon^{-1}}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon)])} + \|f\|_{C^0(B_{\epsilon^{-1}}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon)])})$$

Note that we've changed $C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha} \rightarrow C^{k,\alpha}$ by parameterizing by (σ, τ) instead of (s, t) . Moreover, K is independent of ϵ by the expansion of $\epsilon^2 \Delta_g = \Delta_{g_\epsilon}$ in the scaled coordinates, (σ, τ) . It suffices to prove

$$\|f\|_{C^0(B_{(\epsilon^{-1})/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \leq \tilde{K} \|L_\epsilon f\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\epsilon^{-1}}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon)])}$$

for some $\tilde{K} > 0$ also independent of ϵ . Suppose not, then there exists a sequence of $\{f_j\}$ and $\{\epsilon_j\}$ such that

$$\|f_j\|_{C^0(B_{(\epsilon_j^{-1})/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon_j)/2])} \geq j \|L_{\epsilon_j} f_j\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\epsilon_j^{-1}}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon_j)])}$$

normalize each f_j by $\|f_j\|_{C^0}$ and the assumed bound becomes

$$\|f_j\|_{C^0(B_{(\epsilon_j^{-1})/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon_j)/2])} = 1 \geq j \|L_{\epsilon_j} f_j\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\epsilon_j^{-1}}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon_j)])}$$

so that $\|L_{\epsilon_j} f_j\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\epsilon_j^{-1}}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon_j)])} \rightarrow 0$. Now choose $\{(\sigma_j, \tau_j)\}$ such that $|f_j(\sigma_j, \tau_j)| \geq 1/2$ and consider

$$\tilde{f}_j(s, t) := f_j(\sigma - \sigma_j, \tau - \tau_j)$$

Since our domain is $B_{\epsilon_j^{-1}}(0) \times [0, -\omega \ln(\epsilon_j)/2]$ (i.e. asymmetric in τ) we must show that $\tau_j \not\rightarrow +\infty$. This follows via the maximum principle and is done in §7.2. Now having normalized by $\|f_j\|_{C^0}$, we have uniform $C_{\epsilon_j}^{2,\alpha}$ bounds. Moreover $g_\epsilon \rightarrow g_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ uniformly in ϵ after pulling back to (σ, τ) coordinates. Thus, we have uniform $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates on $f_j(\sigma, \tau)$. Use Arzelà Ascoli to pass to a subsequence which converges in C^2 to $f_\infty : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$ on compact sets. The subsequence comes with $\{\tau_j\} \rightarrow \tau^*$ with $0 < \tau^* < \infty$ so that

$$|f_\infty(0, \tau^*)| > 1/2$$

We also have convergence at the boundary, i.e.

$$\forall \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad f_\infty(\sigma, 0) \equiv 0$$

This follows because for $C > \tau > 0$, all of the \tilde{f}_j 's satisfy

$$|\tilde{f}_j(\sigma, \tau)| \leq 2K\tau$$

by the $C^{2,\alpha}$ bounds and that $\tilde{f}_j(\sigma, 0) \equiv 0$. Thus we get the same interior bound for f_∞ , which forces the same Dirichlet data. Since $j \rightarrow \infty \implies \epsilon_j \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\epsilon_j} &= \Delta_{g_\epsilon} - W''(g(\tau)) \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \partial_\tau^2 - W''(g) =: \tilde{L} \\ \implies \tilde{L}f_\infty &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

this tells us that $f_\infty(\sigma, \tau) \equiv 0$ by lemma 7.1 for $\tilde{L} = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \partial_\tau^2 - W''(g)$ on the half space. But we've point picked so that $f_\infty(0, \tau^*) \neq 0$, a contradiction. \square

In the exact same way, we prove the corresponding $C_\epsilon^{1,\alpha}$ estimate

Lemma 3.4. *Let Y be $C^{2,\alpha}$ and suppose $f : Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in $C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}$ and satisfies $f(s, 0) \equiv 0$. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0$,*

$$\|f\|_{C_\epsilon^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \leq K \|L_\epsilon f\|_{C^0(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon))})$$

Remark Of course, our results apply to $u_{\epsilon,Y}^\pm$ in the closed setting. We contrast the above bounds with the analogous bound in Pacard–Ritore [[15], Prop 8.6]. In this paper, $\phi : Y \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the bound

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times \mathbb{R})} \leq K \|L_\epsilon \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(Y \times \mathbb{R})}$$

holds via the orthogonality condition: $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi \dot{g} = 0$, i.e. ϕ has been projected away from the kernel of L_ϵ , which allows the authors to exclude $\|\cdot\|_{C^0}$ term in the Schauder estimate. Instead of an orthogonality relationship, we use the Dirichlet condition of $u(s, 0) \equiv 0 \implies \phi(s, 0) \equiv 0$ to get rid of the $\|\cdot\|_{C^0}$ term. Note that the Dirichlet condition does not imply orthogonality on the half space, as the solution $w(t)$ from (18) satisfies the Dirichlet condition and also

$$\int_0^\infty w(t) \dot{g}(t) \neq 0$$

purely by a sign argument.

Corollary 3.4.1. *For ϕ as in lemma 3.3, we have*

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon) \tag{26}$$

Proof: Lemma 3.3 and 25 let us conclude that for $u_\epsilon(s, t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s, t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &\leq \|\epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + \|Q_0(\phi)\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ \|Q_0(\phi)\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} &\leq \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])}^2 \\ \implies \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &\leq O(\epsilon) + C e^{-R} \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \end{aligned}$$

having used lemma 3.1 to bound $\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha}^2$. We now apply an iteration argument to the above, noting that the norm on $B_{1/2}$ being bounded by the norm on B_1 can be replaced by the norm on $B_{r/2}$ being bounded by the norm on B_r for any $0 \leq r \leq 1$ with the same constants. This iteration argument is done implicitly in [[18], §11, Eq 11.1], and the explicit lemma is [[16], §4, Lemma 1], which gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &\leq O(\epsilon) + C e^{-R} \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ \implies \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &= O(\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

Finishing the proof. \square

Remark We will use the same iteration argument implicitly when bounding quadratic or higher order terms in ϕ throughout the rest of the paper.

3.3 Better tangential behavior

In this section, we get improved horizontal estimates when Y is $C^{3,\alpha}$. Let ∇^Y denote the gradient on Y , extended as an operator on functions on $Y \times [0, \delta_0)$ in (s, t) coordinates via

$$\nabla^Y f(s, t) = g^{ij}(s, 0) \partial_{s_i}(f) \partial_{s_j}$$

where ∂_{s_i} is identified with $F_*(\partial_{s_i})|_{s,t}$ using equation (10). Then we have

Lemma 3.5. *Let Y be $C^{3,\alpha}$. For $\phi(s, t)$ as in $u(s, t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s, t)$ from 3.1, we have that*

$$\|\nabla_Y \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon) \quad (27)$$

Remark The reader may ask how this estimate is “improved” since ϕ satisfies the same $C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}$ bound. The point is that because of the weighting in the $\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}}$ bound, a priori we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(1) \\ \|\phi_t\|_{C_\epsilon^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(1) \end{aligned}$$

by definition of the $C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}$ norms and (26). By contrast, the above lemma 3.5 gives an $O(\epsilon)$ bound for ϕ_{s_i} - one order in ϵ better. This method does not work for ϕ_t since $[\partial_t, L_\epsilon](\phi)$ is large a priori.

Proof: Starting with:

$$\epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) = L_\epsilon(\phi) + Q_0(\phi)$$

move into Fermi coordinates, and apply ∂_{s_i} to each side

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon(\partial_{s_i} H_t) \dot{g}_\epsilon &= L_\epsilon(\phi_{s_i}) + T_0(\phi) \phi_{s_i} + [L_\epsilon, \partial_{s_i}](\phi) \\ &= L_\epsilon(\phi_{s_i}) + E \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E &= T_0(\phi) \phi_{s_i} + [L_\epsilon, \partial_{s_i}](\phi) \\ T_0(\phi) &= -\frac{1}{2} W'''(g) \phi - 3\phi^2 \end{aligned}$$

and we can bound

$$\|E\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \leq \|\phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \cdot \|T_0(\phi)\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + \|[L_\epsilon, \partial_{s_i}](\phi)\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])}$$

$T_0(\phi) = \tilde{O}(\phi)$ so we see that $\|\phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha} \cdot \|Q'_0(\phi)\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha} = \tilde{O}(\epsilon \cdot \|\phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha})$. To bound on the larger domain, $B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]$ - first note that by (26) and compactness of Y , we have

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon)$$

Similarly, repeating the proof of corollary 3.4.1 but for $\omega \rightarrow 2\omega$, we have

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} = O(\epsilon)$$

With this, we compute the commutator in pieces and bound each

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\epsilon^2 \Delta_t, \partial_{s_i}] \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} &\leq \epsilon^2 \|[\Delta_t, \nabla^Y] \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ &\leq \epsilon^2 \|[\Delta_Y, \nabla^Y] \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + \epsilon^2 \|[(\Delta_t - \Delta_Y), \nabla^Y] \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ &\leq K \epsilon^2 \|\text{Ric}(\nabla^Y \phi)\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + K \epsilon \ln(\epsilon) \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ &\leq K \epsilon \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{1,\alpha}(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + K \epsilon \ln(\epsilon) \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ &\leq K \epsilon^2 \ln(\epsilon) \\ \|[\partial_{s_i}, -\epsilon^2 H_t \partial_t] \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} &= \epsilon^2 \|\partial_{s_i}(H_t) \cdot \phi_t\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ &= \leq K \|\partial_{s_i} H_t\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \cdot \|\epsilon^2 \partial_t \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ &\leq K \epsilon \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{1,\alpha}(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \\ &= O(\epsilon^2) \\ \|[\partial_{s_i}, \epsilon^2 \partial_t^2] \phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the commutator $[\partial_{s_i}, L_\epsilon](\phi)$ produces a small error. Here, we've noted that $\Delta_t = \Delta_Y + tL$ where L is still a second order differential operator in s coordinates and hence $[\partial_{s_i}, L]$ is at most second order. Then we note $t < -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)$ to gain an extra amount of decay. Moreover $[\Delta_Y, \nabla^Y](f) = \text{Ric}_Y(\nabla^Y f)$

