

**SUPERCONCENTRATION FOR MINIMAL SURFACES IN
FIRST PASSAGE PERCOLATION AND
DISORDERED ISING FERROMAGNETS**

BARBARA DEMBIN CHRISTOPHE GARBAN

ABSTRACT. We consider the standard first passage percolation model on \mathbb{Z}^d with a distribution G taking two values $0 < a < b$. We study the maximal flow through the cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, hn]$ between its top and bottom as well as its associated minimal surface(s). We prove that the variance of the maximal flow is superconcentrated, i.e. in $O(\frac{n^{d-1}}{\log n})$, for $h \geq h_0$ (for a large enough constant $h_0 = h_0(a, b)$).

Equivalently, we obtain that the ground state energy of a disordered Ising ferromagnet in a cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, hn]$ is superconcentrated when opposite boundary conditions are applied at the top and bottom faces and for a large enough constant $h \geq h_0$ (which depends on the law of the coupling constants).

Our proof is inspired by the proof of Benjamini–Kalai–Schramm [3]. Yet, one major difficulty in this setting is to control the influence of the edges since the averaging trick used in [3] fails for surfaces.

Of independent interest, we prove that minimal surfaces (in the present discrete setting) cannot have long thin chimneys.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context and main results. We focus in this paper on the fluctuations of the maximal flow (or equivalently of the minimal surface of the dual problem) through a cylinder in \mathbb{Z}^d of the form $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]$, where the vertical height H will be through most of this text of order hn . It is defined informally as follows (see Subsection 1.3 below for a more formal definition). Each non-oriented edge e inside $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, hn]$ carries an i.i.d capacity $t(e)$ whose distribution takes two values $0 < a < b$. Without much loss of generality, one can think of $t(e) \in \{1, 2\}$ with equal probability. The (vertical) maximum flow through this cylinder is informally the maximum amount of *water* which can be injected at the bottom, say, of the cylinder so that it can flow upwards in such a way that the amount of water flowing through any given edge e is less or equal than $t(e)$. Let us denote this maximal flow by $\Phi = \Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$. By max-flow/min-cut principle, it is well-known that this maximal flow can be computed by minimizing the capacity over all possible cut-sets. I.e.,

$$\Phi = \min_E \left\{ \sum_{e \in E} t(e) \right\},$$

where the minimum is taken over all cut-sets E which separate the bottom $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ from the top $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{H\}$. There may be several such minimizing cut-sets E and by duality each of those correspond to a minimal surface embedded in \mathbb{R}^d (see Figure 1).

In dimension $d = 2$, the minimal cut-sets in $[0, n] \times [0, H]$ correspond to geodesics on the dual graph $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^* = \mathbb{Z}^2 + (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ which connect the left and right boundaries of the rectangle. The maximal flow can then be studied as a random metric problem

in this special case and much is known about fluctuations, large-deviations etc. in this case. Let us mention in particular the breakthrough work by Benjamini-Kalai-Schramm [3] which implies in the present setting that $\text{Var}[\Phi([0, n] \times \{0\}, H)] = O(\frac{n}{\log n})$ as long as $H = \Omega(n^\epsilon)$. Furthermore, in this $d = 2$ case, the fluctuations are believed to be described as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the *KPZ universality class* (in particular it is conjectured that $\text{Var}[\Phi] \asymp n^{2/3}$, see for example [19] where this is proved for directed last-passage percolation).

In higher dimensions $d \geq 3$, the problem may no longer be formulated in terms of geodesics and is expressed instead in terms of minimal surfaces (of co-dimension 1). The analysis of such maximal flows/minimal surfaces in $d \geq 3$ was first considered in the seminal paper by Kesten for $d = 3$: *Surfaces with minimal random weights and maximal flows: a higher dimensional version of first-passage percolation* ([20]) where he obtained a law of large numbers for Φ as well as some large deviations estimates. Since the work [20], there has been a lot of activity on the analysis of the maximal flow Φ : Kesten's results were extended by Zhang [27] to any dimensions, and by Rossignol-Théret in [24] to any dimensions for tilted flat cylinders (with height $H = o(n)$). Cerf-Théret proved a law of large number for more general domains in [5]. They later studied the speed of upper and lower large deviations in [6, 7]. Interestingly, upper large deviations are in n^d while lower large deviations are in n^{d-1} . In [15, 14], Dembin-Théret proved upper and lower large deviations principle for the maximal flow in general domains.

Let us now introduce another setting where minimal surfaces appear in the same fashion. Consider the disordered Ising ferromagnet in $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, hn]$ with opposite boundary conditions applied at the top and the bottom. Each non-oriented edge e inside $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, hn]$ carries an i.i.d coupling constant J_e whose distribution takes two values $0 < a < b$. For a configuration $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, hn] \cap \mathbb{Z}^d}$, its associated energy is

$$H(\sigma) = - \sum_{e=\{x,y\}} J_e \sigma_x \sigma_y.$$

One can check that the ground state energy (i.e. the minimal energy) corresponds to Φ and the corresponding minimal surface corresponds to the interface of a ground state (i.e. a configuration achieving the minimal energy). This connection was mentioned for example in Licea-Newman [21].

To our knowledge, prior to this work, nothing was known on the fluctuations of $\Phi = \Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H])$ (besides the easy upper bound $\text{Var}[\Phi] = O(n^{d-1})$). As we shall explain further in the next subsection, this may be due to the following reason. A crucial step in the proof of Benjamini-Kalai-Schramm in [3] is based on a beautiful averaging trick which no longer works with minimal surfaces.

Our main result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $d \geq 2$ and any distribution G on $0 < a < b$, there exist $C > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$, such that for any $n \geq 1$ and $H \geq h_0 n$, we have*

$$\text{Var}(\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)) \leq C \frac{n^{d-1}}{\log n}.$$

As it has been identified in the seminal work by Chatterjee [8], a variance of order $O(\frac{n^{d-1}}{\log n})$ versus a variance of order $\Omega(n^{d-1})$ induces a completely different behaviour of minimal cut-sets under small random perturbations of the capacities $\{t(e)\}_e$. Indeed, a variance negligible w.r.t n^{d-1} corresponds to the phenomenon of *superconcentration* ([8]) and it implies a certain *chaoticity* property for the minimal cut-sets. We shall illustrate this in Corollary 6.1 where we will rely on a mild extension of a very useful identity from [26]. See also the recent work of Chatterjee [9]

which analyzed the groundstate of an Ising model with non-ferromagnetic disordered coupling constants.

We complete our analysis of the fluctuations of $\Phi = \Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$ by the following easier lower bound on the variance. Its proof in Section 5 will rely on the martingale decomposition method from Newman–Piza [22].

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a distribution on $\{a, b\}$ such that $G(\{b\}) > p_c$, where p_c is the critical parameter for Bernoulli bond percolation on $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{E}^d)$. There exists a constant $c = c(G) > 0$ such that for all $n, H \geq 1$, we have*

$$\text{Var}(\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)) \geq c \frac{n^{d-1}}{H}.$$

We now introduce a slightly different model for which a greatly simplified version of our proof also implies superconcentration (see Remark 1 below). In the same cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]$, we now assign i.i.d weights $\{t(x)\}$ to the vertices of the cylinder, again with a distribution G on $0 < a < b$. We consider the following minimal weight

$$\Psi_{\text{Lip}} = \Psi_{\text{Lip}}([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H) := \min_{\psi} \left\{ \sum_{u \in [0, n]^{d-1}} t(u, \psi(u)) \right\},$$

where the minimum is taken over all 1-Lipschitz functions $\psi : [0, n]^{d-1} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, H\}$ (i.e. such that $|\psi_i - \psi_j| \leq 1$ for any $i \sim j$ in $[0, n]^{d-1}$). We obtain in this setting the analog of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.3. *There exist $C, c > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$, both depending on $0 < a < b$, such that for any $n \geq 1$ and $H \geq h_0 n$, we have*

$$\left(c \frac{n^{d-1}}{H} \leq \right) \text{Var}(\Psi_{\text{Lip}}([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)) \leq C \frac{n^{d-1}}{\log n}.$$

To conclude this introduction, we wish to emphasise that if minimal surfaces happen to be anchored at some deterministic curve along the boundary of the cylinder, then we expect a completely different scenario for their fluctuations in large enough dimensions d . We discuss two possible such situations:

- (1) Instead of considering the maximum flow Φ from the bottom $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ to the top $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{H\}$, let us consider the maximal flow $\tau([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$ between the bottom half and the top half of the cylinder, (i.e. between $\partial([0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \cdot \mathbf{e}_d < \frac{H}{2}\}$ and $\partial([0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \cdot \mathbf{e}_d > \frac{H}{2}\}$). Then, the associated minimal surfaces are anchored in the boundary of the meridian plane of the cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{\frac{H}{2}\}$. For a formal definition, we refer to [24]. In high dimensions, by analogy to other models of surface (see in particular [23]), we expect that the anchored surface is localized, that is, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any n , almost all the surface is within distance C of the meridian plane $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{\frac{H}{2}\}$. In that case, by a similar proof as Theorem 1.2, we can prove that there exists $c > 0$ depending on G such that for all $n, H \geq 1$

$$\text{Var}(\tau([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)) \geq cn^{d-1}.$$

This implies that in high dimensions, we don't expect the variance of the anchored surface to be superconcentrated. This is another hint that minimal surfaces behave very differently as geodesics (of codimension $d - 1$) in standard first percolation theory.