Now from lemma 3.3 (note that $\phi_{s_i}(s, 0) \equiv 0$), we see that

$$\|\phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \leq K \|L_\epsilon \phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])}$$

and now evaluating $\|E\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} = O(\epsilon)$ and $\|\epsilon \partial_{s_i} H_t\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} = O(\epsilon)$, we get

$$\|\phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon) \quad (28)$$

The bound on $\nabla_Y \phi$ follows. \square

3.4 Proof of theorem 1.3

Referencing the decomposition in equation (25), we multiply by \dot{g}_ϵ and integrate from $t = 0$ to $t = -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)$, picking up a boundary term:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{O}(\phi^2) &= -\epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon + L_\epsilon(\phi) \\ \implies \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \tilde{O}(\phi^2) \dot{g}_\epsilon &= -\epsilon \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 + \epsilon^2 \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} (\Delta_t \phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &\quad - \epsilon^2 \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} H_t \phi_t \dot{g}_\epsilon + \epsilon^2 \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} [\phi_{tt} - W''(g_\epsilon) \phi] \dot{g}_\epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Note that the left hand side of (29) can be bounded

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \tilde{O}(\phi^2) \dot{g}_\epsilon &\leq K \epsilon^2 \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &\leq K \epsilon^3 + O(\epsilon^k) \\ &\leq K \epsilon^3 \end{aligned}$$

since $\omega > 5$. For the right hand side of (29), we note

$$|H_t - H_0| \leq t \|\dot{H}_t\|_{C^0} \leq Kt$$

which follows by the mean value theorem and (12). Moreover

$$\implies \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 = \epsilon \sigma_0 + C \epsilon^{k+1}$$

(again, $\omega \geq 5$ is arbitrary, so it can be taken sufficiently large to make this error small). We further note from (27):

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \epsilon^2 (\Delta_t \phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon \right\|_{C_Y^\alpha} &= \left\| \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \epsilon^2 (\Delta_0 \phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon \right\|_{C_Y^\alpha} + \left\| \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \epsilon^2 ([\Delta_t - \Delta_0] \phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon \right\|_{C_Y^\alpha} \\ &= O(\epsilon^{3-\alpha}) + O(\epsilon^{4-\alpha} \ln(\epsilon)) \\ &= O(\epsilon^{3-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

Here, we've again used that $\Delta_t - \Delta_0 = tL$ where L is a second order linear differential operator with bounded coefficients. In both cases, we use equation (3.5) to get the final bounds. Similarly, from equation (26), we have

$$\left\| \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \epsilon^2 H_t \phi_t \dot{g}_\epsilon \right\|_{C_Y^\alpha} = O(\epsilon^{3-\alpha})$$

We also compute

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \dot{g}_\epsilon &= \epsilon(1 + O(\epsilon^k)) \\ \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} (\epsilon^2 \phi_{tt} \dot{g}_\epsilon - W''(g) \phi \dot{g}_\epsilon) &= -\epsilon^2 \phi_t(s, 0) + O(\epsilon^k) \\ \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 &= \epsilon^2 H_0 \sigma_0 + O(\epsilon^3) \end{aligned}$$

with all estimates holding in $C^{0,\alpha}(Y)$. Combining, we have

$$\epsilon^2 \phi_t(s, 0) = -\epsilon^2 H_0 \sigma_0 + O(\epsilon^{3-\alpha})$$

for any $k \geq 3$. We summarize this as

$$\phi_t(s, 0) = -H_0 \sigma_0 + O(\epsilon^{1-\alpha})$$

so that

$$\partial_\nu u(p) = \partial_t u = \epsilon^{-1} \dot{g}(0) + \phi_t(p, 0) = \frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{2}} - \sigma_0 H_Y(p) + O(\epsilon^{1-\alpha}) \quad (30)$$

holds in $C^\alpha(Y)$. This proves theorem 1.3. \square

4 Higher Order Expansions

4.1 Next Order Expansion for $H_Y = 0$

In this section, we give a more precise description of the normal derivative for Y minimal and prove theorem 1.4:

Theorem 1.4. *When $Y = \partial M$ is minimal, we have that*

$$\nu^+(u_{\epsilon,Y}^+) = \frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{2}} + \kappa_0 \epsilon [\text{Ric}_Y(\nu, \nu) + |A_Y|^2] + O(\epsilon^{2-\alpha})$$

with error in $C^\alpha(Y)$.

Proof: When Y is minimal, (and hence smooth since we've assumed all our hypersurfaces are at least $C^{2,\alpha}$), (25) becomes

$$L_\epsilon(\phi) = \epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon + \tilde{O}(\phi^2)$$

if $H_Y = H_0 = 0$, then

$$H_t = \int_0^t \dot{H}_r dr$$

we expand this as

$$L_\epsilon(\phi) = \epsilon^2 \dot{H}_0(s) \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon}\right) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon \left(\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) + Q_0(\phi^2) \quad (31)$$

with the goal of showing

$$\left\| \epsilon \left(\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) \right\|_{C^\alpha_\epsilon(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} = o(\epsilon^2)$$

The C^0 bound holds clearly as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \epsilon \left(\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w dw dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) \right| &\leq \epsilon \left(\int_0^t \int_0^r \sup_{\substack{s \in Y \\ w \in [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]}} |\ddot{H}_w(s)| dw dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &\leq K \epsilon t^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &\leq K \epsilon^3 \sup_{t \in [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]} \left| \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon}\right)^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) \right| \\ &\leq K \epsilon^3 \end{aligned}$$

For the $[\cdot]_\alpha$ bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(s, t) &:= \epsilon \left(\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) \\ [f]_{\alpha, B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]} &\leq \epsilon \left(\left\| \int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right\|_{C^0} [\dot{g}_\epsilon]_\alpha + \left[\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right]_\alpha \|\dot{g}_\epsilon\|_{C^0} \right) \end{aligned}$$

on $B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right\|_{C^0} &\leq Kt^2 = O(\epsilon^2 \ln(\epsilon)^2) \\ \left[\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right]_\alpha &\leq Kt^{2-\alpha} = O(\epsilon^{2-\alpha} \ln(\epsilon)^{2-\alpha}) \\ \|\dot{g}_\epsilon\|_{C^0} &= O(1) \\ [\dot{g}_\epsilon]_\alpha &= O(\epsilon^{-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} [f]_\alpha &\leq O(\epsilon^{3-2\alpha} \ln(\epsilon)^{2-\alpha}) \\ &= o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

So that to leading order

$$L_\epsilon(\phi) = O(\epsilon^2)$$

which holds in $C_\epsilon^\alpha(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])$. From lemma 3.3,

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon^2)$$

If we differentiate (31) with respect to ∂_{s_i} again, we get by the same bounding techniques

$$L_\epsilon(\partial_{s_i} \phi) = \epsilon \left(\int_0^t \partial_{s_i}(\dot{H}_r) dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon + \tilde{O}(\phi \phi_{s_i}, \epsilon^2 D^2 \phi, \epsilon^2 D \phi) + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (32)$$

Using our bound on $\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}}$ and lemma 3.3, we get

$$\|\phi_{s_i}\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}((B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2]))} = O(\epsilon^2)$$

so that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2]} \|\Delta_t \phi(s, t)\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} = O(\epsilon^{1-\alpha})$$

Now we multiply (31) by \dot{g}_ϵ and integrate by $\dot{g}_\epsilon(t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2} L_\epsilon(\phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt &= \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2} (\epsilon^2 [\Delta_t(\phi) - H_t \phi_t + \phi_{tt}] - W''(g_\epsilon) \phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt \\ &= -\epsilon^2 \phi_t(s, 0) + O(\epsilon^{4-\alpha}) \\ \epsilon^2 \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \dot{H}_0(s) \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon} \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon^2(t) &= \kappa_0 \epsilon^3 \dot{H}_0 \\ \left| \epsilon \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \left(\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t)^2 dt \right| &\leq C \epsilon \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} t^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon(t)^2 dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^4) \\ \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2} Q_0(\phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon dt &= O(\epsilon^4) \end{aligned}$$

where these error terms hold in $C^\alpha(Y)$. Now note that

$$\dot{H}_0 = [\text{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A_Y|^2]$$

so that

$$\phi_t(s, 0) = \kappa_0 \epsilon [\text{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A_Y|^2] + O(\epsilon^{2-\alpha}) \quad (33)$$

□

4.2 Full characterization of Neumann Data

One can compare theorems 1.3 and 1.4 and note that more terms can be gleaned. In fact, if Y is a $C^{k+3,\alpha}$ surface, we can find an expansion for $u_\epsilon(s, t)$ (not just $\partial_t u_\epsilon|_{t=0}$!) up to order k . Let

$$a_{i,j}(s) := a_{i,j} \left(\{ \partial_s^\beta \partial_t^j H_t|_{t=0} \}_{j+|\beta| \leq i} \right) (s)$$

denote a polynomial in derivatives of $H_t(s)$ at $t = 0$. Define

$$i \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}, \quad \sigma(i) := \max(0, 2\lceil i/2 \rceil - 2) = \begin{cases} 0 & i = 0 \\ \text{largest even integer less than } i & i > 0 \end{cases}$$

We prove our main result, theorem 1.5:

Theorem 1.5. *For $Y = \partial M$ a $C^{k+3,\alpha}$ hypersurface, the minimizer of (1) can be expanded as*

$$u_\epsilon(s, t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon^i \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^{M_i} a_{i,j} \left(\{ \partial_s^\beta \partial_t^j H_t(s)|_{t=0} \}_{j+|\beta| \leq i} \right) w_{i,j,\epsilon}(t) \right) + \phi \quad (6)$$

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon^{k+1})$$

where $a_{i,j}(s)$ are a collection of polynomials in derivatives of H_t up to a certain order, and $w_{i,j,\epsilon}(t) = w_{i,j}(t/\epsilon)$ satisfy

$$w_{i,j} : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \|w_{i,j}\|_{C_{loc}^\infty} = O(1)$$

and are exponentially decaying in C^∞ .