- (2) In the spirit of the easier Theorem 1.3, we may further restrict the 1-Lipschitz functions ψ to be equal to $\frac{H}{2}$ along $\partial[0, n]^{d-1}$. The localisation result for uniform such 1-Lipschitz functions proved by Peled in [23] highly suggests that in high enough dimension, the variance of the associated minimal weight $\Psi_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{anchored}}$ will be $\geq cn^{d-1}$.

We shall discuss this expected different behaviour further in Proposition 5.1 as well as in open question 1.

1.2. Idea of proof.

Benjamini-Kalai-Schramm and Talagrand. As we mentioned above, a similar theorem was first proved for the study of passage times in first passage percolation by Benjamini–Kalai–Schramm [3]. A key ingredient of [3] which we will also use is Talagrand’s inequality [25] (see Theorem 1.4). To obtain a “sub-surface” (i.e. $o(n^{d-1})$) upper-bound using Talagrand’s inequality, one needs to prove that most edges have a low influence on the maximal flow Φ . In [3], the influence of an edge is related to the probability that the geodesic goes through that edge. In our setting, it will be related to the probability that the minimal surfaces goes through the plaquette dual to that edge. We refer to [17, 16] for background on the interplay between Boolean functions and statistical physics.

The main difficulty of this approach, already in [3], is that it happens to be very challenging to upper-bound the influence of any fixed given edge. In fact, for the passage times in first passage percolation, proving that the maximum influence in the bulk goes to zero (this is known as the *BKS midpoint problem*) was only proved a few years ago by Damron–Hanson [10], Ahlberg–Hoffman [1] and was recently solved quantitatively by Dembin–Elboim–Peled in [13].

To circumvent this, Benjamini–Kalai–Schramm relied in [3] on a very nice averaging trick by randomizing the endpoints of the desired passage times. Since the randomized endpoints remain close to the original endpoints of the geodesic, it follows that the difference of passage times between the new geodesic and the original geodesic is negligible compared to the upper bound on standard deviation \sqrt{n} .

No averaging trick for surfaces. We now explain why this averaging trick fails for surfaces. Indeed, consider two surfaces anchored respectively in the boundary of $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ and $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{1\}$, the best control we can get on the difference of capacity is of order n^{d-2} . When $d \geq 3$, we have $n^{d-2} \geq n^{(d-1)/2}$ where $n^{(d-1)/2}$ is the order of the upper bound for the standard deviation for surfaces (obtained for example via Efron-Stein). This shows that as soon as $d \geq 3$, we need to proceed differently as in [3] and a close inspection of influences will be needed.

Idea and structure of the proof. We start by noting that if we were considering a maximal flow in a transitive graph, for example the maximal flow with non-trivial homology along the d^{th} direction in a torus $\mathbb{T}_n^{d-1} \times \mathbb{T}_H$, then a direct application of Talagrand’s inequality (Theorem 1.4) would readily imply fluctuations of order at most $n^{\frac{d-1}{2}} / \sqrt{\log n}$ for any $H \geq \Omega(n^\epsilon)$ just by using the fact that all edges have the same influence by transitivity of the graph.

In our present case, despite the lack of transitive action acting on the cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]$, the rough idea is that if the minimal surface \mathcal{E}_n (chosen among all possible minimal surfaces in any deterministic way, say) happens to be with high probability at distance at least 1 from the top and bottom boundary, then if we shift vertically by one the set of capacities $\{t(e)\}$ (and also replace the missing bottom capacities by the top capacities that went off the cylinder), one may guess that, again with high probability, the new minimal surface $\mathcal{E}_n(t_{\text{shifted}})$ will be nothing but

the vertical shift of $\mathcal{E}_n(t)$. Of course what could prevent this to happen comes from the effect of shuffling the top and bottom capacities. If one could prove that these two claims indeed happen with high enough probability, then it would imply that all edges in a vertical column have a very close influence which would allow us to conclude using Talagrand's inequality 1.4.

In the end, we do not quite succeed making this intuition rigorous but our proof is strongly influenced by analysing the effect of such vertical shifts. The proof of Theorem 1.1 will be based on the following three main steps which are of independent interest and do not have an analog in the analysis of Benjamini-Kalai-Schramm in [3]:

- (1) First, we shall prove that minimal surfaces cannot wiggle too much vertically. This will be achieved in Proposition 2.1. A similar phenomenon is known to arise in the analysis of *minimal surfaces*, see [12]. Our proof in the discrete setting will rely on the isoperimetric bounds in \mathbb{Z}^d obtained in [4]. This proposition is the technical step which is causing the restriction $h \geq h_0$ in our main theorem. Its proof will be given in Section 3.
- (2) Second, we need to know that minimal surfaces are unlikely to stay too close to the top and bottom boundaries. We will not prove this for the true minimal surfaces which lead to the maximal flow $\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$ but rather for a slightly modified notion of maximal flow in which minimal surfaces too close to the top and bottom boundaries receive a *penalisation*. This modified notion of maximal flow is called $\tilde{\Phi}$ (see (5)) and is introduced in Section 2. For this modified maximal flow $\tilde{\Phi}$, we can show that the associated minimal surfaces are typically away from the top and bottom boundaries. This is the purpose of Proposition 4.1.
- (3) Finally, the last difficulty we are facing is the possibility that the minimal surface (for the modified $\tilde{\Phi}$) may often produce a high vertical cliff at certain locations. This would make the influence profile too inhomogeneous to allow us to control the magnitude of influences. Using a deep estimate from Zhang's work [27] (inspired by the original work by Kesten [20]), we will prove Proposition 2.2 which shows that there are only few edges that may carry a large influence (we believe such edges do not exist but we cannot rule this out rigorously). Its proof will be the purpose of Section 4.

Remark 1. We claim that one can prove Theorem 1.2 using the same proof, except there are several drastic simplifications. First, the absence of long thin chimneys (Proposition 2.1) is obvious in this case. Also, vertical cliffs do not exist by definition (thanks to the 1-Lipschitz condition) and as such Proposition 2.2 is much easier to prove in this case. We leave the details to the reader.

1.3. Background.

Definition of maximal flow. We now provide a more formal definition of maximal flows/minimal surfaces. We consider a first passage percolation on the graph $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{E}^d)$ where \mathbb{E}^d is the set of edges that link all the nearest neighbors for the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{Z}^d . Write $(\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_d)$ for the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^d . We consider a distribution G on \mathbb{R}_+ . For each edge e in \mathbb{E}^d we assign a random variable t_e of distribution G such that the family $(t_e)_{e \in \mathbb{E}^d}$ is independent.

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$. Let $h > 0$, we denote by $\text{cyl}(A, h)$ the cylinder of basis A and height h defined by

$$\text{cyl}(A, h) := \{x + t\mathbf{e}_d : x \in A, t \in [0, h]\} .$$

Define the discretized versions $B(A, h)$ and $T(A, h)$ of the bottom and the top of the cylinder $\text{cyl}(A, h)$

$$B(A, h) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \text{cyl}(A, h) : \begin{array}{l} \exists y \notin \text{cyl}(A, h), \langle x, y \rangle \in \mathbb{E}^d \\ \text{and } \langle x, y \rangle \text{ intersects } A \end{array} \right\}$$

and

$$T(A, h) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \text{cyl}(A, h) : \begin{array}{l} \exists y \notin \text{cyl}(A, h), \langle x, y \rangle \in \mathbb{E}^d \\ \text{and } \langle x, y \rangle \text{ intersects } A + h\mathbf{e}_d \end{array} \right\}.$$

Let $E \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ be a set of edges. We say that E cuts $B(A, h)$ from $T(A, h)$ in $\text{cyl}(A, h)$ (or is a cutset, for short) if any path from $B(A, h)$ to $T(A, h)$ in $\text{cyl}(A, h)$ intersects E .

We associate with any set of edges $E \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ its capacity $T(E)$ defined by

$$T(E) := \sum_{e \in E} t_e.$$

We define the maximal flow from the top to the bottom of the cylinder $\text{cyl}(A, h)$

$$\Phi(A, h) := \min\{T(E) : E \text{ cuts } T(A, h) \text{ from } B(A, h) \text{ in } \text{cyl}(A, h)\}. \quad (1)$$

As already mentioned in the introduction, we use the terminology maximal flow as by max-flow min-cut theorem, the dual problem of finding minimal surface boils down to computing the maximal flow.

From now on, we assume that G can only take two values $0 < a < b$. See Open Question 3 for a discussion of possible extensions to more general distributions using for example [2, 11].