Proof: We actually prove the following by induction

$$u_\epsilon^+(s, t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon^i \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m_i} a_{i,j}(s) w_{i,j}(t/\epsilon) \right) + \phi \\ L_\epsilon(\phi) = R_{k+1}(s, t) + F_k(\phi) \\ \|a_{i,j}\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} = O(1) \\ \|w_{i,j}\|_{C^{k,\alpha}([0, \infty))} = O(1)$$

Where $\{w_{i,j}(t)\}$ are all exponentially decaying. Moreover, we require that R_{k+1} can be expanded in powers of ϵ to arbitrary order as follows:

$$\forall \ell \geq 0, \quad \exists \{b_{k+1,i,j}(s)\}, \quad \{f_{k+1,i,j}(t)\} \quad \text{s.t.} \\ R_{k+1}(s, t) = \epsilon^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k+1}} b_{k+1,0,j}(s) f_{k+1,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \\ + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \epsilon^{k+1+i} \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k+1,i}} b_{k+1,i,j}(s) f_{k+1,i,j}(t/\epsilon) + O(\epsilon^{\ell+k+2}) \\ \|f_{k+1,i,j}\|_{C^\alpha([0, \infty))} = O(1)$$

In this sense, we see that there is a partial expansion of the remainder up to any order. Here, we require that

- $b_{k+1,0,j}(s) = b_{k+1,0,j} \left(\{ \partial_t^p \partial_s^\beta H_t|_{t=0} \} \right)$ depends on **at most** $\sigma(k+1)$ **tangential derivatives** of $\{ \partial_t^p H_t|_{t=0} \} (s)$.
- For $i \geq 1$, $b_{k+1,i,j}(s) = b_{k+1,i,j} \left(\{ \partial_t^p \partial_s^\beta H_t|_{t=0} \} \right)$ is a polynomial in **at most** $\sigma(k+2)$ **tangential derivatives** of $\partial_t^p H_t|_{t=0} (s)$.

- Each $f_{k+1,i,j}(t)$ is exponentially decaying in C^∞ . This allows us to solve

$$\begin{aligned} w_{k+1,i,j} &: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \ddot{w}_{k+1,i,j}(t) - W''(g(t))w_{k+1,i,j}(t) &= f_{k+1,i,j}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} w_{k+1,i,j}(0) &= 0 \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w_{k+1,i,j}(t) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

by section §7.6 in the appendix.

We also require that $F_k(\phi)$ is an error term which has at most cubic dependency on ϕ in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} F_k(\phi) &= \epsilon \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} c_{k,i}(s) h_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \phi \\ &\quad + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_k} d_{k,i}(s) p_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \phi^2 \\ &\quad - \phi^3 \\ \|h_{k,i}(t)\|_{C^\alpha([0,\infty))} &= O(1) \\ \|p_{k,i}(t)\|_{C^\alpha([0,\infty))} &= O(1) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover

- $\{h_{k,i}\}$ and $\{p_{k,i}\}$ are exponentially decaying in C^∞
- $\{c_{k,i}\}, \{d_{k,i}\}$ depend on **at most** $\sigma(k)$ **tangential derivatives** of $\partial_t^p H_t|_{t=0}(s)$.

Note that $L_\epsilon(\phi) = R_{k+1} + F_k$ and 3.3 automatically gives the conclusion of

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon^{k+1})$$

Base Case $k = 0$:

This is the content of corollary 3.4.1

$$\begin{aligned} u_\epsilon^+(s, t) &= g_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s, t) \\ L_\epsilon(\phi) &= \epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon - \left[\frac{1}{2} W'''(g_\epsilon) \phi^2 + \phi^3 \right] \\ &= R_1(s, t) + F_0(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

from (25). At this level of expansion, $\{a_{1,i,j} = 0\}, \{w_{1,i,j} = 0\}$. We see that $R_1(s, t) = \epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon$ satisfies our inductive assumptions simply by expanding

$$\begin{aligned} H_t &= H_0 + t\dot{H} + \frac{t^2}{2}\ddot{H} + \dots + \frac{t^{\ell+1}}{(\ell+1)!} \partial_t^{\ell+1} H_t|_{t=0} + O(t^{\ell+2}) \\ \implies \epsilon H_t \dot{g}_\epsilon &= \epsilon(H_0)\dot{g}_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \epsilon^{i+1} \left(\frac{1}{(i+1)!} \partial_t^{\ell+1} H_t|_{t=0} \right) \left[\left(\frac{t}{\epsilon} \right)^{i+1} \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) \right] + O(\epsilon^{\ell+2}) \end{aligned}$$

here, we've noted that $\left(\frac{t}{\epsilon}\right)^i \dot{g}_\epsilon$ is bounded in $C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}$ for all k, α, i . Thus $R_1(s, t)$ satisfies our inductive assumptions. Note that computing $\partial_t^i H_t$ does not require extra regularity of Y - simply expand (12) in t . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} N_{1,i} &= 0 \\ b_{1,i,0}(s) &= \left(\frac{1}{(i+1)!} \partial_t^{\ell+1} H_t|_{t=0} \right) \\ f_{1,i,0}(s) &= \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon} \right)^{i+1} \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, each b_{i+1} depends on $0 \leq \sigma(1), \sigma(2)$ tangential derivatives of $\{\partial_t^p H_t|_{t=0}\}$. And finally, each $f_{1,i,0}(t)$ is exponentially decaying. Similarly, it is clear that $F_0(\phi)$ satisfies our inductive assumptions as it only has quadratic and cubic terms with bounded coefficients in $C_\epsilon^{k,\alpha}$ that are also exponentially decaying.

$$\begin{aligned} d_{0,1}(s) &= 1 \\ p_{0,1}(t/\epsilon) &= \frac{1}{2} W'''(g_\epsilon) = 3g_\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Induction:

Now assume that Y is a $C^{k+3,\alpha}$ surface, and we have an expansion up to order $k-1$:

$$\begin{aligned} u_\epsilon^+(s, t) &= g_\epsilon(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \epsilon^i \sum_{j=0}^{m_i} a_{i,j}(s) w_{i,j}(t/\epsilon) + \phi \\ L_\epsilon(\phi) &= R_k(s, t) + F_{k-1}(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

We expand (for any $\ell \geq 1$)

$$R_k(s, t) = \epsilon^k \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} b_{k,0,j}(s) f_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \epsilon^{i+k} \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k,i}} b_{k,i,j}(s) f_{k,i,j}(t/\epsilon) + O(\epsilon^{\ell+1+k}) \right] \quad (36)$$

where we know $\{b_{k,0,j}\}$ depend on at most $\sigma(k-1+1) = \sigma(k) = \max(0, 2\lceil k/2 \rceil - 2) \leq k-1$ derivatives of $\partial_t^p H_t|_{t=0}(s)$. We can compute 2 more tangential derivatives of $b_{k,0,j}$ when Y is $C^{k+3,\alpha}$. With this, we use (36) and write

$$\phi(s, t) = \epsilon^k \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} b_{k,0,j}(s) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \tilde{\phi}$$

such that each $w_{k,0,j}$ solves

$$\ddot{w}_{k,0,j}(t) - W''(g_\epsilon) w_{k,0,j}(t) = f_{k,0,j}(t)$$

and has bounded C^α and is exponentially decaying. This follows again by §7.6. With this expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_\epsilon(\phi) &= L_\epsilon(\tilde{\phi}) \\ &+ \epsilon^{k+2} \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} \Delta_t(b_{k,0,j})(s) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \\ &- \epsilon^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} H_t(s) b_{k,0,j}(s) \dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \\ &+ \epsilon^k \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} b_{k,0,j}(s) [\ddot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) - W''(g_\epsilon) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon)] \end{aligned}$$

Because $\{b_{k,0,j}\}$ depend on $\sigma(k) \leq k-1$ derivatives of $\partial_t^p H_t|_{t=0}(s)$, we know that $\Delta_t b_{k,0,j}$ is at least in $C^\alpha(Y)$. Using (34), we see that the last line cancels with the first term in (36). We also expand

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_t(b_{k,0,j}) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) &= \Delta_0(b_{k,0,j})(s) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \epsilon \left(\frac{\Delta_t - \Delta_0}{t} \right) (b_{k,0,j}) \cdot \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon} \right) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \\ H_t(s) b_{k,0,j}(s) \dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) &= H_0(s) b_{k,0,j}(s) \dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \epsilon \left(\frac{H_t(s) - H_0(s)}{t} \right) \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon} \right) b_{k,0,j}(s) \dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

where we can write

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_t b_{k,0,j}) &= \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{t^i}{i!} \left(\partial_t^i \Delta_t \Big|_{t=0} \right) (b_{k,0,j})(s) + O(t^{m+1}) \\ (\partial_t^m \Delta_t) \Big|_{t=0} &: C^{l+2}(Y) \rightarrow C^l \\ &= \left(\partial_t^m g^{ij}(s, t) \Big|_{t=0} \right) \partial_{s_i} \partial_{s_j} - \left(\partial_t^m b^k(s, t) \Big|_{t=0} \right) \partial_{s_k} \end{aligned}$$

These expansions in t do not require higher regularity of $H_t(s)$, as can be seen from the expansion of the metric, $g(s, t)$, and the second fundamental form, $A(s, t)$, in equations (11) and (12). This allows us to make sense of $\frac{\Delta_t - \Delta_0}{t}$. Similarly

$$H_t(s)b_{k,0,j}(s)\dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) = \sum_{i=0}^m \epsilon^i \frac{1}{i!} \left(\partial_t^i H_t \Big|_{t=0}(s) \right) \left[\left(\frac{t}{\epsilon} \right)^i \dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \right] + O(\epsilon^{m+1})$$

for any m .