Dual representation of cutsets. Let $E \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ be a cutset separating $T(A, h)$ from $B(A, h)$ in $\text{cyl}(A, h)$. The set E is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional object, that can be seen as a surface. To better understand this interpretation in term of surfaces, we can associate with each edge $e \in E$ a small plaquette e^* . The plaquette e^* is an hypersquare of dimension $d-1$ whose sides have length one and are parallel to the edges of the graphs, such that e^* is normal to e and cuts it in its middle. We also define the dual of a set of edge E by $E^* := \{e^*, e \in E\}$ (see Figure 1). Roughly speaking, if the set of edges E cuts $T(A, h)$ from $B(A, h)$ in $\text{cyl}(A, h)$, the surface of plaquettes E^* disconnects $T(A, h)$ from $B(A, h)$ in $\text{cyl}(A, h)$. Note that, in dimension 2, a surface of plaquettes is very similar to a path in the dual graph of \mathbb{Z}^2 and thus the study of minimal cutsets is very similar to the study of geodesics.




FIGURE 1. The dual of a cutset between the top and the bottom of a cylinder for $d = 3$.

Concentration inequalities. Let J be a finite set of indices. For $\omega \in \{a, b\}^J$ and $j \in J$ denote $\sigma_j \omega$ the function that switches the value in the j -th coordinate. For $f : \{a, b\}^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, denote

$$\partial_j f := \frac{f - f \circ \sigma_j}{2}.$$

For $p \in (0, 1)$, consider μ_p the product measure on $\{a, b\}^J$ which gives a with probability p and b with probability $1 - p$. We denote $\|f\|_2^2 = \int f^2 d\mu_p$.

Theorem 1.4 (Talagrand's inequality [25] Theorem 1.5). *Let $f : \{a, b\}^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in \{0, 1\}$. We have*

$$\text{Var}(f) \leq C \log \frac{2}{p(1-p)} \sum_{j \in J} \frac{\|\partial_j f\|_2^2}{1 + \log(\|\partial_j f\|_2 / \|\partial_j f\|_1)} \quad (2)$$

where C is a universal constant.

The following proposition is an upper bound on the variance using Efron-Stein inequality.

Theorem 1.5 (Efron-Stein inequality). *Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $X' = (X'_1, \dots, X'_n)$ be two independent and identically distributed vectors taking values in a space \mathcal{X}^n . Let $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We have*

$$\text{Var}(f(X)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X^{(i)})|X])^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[(f(X) - f(X^{(i)}))_-^2 \right],$$

where $X^{(i)} := (X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X'_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n)$ and $x_- = \max(-x, 0)$.

2. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we state the main intermediate Propositions which were mentioned in the Section *idea of proof* and which will be proved in the next two Sections. We also implement the *penalisation scheme* used to “localize” the optimal surface away from the top and bottom boundaries. This will be the purpose of the re-weighting function Y_i below. Finally, using these ingredients we give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Geometric control on minimal surfaces. The proposition stated below will be proved in Section 3.

Proposition 2.1 (“Absence of long thin chimneys”). *Fix $0 < a < b$. There exists an even $h_0 > 0$ depending only on $0 < a < b$ such that for any $n \geq 1$, $H \geq \frac{1}{2}h_0n$ and any configuration of capacities in $\{a, b\}$ assigned to the edges of $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]$, all minimal-cut sets E (i.e. that achieve the infimum in $\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$ defined in (1)) are contained in a cylinder of vertical height bounded by $\frac{1}{2}h_0n$. I.e. for any minimal cut-set E , there exists some $u \geq 0$ such that $E \subset [0, n]^{d-1} \times [u, u + \frac{1}{2}h_0n]$.*

Fix $H \geq h_0n$. Write $A = [0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}$. Define for $i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n$

$$X_i := \min \left\{ T(E) : \begin{array}{l} E \text{ cuts } B(A + i\mathbf{e}_d, \frac{1}{2}h_0n) \text{ from } T(A + i\mathbf{e}_d, \frac{1}{2}h_0n) \\ \text{in } \text{cyl}(A + i\mathbf{e}_d, \frac{1}{2}h_0n) \\ \text{and } E \cap (B(A + i\mathbf{e}_d, \frac{1}{2}h_0n) \cup T(A + i\mathbf{e}_d, \frac{1}{2}h_0n)) \neq \emptyset \end{array} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Penalisation scheme. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \delta < 1/4$. Set $M := \lfloor n^\varepsilon \rfloor$ where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer smaller than x . Let $(Z_i)_{1 \leq i \leq M}$ be a family of i.i.d. random variables that takes the value -1 with probability $G(\{a\})$ and 1 with probability $1 - G(\{a\}) = G(\{b\})$. The reason for this choice is that to apply Talagrand formula (Theorem 1.4) the t_e and Z_i must be parameterized by a Bernoulli random variable with the same parameter. Set

$$S_M := \sum_{k=1}^M Z_k.$$

We define

$$\mathbf{i}_0 := \left\lfloor \frac{H}{2} \right\rfloor + S_M.$$

In particular \mathbf{i}_0 is a random integer variable taking value in $[\lfloor H/2 \rfloor - M, \lfloor H/2 \rfloor + M]$. We define the family $(Y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq H}$ as follows

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq H \quad Y_i = Y_i(\mathbf{i}_0) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}_0 - i| \leq \frac{H}{2} - n^\delta \\ \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{n^\delta \log n} (|\mathbf{i}_0 - i| - \frac{H}{2} + n^\delta) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Let \mathbf{j}_0 be such that

$$X_{\mathbf{j}_0} + Y_{\mathbf{j}_0} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n} X_i + Y_i.$$

If there are several possible choices, we pick the smallest. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\min}(\mathbf{j}_0)$ be the surface achieving the minimum in the definition of $X_{\mathbf{j}_0}$. Again if there are several possible choices, we choose in a deterministic way (that is invariant by translation along the e_d axis).

Edges with large influence. The following proposition will be proved in Section 4.

Proposition 2.2. *There exist $n_0 = n_0(G)$ and $\xi > 0$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$*

$$|\{e \in \text{cyl}(A, H) : \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(\mathbf{j}_0)) \geq n^{-\xi}\}| \leq n^{d-1-\xi}.$$

We are now in position of proving Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Set E be the set of edges in $\text{cyl}([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$. Let \mathbb{I} be the set of indices that encode the choice of \mathbf{i}_0 , in particular $|\mathbb{I}| = M$. Set

$$\tilde{\Phi} := \min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n} (X_i + Y_i) \quad (5)$$

where $(X_i)_i$ was defined in (3) and $(Y_i)_i$ in (4). Thanks to Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n} X_i.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\left| \min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n} (X_i + Y_i) - \min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n} X_i \right| \leq \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{\log n}.$$

It follows that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)] \right| \leq \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{\log n}.$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var}(\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)) \\
&= \mathbb{E}((\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H) - \mathbb{E}\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H))^2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}((\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H) - \tilde{\Phi} + \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi} - \mathbb{E}\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H) + \tilde{\Phi} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi})^2) \\
&\leq 3 \left(\text{Var}(\tilde{\Phi}) + 2 \frac{n^{d-1}}{\log n} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Let us compute the influence of the bits in I and E . For $j \in I$, we have $|\partial_j S_M| \leq 2$ and it yields that

$$|\partial_j i_0| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_j Y_{i_0}| \leq \frac{2n^{(d-1)/2}}{n^\delta \log n}.$$

As a result,

$$\forall j \in I \quad |\partial_j \tilde{\Phi}|^2 \leq \frac{4n^{d-1}}{n^{2\delta} \log^2 n}.$$

Denote $\Delta_e \tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi} \circ \sigma_e^b - \tilde{\Phi} \circ \sigma_e^a$ where σ_e^a, σ_e^b is the function that changes the value of the edge e to a , respectively b . We have

$$\mathbb{P}(\partial_e \tilde{\Phi} \neq 0) = \mathbb{P}(\Delta_e \tilde{\Phi} \neq 0) = \frac{1}{G(\{a\})} \mathbb{P}(\Delta_e \tilde{\Phi} \neq 0, t_e = a) \leq \frac{1}{G(\{a\})} \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)).$$

Note that if $\Delta_e \tilde{\Phi} \neq 0$ and $t_e = a$, then necessarily e has to belong to the minimal surface. For $e \in E$, thanks to the previous inequality, we have

$$\|\partial_e \tilde{\Phi}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{(b-a)^2}{4} \mathbb{P}(\partial_e \tilde{\Phi} \neq 0) \leq \frac{(b-a)^2}{4G(\{a\})} \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)).$$

Besides, we have by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality

$$\|\partial_e \tilde{\Phi}\|_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[|\partial_e \tilde{\Phi}| \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\partial_e \tilde{\Phi} \neq 0)} \|\partial_e \tilde{\Phi}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{G(\{a\})^{-1} \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0))} \|\partial_e \tilde{\Phi}\|_2.$$