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k-1}(\phi) &= \epsilon \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_{k-1}} c_{k-1,i}(s)h_{k-1,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \phi + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{k-1}} d_{k-1,i}(s)p_{k-1,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \phi^2 - \phi^3 \\ &= \epsilon \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_{k-1}} c_{k-1,i}(s)h_{k-1,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \left(\epsilon^k \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} b_{k,0,j}(s)f_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \tilde{\phi} \right) \\ &\quad + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{k-1}} d_{k-1,i}(s)p_{k-1,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \left(\epsilon^k \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} b_{k,0,j}(s)f_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \tilde{\phi} \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\epsilon^k \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} b_{k,0,j}(s)f_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \tilde{\phi} \right)^3 \end{aligned}$$

with $\{c_{k-1,i}\}, \{d_{k-1,i}\}$ depending on at most $\sigma(k-1)$ derivatives of $\partial_t^p H_t \Big|_{t=0}(s)$. If we expand and relabel, noting that the product of exponentially decaying functions are themselves exponentially decaying, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k-1}(\phi) &= \epsilon^{k+1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}_k} C_{k,i}(s)H_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \\ &\quad + \epsilon \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} c_{k,i}(s)h_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \tilde{\phi} \\ &\quad + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_k} d_{k,i}(s)p_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \tilde{\phi}^2 \\ &\quad - \tilde{\phi}^3 \end{aligned}$$

for some n_k, m_k, \tilde{n}_k . Here

- $\{H_{k,i}, h_{k,i}, p_{k,i}\}$ are all exponentially decaying and $O(1)$ in C^α norm
- $\{C_{k,i}\}, \{c_{k,i}\}, \{d_{k,i}\}$ depend on at most $\sigma(k)$ derivatives of $\partial_t^p H_t \Big|_{t=0}(s)$.

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{k+1}(s, t) &:= \left[R_k(s, t) - \epsilon^k \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} b_{k,0,j}(s) f_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \right] + \epsilon^{k+1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}_k} C_{k,i}(s) H_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \\
&\quad - \epsilon^{k+2} \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} \Delta_t(b_{k,0,j})(s) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) + \epsilon^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} H_t(s) b_{k,0,j}(s) \dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \\
\implies R_{k+1}(s, t) &= \epsilon^{k+1} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{N_{k,1}} b_{k,1,j}(s) f_{k,1,j}(t/\epsilon) + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}_k} C_{k,i}(s) H_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} H_0(s) b_{k,0,j}(s) \dot{w}_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \right] \\
&\quad + \epsilon^{k+2} \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} \left(\frac{H_t(s) - H_0(s)}{t} \right) \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon} \right) b_{k,0,j}(s) - \epsilon^{k+2} \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} \Delta_t(b_{k,0,j})(s) w_{k,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} \epsilon^{i+k} \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k,i}} b_{k,i,j}(s) f_{k,i,j}(t/\epsilon) + O(\epsilon^{\ell+1+k})
\end{aligned}$$

moreover, note that $\{b_{k+1,i,j}\}$ depends on at most $\sigma(k+1)$ derivatives for $i \geq 1$, while $C_{k,i}$ and $b_{k,0,j}(s)$ depend on at most $\sigma(k)$ derivatives. Also recalling that ℓ is arbitrary, we can rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{k+1}(s, t) &= \epsilon^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k+1}} b_{k+1,0,j}(s) f_{k+1,0,j}(t/\epsilon) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \epsilon^{i+k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k+1,i}} b_{k+1,i,j}(s) f_{k+1,i,j}(t/\epsilon) + O(\epsilon^{\ell+k+2})
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we define

$$F_k(\tilde{\phi}) := \epsilon \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} c_{k,i}(s) h_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \tilde{\phi} + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_k} d_{k,i}(s) p_{k,i}(t/\epsilon) \right] \tilde{\phi}^2 - \tilde{\phi}^3$$

So that

$$L_\epsilon(\tilde{\phi}) = R_{k+1}(s, t) + F_k(\tilde{\phi})$$

with the correct decomposition and regularity of coefficients. Now with the decomposition of R_{k+1} , we use lemma 3.3 and get

$$\|\tilde{\phi}\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon^{k+1})$$

This finishes the induction. \square

As a result, we have the following corollaries for $k = 1$

Corollary 4.0.1. *For u_ϵ a solution to Allen–Cahn with Dirichlet data on $Y = \partial M$ a $C^{4,\alpha}$ hypersurface, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned}
u_\epsilon(s, t) &= g_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon H_Y(s) w_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s, t) \\
\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &= O(\epsilon^2)
\end{aligned}$$

We give a more “hands-on” proof of this in §7.7 of the appendix. Similarly for $k = 2$, we have

Corollary 4.0.2. *For u_ϵ a solution to Allen–Cahn with Dirichlet data on $Y = \partial M$ a $C^{5,\alpha}$ hypersurface, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned}
u_\epsilon^+(s, t) &= g_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon H_Y(s) w_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon^2 \left[\dot{H}_0(s) \tau_\epsilon(t) + H_Y^2 \rho_\epsilon(t) + \frac{1}{2} H_Y^2(s) \kappa_\epsilon(t) \right] + \phi \\
\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &= O(\epsilon^3)
\end{aligned}$$

5 Proof of theorem 1.6

In this section, we work in the closed setting. Consider Y a minimal hypersurface, and perturbations $\eta : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with Y_η defined as in section 1.3. Recall the definition of $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ (7):

$$u_{\epsilon,\eta} = \begin{cases} u_{\epsilon,\eta}^+(p) & p \in M^+ \\ -u_{\epsilon,\eta}^-(p) & p \in M^- \end{cases}$$

We aim to prove theorem 1.6:

Theorem 1.6. *Let $Y \subseteq M$ a minimal separating hypersurface in a closed, smooth Riemannian manifold. For $u_{\epsilon,\eta} : Y \times (\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon), -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in (7), suppose that $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ is C^1 across Y_η and $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} = O(\epsilon^{1+\beta})$ for some $\beta \geq \alpha$ fixed. Then*

$$\int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt = 2\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

with error holding in $C^\alpha(Y)$. If we further have that Y is non-degenerate, then

$$\int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} u_{\epsilon,\eta}(s,t) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \eta(s) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^2, \eta^2)$$

with error in $C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$

As a corollary, we can describe the horizontal variation of the solutions constructed in Pacard–Ritore ([15], Thm 4.1), [[14], Thm 1.1]). We recall their notation:

$$u_\epsilon(t) := \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$$

$$\bar{u}(y,t) = u_\epsilon(t - \zeta(y)) + v(y,t)$$

in our notation $v(y,t) \leftrightarrow \phi(s,t)$ and $\zeta(y) \leftrightarrow \eta(s)$. With this, we have

Corollary 5.0.1. *Suppose ζ is the perturbation constructed in [[14], Thm 3.33] and v the solution to (2) with $v^{-1}(0) = Y_\zeta$ and Y non-degenerate, minimal, and separating. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} v(s,t) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \zeta(s) + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

with error in $C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$. In particular

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta_Y v(s,t) \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} J_Y(\zeta) + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

Remark

- Note that

$$J_Y = \Delta_Y + (|A_Y|^2 + \text{Ric}_g(\nu, \nu))$$

and we show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (|A_Y|^2 + \text{Ric}_g(\nu, \nu)) v \dot{g}_\epsilon = o(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

in $C^\alpha(Y)$. Thus we could replace $\Delta_Y v$ with $J_Y v$ on the left hand side of 5.0.1

- The corollary tells us that the Pacard–Ritore solutions **have horizontal variation as large as the perturbation**, $\zeta(s)$, off of the initial Y minimal.

The proof is essentially the same as 1.4, but we have to confront the low regularity of Y_η given that $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$. We do this by pulling back $u_{\epsilon,\eta}^+$ to $Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon))$ and then showing:

$$v^+(u_{\epsilon,\eta}^+) = \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{2}} + \kappa_0 \epsilon [\text{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A_Y|^2] + \left[\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(u_{\epsilon,\eta}) \dot{g}_\epsilon \right] + \tilde{O}(\eta^2, \epsilon^2) \quad (37)$$

5.1 Set up

For Y_η as in (17), we consider the decomposition of $M = M_\eta^+ \cup_{Y_\eta} M_\eta^-$ and $u_{\epsilon,\eta}^\pm$ the minimizers on M_η^\pm . With Fermi coordinates about Y , define

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &: Y \times (\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)^2, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)^2) \rightarrow Y \times (\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)^2, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)^2) \\ \Phi(s, t) &:= F \left(s, t + \eta(s) \zeta \left(\frac{-4t}{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)^2} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for F as in (10) and where $\zeta(t)$ is the standard bump function which is 1 on $(-1, 1)$ and goes to zero outside of $[-2, 2]$. Note the factor of $\ln(\epsilon)^2$ so that Φ restricted to $Y \times (\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon), -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon))$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image.