Let n_0 be as in the statement of Proposition 2.2. Finally, by applying Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 2.2, we get for $n \geq n_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var}(\tilde{\Phi}) \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_{j \in I} \|\partial_j \tilde{\Phi}\|_2^2 + \sum_{\substack{e \in E: \\ \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) \geq n^{-\xi}}} \|\partial_e \tilde{\Phi}\|_2^2 + \sum_{\substack{e \in E: \\ \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) < n^{-\xi}}} \frac{\|\partial_e \tilde{\Phi}\|_2^2}{1 - \log(G(\{a\})^{-1} \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)))/2} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(|\mathbb{I}| \frac{n^{d-1}}{n^{2\delta} \log^2 n} + \frac{(b-a)^2}{G(\{a\})} n^{d-1-\xi} + \frac{(b-a)^2}{G(\{a\})(1 + \frac{\xi}{4} \log n)} \sum_{e \in E} \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Besides, note that the following set is a cutset from the top to the bottom of the cylinder $\text{cyl}(A + \lfloor \frac{H}{2} \rfloor \mathbf{e}_d, \frac{1}{2} h_0 n)$

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ \{x, x + \mathbf{e}_d\}, x \in \left([0, n]^{d-1} \times \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{H}{2} \right\rfloor \right\} \right) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \right\}.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\Phi} \leq X_{\lfloor \frac{H}{2} \rfloor} \leq b|\mathcal{F}| = b(n+1)^{d-1}$$

and

$$a|\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)| \leq b(n+1)^{d-1}. \tag{8}$$

We conclude by combining inequalities (6), (7) and (8). \square

3. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.1 (ABSENCE OF LONG CHIMNEYS)

We shall need the following discrete isoperimetric inequality from [4] (N.B. the result in [4] is essentially sharp both in the side-length n and in the dimension $d-1$, we only need the weaker statement given below).

Theorem 3.1 (Corollary of Theorem 2 in [4]). *For any $d \geq 2$, there exists $c = c(d) > 0$ s.t. for any $n \geq 1$ and any set $A \subset [0, n]^{d-1}$,*

$$|\Delta A| \geq c|A|^{1-\frac{1}{d-1}} \wedge ((n+1)^{d-1} - |A|)^{1-\frac{1}{d-1}},$$

where ΔA stands for the edge boundary of the set A in $[0, n]^{d-1}$ (i.e. $\Delta A := \{\{i, j\}, \|i - j\|_2 = 1, i \in A \text{ and } j \in [0, n]^{d-1} \setminus A\}$).

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let $h_0 > 0$ whose value will be chosen later depending on a and b . Let $H \geq \frac{1}{2}h_0n$ and let $E \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ be a cut-set that achieves the infimum in $\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$.

Let h_{max} be the maximum height in $\{0, \dots, H\}$ of a vertex belonging to an edge in the minimal cut-set E . Define similarly h_{min} . Our goal is then to show that uniformly in the configuration of capacities $\{t(e)\}$, one necessarily has $h_{max} - h_{min} \leq \frac{h_0}{2}$.

Scanning the upper horizontal slices. We start by scanning the upper horizontal layers of the cut-set E as follows. For any $1 \leq i \leq h_{max}$, we call the i^{th} upper layer, $U_i := [0, n]^{d-1} \times \{h_{max} - i\}$ and we define the following subset of U_i . Let $A(i) \subset U_i$ be the set of all points $x \in U_i$ such that any path γ connecting x to $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{H\}$ inside the cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [h_{max} - i, H]$ necessarily intersects E .

Let us start with the following two easy observations:

- Since E is a minimal cut-set, it is easy to check that $A(i) \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \geq 1$.
- Notice that the edge boundary $\Delta A(i) \subset E \cap U_i$ (N.B. in general, there is no equality).

We will need the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *For each $i \geq 1$, let $F_i := E \cap [0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, h_{max} - i]$, i.e. the set of all edges in E that belong to the layer U_i or are below that layer. Then for any $i \geq 1$, the set*

$$E_i := F_i \cup \{\{x, x - \mathbf{e}_d\}, x \in A(i)\}$$

is a cut-set of the cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]$. (N.B. Its dual may no longer correspond to a simply connected surface. See Figure 2).