Figure 7: Φ map describing our set up

In fact, on this subdomain

$$|t| < -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon) \implies \Phi(s, t) = (s, t + \eta(s))$$

We pull back $u_{\epsilon,\eta}^+$ by this function and compute the Allen–Cahn equation under this pullback. We define (dropping the \pm notation)

$$\begin{aligned} u_\epsilon^\eta &: Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ &:= \Phi^*(u_{\epsilon,\eta})(s, t) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^*(W'(u_{\epsilon,\eta})) &= W'(u_\epsilon^\eta) \\ u_\epsilon^\eta(s, 0) &\equiv 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Phi^*(\Delta_g u_{\epsilon,\eta}^+) = \Delta_{\Phi^*(g)} u_\epsilon^\eta$$

using diffeomorphism invariance of the laplacian. Instead of computing $\Phi^*(g)$ in coordinates, we push forward Δ_g to $(M, \Phi^*(g))$, as a differential operator, by Φ^{-1} , i.e.

$$\Delta_{\Phi^*(g)} = (\Phi^{-1})_*(\Delta_g)$$

We first expand Δ_g on (M, g) , recalling (14)

$$\Delta_g = \Delta_t - H_t \partial_t + \partial_t^2$$

Where Δ_{t_0} denotes the laplacian on $Y_{t_0} := Y + t_0\nu$, i.e. the set of a signed distance t_0 from Y . We now compute $\Delta_{\Phi^*(g)} = (\Phi^{-1})_*(\Delta_g)$ by pushing forward each summand:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi^{-1})_*(H_t \partial_t) &= H_{t+\eta} \partial_t \\ (\Phi^{-1})_*(\partial_t^2) &= \partial_t^2 \\ (\Phi^{-1})_*(\Delta_t) &= \Delta_{t+\eta} + E_\eta \\ \implies (\Phi^{-1})_*(\Delta_g) \Big|_t &= \Delta_g \Big|_{t+\eta} + E_\eta \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, $\Delta_g|_{t+\eta}$ denotes the ambient laplacian on M but with metric coefficients evaluated at the point $(s, t + \eta(s))$. We also define

$$\begin{aligned} E_\eta &:= g^{ij}(s, t + \eta(s)) [-\eta_i(s)\partial_t\partial_{s_j} - \eta_j(s)\partial_t\partial_{s_i} - \eta_{ij}(s)\partial_t + \eta_i(s)\eta_j(s)\partial_t^2] \\ &= -\Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta)\partial_t - 2\nabla^{t+\eta}(\eta)\partial_t + |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2\partial_t^2 \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

From hereon, we only consider u_ϵ^η restricted to $Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]$, and we rewrite the pulled back allen-cahn equation as:

$$\epsilon^2[\Delta_{t+\eta} - H_{t+\eta}\partial_t + \partial_t^2 + E_\eta](u_\epsilon^\eta) = W'(u_\epsilon^\eta)$$

Now we decompose (using that Y is minimal and inspired by corollary 4.0.2)

$$u_\epsilon^\eta = g_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon^2\dot{H}_0(s)\tau_\epsilon(t) + \phi^\eta(s, t)$$

where

$$\ddot{\tau}(t) - W''(g(t))\tau(t) = t\dot{g}(t)$$

from hereon, we label $\phi^\eta =: \phi$, and our pulled back Allen-Cahn equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\epsilon, t+\eta}(\phi) &= \epsilon[\Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta) + \dot{H}_0\eta]\dot{g}_\epsilon + |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2\dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &+ \epsilon^3 \left(\frac{H_{t+\eta}(s) - \dot{H}_0(s)(t+\eta)}{(t+\eta)^2} \right) \left(\frac{t+\eta}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &- \epsilon^4\Delta_{t+\eta}(\dot{H}_0)\tau_\epsilon + \epsilon^3H_{t+\eta}\dot{H}_0\dot{\tau}_\epsilon + \epsilon^3\Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta)\dot{H}_0\dot{\tau}_\epsilon + 2\epsilon^3\nabla^{t+\eta}(\eta)(\dot{H}_0)\dot{\tau}_\epsilon \\ &- \epsilon^2|\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2\dot{H}_0\dot{\tau}_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}W'''(g_\epsilon)\epsilon^4\dot{H}_0^2\tau_\epsilon^2 + \epsilon^6\dot{H}_0^3\tau_\epsilon^3 \\ &+ R(\phi) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\epsilon, r} &:= \epsilon^2(\Delta_r - H_r\partial_t + \partial_t^2 - W''(g_\epsilon(t))) \\ R(\phi) &:= \epsilon^2E_\eta(\phi) - F_0(\phi) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

$$F_0(\phi) := W'''(g_\epsilon)\epsilon^2\dot{H}_0\tau_\epsilon\phi + \left[3\epsilon^4\dot{H}_0^2\tau_\epsilon^2 + \frac{1}{2}W'''(g_\epsilon) \right] \phi^2 + \phi^3 \quad (41)$$

where $F_0(\phi)$ is the error term from expanding $W'(u)$. We abbreviate the right hand side of equation (39) as $G(\phi)$. Note that we have (and will continue to) abuse notation with $L_{\epsilon, t} = L_\epsilon$.

5.2 Estimates on ϕ

By the same proof of 3.3, we have that for ϵ_0 sufficiently small and $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \leq K\|L_{\epsilon, t+\eta}\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])}$$

With $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} \leq K\epsilon^{1+\beta}$ this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &\leq K \left[\|\epsilon[\Delta_{t+\eta} + \dot{H}_0](\eta)\dot{g}_\epsilon\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + \|\ |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2\dot{g}_\epsilon\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} \right] + O(\epsilon^3) \\ &\leq O(\epsilon^{2+\beta}) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

5.3 Proof of theorem 1.6

Now as in §3.4, we again decompose $L_{\epsilon, t+\eta}$, multiply by \dot{g}_ϵ , integrate, and extract the normal derivative:

$$\int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} L_{\epsilon, t+\eta}(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon = -\epsilon^2\phi_t(s, 0) + \epsilon^2 \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon + O(\epsilon^{4+\beta-\alpha})$$

Having used (42). Similarly

$$\int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} G(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon = \epsilon^2 \dot{H}_0 \eta \sigma_0 + \epsilon^2 \Delta_0(\eta) \sigma_0 + O(\epsilon^{3+2\beta})$$

The details are sketched in the appendix (section §7.4) and the error terms hold in $C^\alpha(Y)$. Because $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} \leq K\epsilon^{1+\beta}$, we see that in terms of order

$$\phi_t(s, 0) = \underbrace{\int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt}_{O(\epsilon^{1+\beta-\alpha})} - \underbrace{\sigma_0[\Delta_0 + \dot{H}_0](\eta)}_{O(\epsilon^{1+\beta})} + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

where the above asymptotics hold in $C^\alpha(Y)$. We frame this as

$$\|\phi_t(s, 0) - \int \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon + \sigma_0 J_Y(\eta)\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} = O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta}) \quad (43)$$

We now note that ∂_t is comparable to ν_η (see section §7.3), i.e. the normal vector for Y (translated to Y_η) and Y_η are comparable since η is small:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\eta &= (1 + A(s))\partial_t + B^i(s)\partial_{s_i} \\ \|A(s)\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} &\leq C\|\eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Y)}^2 \\ \|B^i(s)\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} &\leq C\|\eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Y)} \end{aligned}$$

as such

$$\|\nu_\eta(\phi) - \phi_t(s, 0)\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} = O(\epsilon^{3+3\beta-\alpha})$$

(recall that $\phi_{s_i}(s, 0) \equiv 0$) and so

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\eta(\phi) &= \phi_t(s, 0) + O(\epsilon^{3+3\beta-\alpha}) \\ &= \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt - \sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

To prove theorem 1.6, we note that if $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ is C^1 across $Y_\eta = u_{\epsilon,\eta}^{-1}(0)$, then the Neumann data match. If we take

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\epsilon,\eta} &: Y \times (\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon), -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ u_{\epsilon,\eta} &= g_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s, t) \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\phi(s, t) := \begin{cases} \phi^+(s, t) & t \geq 0 \\ \phi^-(s, t) & t < 0 \end{cases}$$

then $\nu_\eta(u_{\epsilon,\eta})$ is well defined, and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \nu_\eta(\phi^+) - \nu_\eta(\phi^-) \\ &= -2\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + \int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta}) \\ \implies \int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt &= 2\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{1+2\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

where the error holds in $C^\alpha(Y)$. Now note that

$$\left\| \int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \dot{H}_0 \phi \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \right\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} = O(\epsilon^{3+\beta-\alpha})$$

so that we can write the above as

$$J_Y \left(\int_{\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \phi \dot{g}_\epsilon(t) dt \right) = 2\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

with error in $C^\alpha(Y)$. We now substitute $\int u_{\epsilon,\eta}\dot{g}_\epsilon$ for $\int \phi\dot{g}_\epsilon$ at the cost of negligible error since

$$\int_{\omega\epsilon\ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon\ln(\epsilon)} g_\epsilon(t)\dot{g}_\epsilon(t)dt = O(\epsilon^k)$$

Furthremore, if Y is non-degenerate, we invert both sides by J_Y

$$\int_{\omega\epsilon\ln(\epsilon)}^{-\omega\epsilon\ln(\epsilon)} u_{\epsilon,\eta}(s,t)\dot{g}_\epsilon(t)dt = 2\sigma_0\eta(s) + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

where the error holds in $C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$. This concludes the theorem. \square

6 Future Work

The following generalizations and next steps are of interest:

- Can we reproduce the multiplicity one version of Wang–Wei [[18], Thm 1.1] using these techniques? More specifically, instead of perturbing the 0 set of Allen–Cahn solutions by some function $h(s)$, can we bootstrap a system of equations using Schauder estimates from lemma 3.3 to get regularity of H_{Y_η} ? This would require showing a better bound than $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} \leq K\epsilon^{1+\beta}$ when $u_{\epsilon,\eta}$ being a solution to (2)

- Can we show that

$$\int u_{\epsilon,\eta}\dot{g}_\epsilon = \sigma_0\eta(s) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^2, \eta^2)$$

holds for all such perturbations, η , off of Y minimal? I.e. not *just* when η gives rise to a 2-sided solution to (2) via energy minimization.

- Given the above equality, can one reprove the result of Pacard–Ritore using just energy minimization and the local perturbation η ? We note the recent work of De Phillipis and Pigati [[5], Thm 5] who prove the result using purely energy and gradient flow methods. We ask if an alternate solution can be performed by better understanding the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for arbitrary perturbation.
- In particular, consider Y a non-degenerate minimal hypersurface and the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(\eta) &= \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon,\eta}^+}{\partial \nu_\eta} - \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon,\eta}^-}{\partial \nu_\eta} \\ F(\eta) &:= -\frac{1}{4\sigma_0} J_Y^{-1}[\mathcal{P}(\eta) - 4\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta)] = -J_Y^{-1}(\tilde{R}_Y(\eta)) \end{aligned}$$

with the hopes of showing that $F : C^{2,\alpha}(Y) \rightarrow C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$ is a contraction.

- The above boils down to showing that

$$\left\| \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon\ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon dt \right\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} = o(\epsilon^{1+\beta})$$

- During the course of this paper, the author conjectured the following:

Conjecture 6.0.1. *Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\phi(s, 0) \equiv 0$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and suppose*

$$[\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n} - W''(g)](\phi) = f(s)\dot{g}(t)$$

then there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(s) \equiv c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi(s, t) = cw(t)$ for $w(t)$ as in (18).

7 Appendix

7.1 Lemma on $L^* = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \partial_t^2 - W''(g)$ for $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$

Lemma 7.1. *For $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+)$, suppose $\phi(s, 0) \equiv 0$ and $L^*(\phi) = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$. Then $\phi \equiv 0$*

Proof: The proof is a slight extension of the well known classification of $\ker(L)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. See [[14], Lemma 3.7] for reference. Because of the Dirichlet condition at $t = 0$, consider the odd reflection

$$\tilde{\phi}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \phi(s, t) & t \geq 0 \\ -\phi(s, -t) & t < 0 \end{cases}$$

then $\tilde{\phi}(s, t)$ is a C^1 solution to L^* . By the maximum principle, $\tilde{\phi}$ converges to 0 exponentially and uniformly as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Thus it is in L^2 and via an energy argument (again [[14], Lemma 3.7]), we see that

$$\tilde{\phi}(s, t) = c\dot{g}(t)$$

but $\phi(s, 0) = 0$ so $c = 0$. □

7.2 Boundedness of τ in Lemma 3.3

We show that τ_j is uniformly bounded from above and below. In terms of scaled fermi coordinates, (σ, τ) , we have

$$L = \Delta_{g_\epsilon} - W''(g)$$

Consider $\phi = 1$ for which

$$L(1) = -W''(g) = 1 - 3g^2$$

We see that this $L(1) < -1$ for all $\tau > \operatorname{arctanh}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\right) =: c_0$. Moreover, $1 \geq |\phi_j|$ by the normalization. Thus, the maximum principle applied to L and $(1 \pm \phi)$ tells us that for $\tau > c_0$, $1 \pm \phi_j$ achieves its minimum on the boundary of $\{\tau > c_0\}$. Let

$$K^\pm = \sup_{\sigma \in B_{\epsilon_j^{-1}}(0)} (1 \pm \phi_j(\sigma, c_0))$$

If $K^+ \leq 1/2$, then we see that $\phi_j(\sigma, c_0) \leq -1/2$ for some $\sigma \in B_{\epsilon_j^{-1}}(0)$ and hence $|\phi_j(\sigma, c_0)| \geq 1/2$. Similarly, if $K^- \leq 1/2$, then we have that $-\phi_j(\sigma, c_0) \leq -1/2$ and the same conclusion about $|\phi(\sigma, c_0)|$ holds. Thus we can choose $\tau_j \leq c_0$ with $|\phi_j(\sigma, \tau_j)| > 1/2$. If both $K^+ > 1/2$ and $K^- > 1/2$, then we have that $\phi_j(\sigma, c_0) > -1/2$ and $-\phi_j(\sigma, c_0) > -1/2$, i.e.

$$-1/2 < \phi_j(\sigma, c_0) < 1/2 \implies |\phi_j(\sigma, c_0)| < 1/2$$

but also by the maximum principle we have that $|\phi_j(\sigma, \tau)| < 1/2$ for $\tau > c_0$. Thus we must have $\tau_j < c_0$ in this case as well. In all cases, we've shown that τ_j is bounded from above uniformly in j .

Similarly, we can show that $\tau_j > \tau_0 > 0$ as follows, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\tau \phi_j(\sigma, \tau)| &\leq \|\phi_j\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \\ &\leq K(\|L\phi_j\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + \|\phi_j\|_{C^0(B_1(0) \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])}) \\ &\leq K(o(1) + 1) \leq 2K \end{aligned}$$

so that because $\phi_j(\sigma, 0) = 0$, we have that

$$|\phi_j(\sigma_j, \tau_j)| \geq 1/2 \implies \tau_j \geq \frac{1}{4K}$$

where K is the Schauder constant and independent of j and ϵ . This tells us that

$$0 < \frac{1}{4K} \leq \tau_j \leq c_0$$

so there exists a convergent subsequence of $\{\tau_j\}$ which converges to $0 < \tau < \infty$.

7.3 Normal for Y_η

In this section, we show that for η a perturbation with $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} \leq K\epsilon^{1+\beta}$, we have

$$\nu_{Y_\eta} = \partial_t + O(\epsilon^2)$$

Lemma 7.2. *For any $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}(Y)$ and $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} \leq K\epsilon^{1+\beta}$, there exists $C > 0$ so that, the normal derivative to Y_η expands as*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\eta &= a^t(s)\partial_t + a^i(s)\partial_{s_i} \\ \|a^t(s) - 1\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Y)} &\leq C\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)}^2 \\ \|a^i(s)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Y)} &\leq C\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} \end{aligned}$$

Proof: In coordinates, we compute the tangent basis for Y_η as

$$v_i = \partial_{s_i} + \eta_i \partial_t \Big|_{(s,t=\eta)}$$

Let $g(\eta)_{ij} := g(v_i, v_j)$ and $g(\eta)^{ij}$ be the corresponding inverse. Then

$$\begin{aligned} g(\eta)_{ij} &= g_{ij} \Big|_{(s,t=\eta)} + \eta_i \eta_j \\ &= \delta_{ij} + \eta A_{ij} + \eta_i \eta_j \\ &= \delta_{ij} + \eta A_{ij} + O((D\eta)^2) \end{aligned}$$

so that for

$$\begin{aligned} w_\eta &:= \partial_t - \Pi_{TY}(\partial_t) \\ &= \partial_t - g^{ij}g(\partial_t, v_i)v_j \\ &= \partial_t - (\delta_{ij} - \eta A_{ij} + \tilde{O}((D\eta)^2))\eta_i(\partial_{s_j} + \eta_j \partial_t) \\ &= (1 + \tilde{O}(\eta\eta_i\eta_j, (D\eta)^4))\partial_t - (\eta_i\delta_{ij} + \tilde{O}(\eta D\eta, (D\eta)^3))\partial_j \end{aligned}$$

The third line comes from expanding the metric in fermi coordinates over Y and evaluating at $t = \eta$. We compute

$$\|w_\eta\|^2 = 1 + \tilde{O}((D\eta)^2) \implies \|w_\eta\|^{-1} = 1 + \tilde{O}((D\eta)^2)$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\eta &= \frac{w_\eta}{\|w_\eta\|} = a^t(s)\partial_t + a^i(s)\partial_{s_i} \\ \|a^t - 1\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} &\leq C\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)}^2 \\ \|a^i\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} &\leq C\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)} \end{aligned}$$

□

7.4 Integrating η equation for normal derivative

In this section, we keep track of all the terms in section §5.2 when integrating against \dot{g}_ϵ to extract $\phi_t^\eta(s, 0)$.

Lemma 7.3. $\phi_t^\eta(s, 0)$ decomposes as

$$\phi_t^\eta(s, 0) = \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon(t)dt - J_Y(\eta) + O(\epsilon^{1+2\beta})$$

where the error bound holds in $C^\alpha(Y)$.

Proof: Recall that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\epsilon, t+\eta}(\phi) &= \epsilon[\Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta) + \dot{H}_0\eta]\dot{g}_\epsilon + |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2\ddot{g}_\epsilon \\
&+ \epsilon^3 \left(\frac{H_{t+\eta}(s) - \dot{H}_0(s)(t+\eta)}{(t+\eta)^2} \right) \left(\frac{t+\eta}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon \\
&- \epsilon^4 \Delta_{t+\eta}(\dot{H}_0)\tau_\epsilon + \epsilon^3 H_{t+\eta}\dot{H}_0\dot{\tau}_\epsilon + \epsilon^3 \Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta)\dot{H}_0\dot{\tau}_\epsilon + 2\epsilon^3 \nabla^{t+\eta}(\eta)(\dot{H}_0)\dot{\tau}_\epsilon \\
&- \epsilon^2 |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2 \dot{H}_0\ddot{\tau}_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} W'''(g_\epsilon) \epsilon^4 \dot{H}_0^2 \tau_\epsilon^2 + \epsilon^6 \dot{H}_0^3 \tau_\epsilon^3 \\
&+ R(\phi) \\
&=: G(\phi)
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Starting with the left hand side, we first recall

$$L_{\epsilon, t+\eta}(\phi) = \epsilon^2 (\Delta_{t+\eta}(\phi^\eta) - H_{t+\eta}\phi_t^\eta + \phi_{tt}^\eta) - W''(g_\epsilon)\phi^\eta$$

we multiply by \dot{g}_ϵ and integrate from $t = 0 \rightarrow t = -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)$. From hereon, all integrals will be from $[0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} L_{\epsilon, t+\eta}(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon &= -\epsilon^2 \phi_t^\eta(s, 0) + \epsilon^2 \int \Delta_{t+\eta}(\phi^\eta)\dot{g}_\epsilon - \epsilon^2 \int H_{t+\eta}\phi_t^\eta\dot{g}_\epsilon \\
&= -\epsilon^2 \phi_t^\eta(s, 0) + \epsilon^2 \int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \Delta_Y(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon + O(\epsilon^{4-\alpha})
\end{aligned}$$

here we've used that (42) i.e.

$$\|\phi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon^{2+\beta})$$

and $\|H_{t+\eta}\|_{C^\alpha} = O(\epsilon^{1+\beta})$ since Y is minimal and $\|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} = O(\epsilon^{1+\beta})$. On the right hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} G(\phi^\eta)\dot{g}_\epsilon dt &= \int \epsilon[\Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta) + \dot{H}_0\eta]\dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt + \int |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon \ddot{g}_\epsilon dt \\
&+ \epsilon^3 \int \left(\frac{H_{t+\eta}(s) - \dot{H}_0(s)(t+\eta)}{(t+\eta)^2} \right) \left(\frac{t+\eta}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt \\
&- \epsilon^4 \int \Delta_{t+\eta}(\dot{H}_0)\tau_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon dt + \epsilon^3 \int H_{t+\eta}\dot{H}_0\dot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon dt + \epsilon^3 \int \Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta)\dot{H}_0\dot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon + 2\epsilon^3 \int \nabla^{t+\eta}(\eta)(\dot{H}_0)\dot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon \\
&- \epsilon^2 \int |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2 \dot{H}_0\ddot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^4 \int W'''(g_\epsilon) \dot{H}_0^2 \tau_\epsilon^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon + \epsilon^6 \int \dot{H}_0^3 \tau_\epsilon^3 \dot{g}_\epsilon \\
&+ \int R(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

we write this as

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{-\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} G(\phi^\eta)\dot{g}_\epsilon dt &= A_1 + A_2 \\
&+ B_1 \\
&+ C_1 + C_2 + C_3 + C_4 \\
&+ D_1 + D_2 + D_3 \\
&+ E
\end{aligned}$$

With the aim of extracting the leading terms and an appropriate error bounded in $C^\alpha(Y)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \epsilon \left(\Delta_0(\eta) + \dot{H}_0\eta \right) \int \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt + \epsilon \int [\Delta_{t+\eta} - \Delta_0](\eta)\dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt \\
&= \sigma_0 \epsilon^2 J_Y(\eta) + \epsilon \int [\Delta_{t+\eta} - \Delta_0](\eta)\dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt \\
&= \sigma_0 \epsilon^2 J_Y(\eta) + O(\epsilon^3 \|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)}, \epsilon^2 \|\eta\|_{C^\alpha(Y)} \|\eta\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Y)}) \\
&= \sigma_0 \epsilon^2 J_Y(\eta) + O(\epsilon^{4+\beta})
\end{aligned}$$

which comes from expanding $\Delta_{t+\eta} - \Delta_0$ in powers of $(t + \eta)$. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= \int |\nabla^Y \eta|^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon \ddot{g}_\epsilon + \int [|\nabla^{t+\eta} \eta|^2 - |\nabla^Y \eta|^2] \dot{g}_\epsilon \ddot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^{3+2\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

which comes from expanding $g^{ij}(s, t + \eta)$ in powers of $(t + \eta)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^{t+\eta} \eta|^2 &= g^{ij}(s, t + \eta) \eta_i \eta_j \\ &= g^{ij}(s, 0) \eta_i \eta_j + [g^{ij}(s, t + \eta) - g^{ij}(s, 0)] \eta_i \eta_j \end{aligned}$$

For B_1 , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_1\|_{C^0} &\leq \epsilon^3 \int K \left(\frac{|t| + |\eta|}{\epsilon} \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt \\ &\leq O(\epsilon^4) \end{aligned}$$

to see the $[\cdot]_\alpha$ bound, we write

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \epsilon^3 \int_0^{-\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \left(\int_0^{t+\eta} [\dot{H}_r(s) - \dot{H}_0(s)] dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt \\ &= \epsilon^3 \int_0^{-\omega \epsilon \ln(\epsilon)} \left(\int_0^{t+\eta} \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w(s) dw dr \right) \dot{g}_\epsilon^2 dt \\ \implies [B_1]_{C^\alpha(Y)} &= O(\epsilon^4) \end{aligned}$$

For $\{C_i\}$, we compute in a straight forward manner using that $Y \in C^{4,\alpha}$ and satisfies (8):

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \epsilon^4 \int \Delta_{t+\eta} (\dot{H}_0) \dot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^5) \\ C_2 &= \epsilon^3 \int H_{t+\eta} \dot{H}_0 \dot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^4) \\ C_3 &= \epsilon^3 \int \Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta) \dot{H}_0 \dot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^{5+\beta}) \\ C_4 &= 2\epsilon^3 \int \nabla^{t+\eta}(\eta) (\dot{H}_0) \dot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^{5+\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

which is seen from making a change of variables $t \rightarrow t/\epsilon$ to gain another factor of ϵ , and then noting that the integrals converge and are bounded in $C^\alpha(Y)$.

For the $\{D_i\}$ terms, we similarly have:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= -\epsilon^2 \int |\nabla^{t+\eta} \eta|^2 \dot{H}_0 \ddot{\tau}_\epsilon \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^{5+2\beta}) \\ D_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^4 \int W'''(g_\epsilon) \dot{H}_0^2 \tau_\epsilon^2 \dot{g}_\epsilon dt \\ &= O(\epsilon^5) \\ D_3 &= \epsilon^6 \int \dot{H}_0^3 \tau_\epsilon^3 \dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &= O(\epsilon^7) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recall (40) to decompose the E term

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \int R(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &= \int \epsilon^2 E_\eta(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon - \int F_0(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

And we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_\eta &= -\Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta)\partial_t - 2\nabla^{t+\eta}(\eta)\partial_t + |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2\partial_t^2 \\ \epsilon^2 \int (-\Delta_{t+\eta}(\eta))\phi_t\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{5+2\beta-\alpha}) \\ -2\epsilon^2 \int \nabla^{t+\eta}(\eta)(\phi_t)\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{4+2\beta-\alpha}) \\ \epsilon^2 \int |\nabla^{t+\eta}\eta|^2\phi_{tt}\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{5+3\beta-\alpha}) \\ \implies \epsilon^2 \int E_\eta(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{4+2\beta-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

with bounds holding in $C^\alpha(Y)$. Similarly, using the definition of F_0 in (41)

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(\phi) &:= W'''(g_\epsilon)\epsilon^2\dot{H}_0\tau_\epsilon\phi + \left[3\epsilon^4\dot{H}_0^2\tau_\epsilon^2 + \frac{1}{2}W'''(g_\epsilon) \right] \phi^2 + \phi^3 \\ \epsilon^2 \int W'''(g_\epsilon)\dot{H}_0\tau_\epsilon\phi\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{5+\beta-\alpha}) \\ 3\epsilon^4 \int \dot{H}_0^2\tau_\epsilon^2\phi^2\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{9+2\beta-\alpha}) \\ \frac{1}{2} \int W'''(g_\epsilon)\phi^2\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{5+2\beta-\alpha}) \\ \int \phi^3\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{7+3\beta-\alpha}) \\ \implies \int F_0(\phi)\dot{g}_\epsilon &= O(\epsilon^{5+\beta-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

With this, we've shown that

$$\int G(\phi^\eta)\dot{g}_\epsilon dt = \epsilon^2\sigma_0 J_Y(\eta) + O(\epsilon^{3+2\beta})$$

with error in $C^\alpha(Y)$.

7.5 Extended Schauder estimates

In this section we prove the following improved Schauder estimate, assuming an extra Neumann condition

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose $\phi : Y \times \mathbb{R}^+$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$ in the interior and satisfies $\phi(s, 0) \equiv 0$, $\phi_t(s, 0) \equiv 0$. Further suppose that*

$$L_\epsilon(\phi) = f(s)\dot{g}_\epsilon + R$$

Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ arbitrary. There exists $\epsilon_0(\sigma) > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, at least one of the following hold

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} \leq K\|R\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} \quad (46)$$

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} \leq \sigma\|f\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} \quad (47)$$

for K independent of σ and ϵ .

Proof: Suppose neither (46) nor (47) hold. Then for some sequence of ϕ^j , f^j , ϵ_j , and R^j , along with σ_0 fixed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} &\geq \sigma_0\|f^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^\alpha(B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} \\ \|\phi^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} &\geq j\|R^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^\alpha(B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^+)} \quad \forall j \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, 3.3 gives us

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq K(\|f\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|R\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(B_1(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)})$$

so we can form the combined bound

$$\sigma_0 \|f^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^\alpha(B_1(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq \|\phi^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^2(B_{1/2}(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq \|\phi^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq K \|f^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^\alpha(B_1(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)}$$

Divide all functions by $\|f^j\|_{C_{\epsilon_j}^\alpha(B_1(0)\times\mathbb{R}^+)}$. Letting $\tilde{\phi}^j$, \tilde{f}^j , and \tilde{R}^j denote these normalized functions, we rescale $(s, t) \rightarrow (\sigma, \tau) = ((\epsilon_j)^{-1}s, (\epsilon_j)^{-1}t)$ and get in these coordinates:

$$\sigma_0 \leq \|\tilde{\phi}^j\|_{C^2(B_{\epsilon^{-1}/2}(0)\times\mathbb{R})} \leq \|\tilde{\phi}^j\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(B_{\epsilon^{-1}/2}(0)\times\mathbb{R})} \leq K$$

We point pick (s_j, t_j) so that

$$\max\{|\tilde{\phi}^j(s_j, t_j)|, |\nabla\tilde{\phi}^j(s_j, t_j)|, |D^2\tilde{\phi}^j(s_j, t_j)|\} \geq \frac{\sigma_0}{2}$$

We define $\bar{\phi}^j := \tilde{\phi}^j(s - s_j, t)$ and note that by the same argument as in lemma 3.3, we see that t_j are bounded and hence converge up to subsequence to $0 < t_\infty < \infty$. With this, we get convergence of $\bar{\phi}^j \xrightarrow{C_{loc}^2} \phi^\infty$ such that

$$\max\{|\phi^\infty(0, t_\infty)|, |\nabla\phi^\infty(0, t_\infty)|, |D^2\phi^\infty(0, t_\infty)|\} \geq \frac{\sigma_0}{2} \quad (48)$$

We also have convergence of $\tilde{f}^j(s - s_j) \xrightarrow{C_{loc}^0} f^\infty$. We now have the system

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} + \partial_t^2 - W''(g(t))]\phi^\infty &= f^\infty(s)\dot{g}(t) \\ \phi^\infty(s, 0) &\equiv 0 \\ \phi_t^\infty(s, 0) &\equiv 0 \end{aligned}$$

having noted that $\tilde{R}^j \xrightarrow{C^0} 0$. With this, we define $\bar{\phi}^\infty$ to be the even reflection of ϕ^∞ , noting that it satisfies the same PDE

$$[\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} + \partial_t^2 - W''(g(t))]\bar{\phi}^\infty = f^\infty(s)\dot{g}(t)$$

By [[10], Appendix B, Lem 15] we conclude that

$$\bar{\phi}^\infty(s, t) = c(s)\dot{g}(t)$$

for some $c(s) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$. However, the condition $\phi^\infty(s, 0) \equiv 0$ implies that $c \equiv 0$, a contradiction to (48). \square

Remark Equation (46) is reminiscent of [[6], Prop 4.1]. While that proposition requires orthogonality in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ to $\dot{g}(t)$, we are operating on a half space and use the vanishing Dirichlet and Neumann condition on Y to leverage a similar bound.

7.6 Existence of solutions to $\ddot{F} - W''(g)F = \varphi$

Given $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth and asymptotically exponentially decaying, consider

$$\partial_t^2 F(t) - W''(g(t))F(t) = \varphi(t) \quad (49)$$

$$F(0) = 0$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t) = 0 \quad (50)$$

we reprove the following lemma seen in [10] and proven in [[1], Lemma B.1, Remark B.3].

Lemma 7.5. *Given $\varphi \in C^\infty([0, \infty))$ such that*

$$\exists t_0 > 0, K > 0, \gamma > 0 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \forall t > t_0, \quad |\varphi(t)| \leq Ke^{-\gamma t}$$

then there exists a smooth solution to the system (49) with exponential decay.

Proof: Consider the a priori solution of the form

$$F(t) = v(t)\dot{g}(t)$$

where $v(t)$ is to be constructed with $v(0) = 0$. We plug this into (49), multiply by \dot{g} , and integrate twice to get a general solution of

$$v(t) = b_0 + \int_0^t \dot{g}(s)^{-2} \left[a_0 + \int_0^s \varphi(r)\dot{g}(r)dr \right] ds$$

Using the condition of $v(0) = 0$, we have $b_0 = 0$. Moreover, we can set

$$a_0 = - \int_0^\infty \varphi(r)\dot{g}(r)$$

We now show that $v(t)$ is bounded so that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t) = 0$. We compute

$$\dot{v}(t) = \dot{g}(t)^{-2} \left[a_0 + \int_0^t \varphi(r)\dot{g}(r)dr \right]$$

we know that for t large,

$$\dot{g}(t)^{-2} \sim e^{\sqrt{2}t}$$

So it suffices to show that

$$|a_0 + \int_0^t \varphi(r)\dot{g}(r)| \leq K e^{-(\beta + \sqrt{2})t}$$

for some $K > 0, \beta > 0$. Yet this follows immediately as

$$\begin{aligned} |a_0 + \int_0^t \varphi(r)\dot{g}(r)dr| &= \left| \int_t^\infty \varphi(r)\dot{g}(r)dr \right| \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{s \geq t} |\varphi(s)| \right) \int_t^\infty \dot{g}(r)dr \\ &\leq K e^{-\gamma t} [1 - g(t)] \\ &\leq K e^{-(\gamma + \sqrt{2})t} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, \dot{v} is exponentially decaying, so that $v(t)$ is bounded and hence

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t)\dot{g}(t) = 0$$

Moreover, since $v(t)$ is bounded and $\dot{g}(t)$ is exponentially decaying, $F(t)$ is also exponentially decaying by differentiating the equation for F . \square

7.7 Manual Expansion for $Y \in C^{4,\alpha}$

We prove the $k = 1$ case of theorem 1.5, doing the expansions and bounds out explicitly. This gives corollary 1.1:

Corollary 1.1. *For u_ϵ a solution to Allen–Cahn with Dirichlet data on Y a $C^{4,\alpha}$ hypersurface, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\epsilon,Y}^+(s,t) &= g_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon H_Y(s)w_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s,t) \\ \|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} &= O(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Consider $w(t)$ the solution to equation (18) with $w_\epsilon(t) = w(t/\epsilon)$. Take the decomposition

$$u_\epsilon(s,t) = g_\epsilon(t) + \epsilon H_0(s)w_\epsilon(t) + \phi(s,t)$$

(recall $H_0 = H_Y$!) with the aim of showing that ϕ is a remainder term in $C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])$. Note that $\phi = o(1)$ in C_ϵ^∞ from the same argument as in section 3.1. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 \Delta_g u &= -H_t \epsilon \dot{g} + \ddot{g}_\epsilon + \epsilon^3 (\Delta_t H_Y) w_\epsilon(t) - \epsilon^2 H_t H_Y \dot{w}_\epsilon + \epsilon H_Y \ddot{w}_\epsilon + \epsilon^2 (\Delta_g \phi) \\ W'(u) &= W'(g_\epsilon) + W''(g_\epsilon) [\epsilon H_Y w_\epsilon + \phi] + \tilde{O}((\epsilon H_Y w_\epsilon, \phi)^2) \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two lines, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= L_\epsilon(\phi) + \epsilon[-H_0\dot{g}_\epsilon + H_0\ddot{w}_\epsilon - W''(g_\epsilon)H_0w_\epsilon] \\ &\quad + \epsilon(H_0 - H_t)\dot{g}_\epsilon - \epsilon^2 H_t H_0 \dot{w}_\epsilon + \epsilon^3 (\Delta_t H_0) w_\epsilon + \tilde{O}((\epsilon H_0 w, \phi)^2) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{O}((\epsilon H_0 w, \phi)^2)$ denotes combinations of $\epsilon H_0 w$ and ϕ which are at least quadratic in combinations of these two terms, and have bounded $C_\epsilon^\alpha(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])$ norm in terms of these. Using equation (18), we cancel the first set of bracketed terms and get

$$0 = L_\epsilon(\phi) + \epsilon(H_0 - H_t)\dot{g}_\epsilon - \epsilon^2 H_t H_0 \dot{w}_\epsilon + \epsilon^3 (\Delta_t H_0) w_\epsilon + \tilde{O}((\epsilon H_0 w, \phi)^2)$$

Note that since $w(0) = 0$, we still have $u_\epsilon(s, 0) \equiv \phi(s, 0) \equiv 0$, and hence by 3.3 and an iteration argument, we get

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} \leq K \|\epsilon(H_0 - H_t)\dot{g}_\epsilon\|_{C_\epsilon^\alpha(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])} + O(\epsilon^2)$$

now as in section §4.1, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon(H_0 - H_t)\dot{g}_\epsilon &= \epsilon^2 \dot{H}_0 \left(\frac{t}{\epsilon}\right) \dot{g}_\epsilon + \epsilon \left(\int_0^t \int_0^r \ddot{H}_w dw dr\right) \dot{g}_\epsilon \\ &= O(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

with error in $C_\epsilon^\alpha(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)])$. Thus

$$\|\phi\|_{C_\epsilon^{2,\alpha}(Y \times [0, -\omega\epsilon \ln(\epsilon)/2])} = O(\epsilon^2)$$

which finishes the proof. □

References

- [1] Nicholas D Alikakos, Giorgio Fusco, and Vagelis Stefanopoulos. Critical spectrum and stability of interfaces for a class of reaction–diffusion equations. *journal of differential equations*, 126(1):106–167, 1996.
- [2] Samuel M Allen and John W Cahn. A microscopic theory for antiphase boundary motion and its application to antiphase domain coarsening. *Acta metallurgica*, 27(6):1085–1095, 1979.
- [3] Haïm Brezis and Luc Oswald. Remarks on sublinear elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 10(1):55–64, 1986.
- [4] Otis Chodosh and Christos Mantoulidis. Minimal surfaces and the allen–cahn equation on 3-manifolds: index, multiplicity, and curvature estimates. *Annals of Mathematics*, 191(1):213–328, 2020.
- [5] Guido De Philippis and Alessandro Pigati. Non-degenerate minimal submanifolds as energy concentration sets: a variational approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12389*, 2022.
- [6] Manuel Del Pino, Michal Kowalczyk, Juncheng Wei, and Jun Yang. Interface foliation near minimal submanifolds in riemannian manifolds with positive ricci curvature. *Geometric and functional analysis*, 20(4):918–957, 2010.
- [7] David Gilbarg, Neil S Trudinger, David Gilbarg, and NS Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224. Springer, 1977.
- [8] Marco Guaraco. Min-max for the allen-cahn equation and other topics (princeton, 2019). 2019.
- [9] Francois Hamel, Yong Liu, Pieralberto Sicbaldi, Kelei Wang, and Juncheng Wei. Half-space theorems for the allen–cahn equation and related problems. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 2021(770):113–133, 2021.
- [10] Christos Mantoulidis. Variational aspects of phase transitions with prescribed mean curvature. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 61(2):1–35, 2022.
- [11] Marius Mitrea and Michael Taylor. Boundary layer methods for lipschitz domains in riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 163(2):181–251, 1999.

- [12] Luciano Modica. A gradient bound and a liouville theorem for nonlinear poisson equations. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 38(5):679–684, 1985.
- [13] L Modica-S Mortola. Un esempio di γ -convergenza. *Boll. UMI*, 14:285–299, 1977.
- [14] Frank Pacard. The role of minimal surfaces in the study of the allen-cahn equation. *Geometric analysis: partial differential equations and surfaces*, 570:137–163, 2012.
- [15] Frank Pacard and Manuel Ritoré. From constant mean curvature hypersurfaces to the gradient theory of phase transitions. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 64(3):359–423, 2003.
- [16] Leon Simon. Schauder estimates by scaling. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 5(5):391–407, 1997.
- [17] Kelei Wang and Juncheng Wei. Finite morse index implies finite ends. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 72(5):1044–1119, 2019.
- [18] Kelei Wang and Juncheng Wei. Second order estimate on transition layers. *Advances in Mathematics*, 358:106856, 2019.