Proof. Let $\gamma = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ be any connected vertex-path connecting the bottom to the top of the cylinder. Let $1 \leq m < N$ be the first time where the path reaches the layer U_i , i.e. x_0, \dots, x_{m-1} stays strictly below L_i and $x_m \in U_i$. We need to discuss the following two cases: First, if $x_m \in A(i)$, then we are done as the edge $\{x_{m-1}, x_m\}$ belongs to $\{\{x, x - \mathbf{e}_d\}, x \in A(i)\}$. If, on the other hand, the point $x_m \notin A(i)$, then we claim that the path $\{x_0, \dots, x_m\}$ has necessarily intersected an edge of F_i . Indeed, if this was not the case then the path $\{x_0, \dots, x_m\}$ would arrive at $x_m \notin A(i)$ without ever crossing E and by definition of $A(i)$, one could find a connected continuation of this path y_1, \dots, y_M such that the path $x_0, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_M$ connects the bottom to the top of the cylinder without ever intersecting the cut-set E . This gives us a contradiction and thus concludes our proof. \square

The reason of this Lemma is that it immediately provides us with the following highly useful constraint: since E is a minimal cut-set and since $F_i \cup \{\{x, x - \mathbf{e}_d\}, x \in A(i)\}$ is a cut-set, we have for all $i \geq 1$,

$$a|E \setminus F_i| \leq b|\{\{x, x - \mathbf{e}_d\}, x \in A(i)\}| = b|A(i)| \quad (9)$$




FIGURE 2. Illustration in dimension $d = 2 (= 1 + 1)$ of the cut-set E_i defined in Lemma 3.2. It is made here of all the blue edges below level i as well as the additional green edges. By extrapolating such a picture in higher dimension $d \geq 3$, one can easily produce situations where the set E_i splits into distant disconnected parts even though it arises from a minimal cut-set.

We now define

$$T := \min\{i \geq 1 \text{ s.t. } |A(i)| \geq (1 - \frac{a}{10b})(n+1)^{d-1}\}. \quad (10)$$

We shall prove the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *For any $0 < a < b$, there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(a, b) > 0$ s.t. for any $1 \leq k \leq T - 1$,*

$$|\Delta A(k)| \geq \epsilon k^{d-2},$$

The Lemma is easily proved by induction as follows. Unless $T = 1$, the lemma clearly holds for $k = 1$. (This is because in this case $\emptyset \subsetneq A(1) \subsetneq [0, n]^{d-1}$). Now, suppose the Lemma holds for a certain constant $\epsilon > 0$ for all $m < k \leq T - 1$.

We shall use the above constraint (9) at the layer $i = k$. Notice that the set of edges $E \setminus F_k$ is by definition the set of edges that are above the layer k (including some vertical edges pointing at that layer). In particular, this set is larger than the set of horizontal edges which lie above the k^{th} layer U_k , namely,

$$E \setminus F_k \supset \bigcup_{m=1}^{k-1} E \cap U_m.$$

Our next crucial point is the fact that for any m , as pointed out earlier, one has $\Delta A(m) \subset E \cap U_m$. As such, this gives us

$$\begin{aligned} |E \setminus F_k| &\geq \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} |E \cap U_m| \geq \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} |\Delta A(m)| \\ &\geq \epsilon \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} m^{d-2} \geq \epsilon C(d) k^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now plugging this into the constraint (9) gives us

$$b|A(k)| \geq a|E \setminus F_k| \geq a\epsilon C(d) k^{d-1}. \quad (11)$$

Now, using the fact that $|A(k)| < (1 - \frac{a}{10b})(n+1)^{d-1}$ (this is because $k < T$), we obtain from Theorem 3.1 that

$$|\Delta A(k)| \geq c(a, b) |A(k)|^{1 - \frac{1}{a-1}}.$$

(Where for example $c(a, b) = c(\frac{a}{20b})^{1 - \frac{1}{a-1}}$). Plugging this into (11) now gives us

$$|\Delta A(k)| \geq c(a, b) \left(\frac{a\epsilon C(d)}{b} \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{a-1}} k^{d-2}.$$

For $0 < a < b$ and the dimension d fixed, one can choose the constant ϵ small enough so that

$$c(a, b) \left(\frac{a\epsilon C(d)}{b} \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{a-1}} > \epsilon,$$

which ends the proof of the Lemma. \square

Now using the Lemma 3.3 until $k = T - 1$, we extract the following estimate:

$$C(d)\epsilon T^{d-1} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{T-1} |\Delta A(k)| \leq |E \setminus F_T| \leq |E| \leq \frac{b}{a}(n+1)^{d-1}.$$

This implies the deterministic statement that the stopping time T is always bounded from above by $\bar{h}_0 n$, where \bar{h}_0 is a constant which only depends on $0 < a < b$ and the dimension d .

The rest of the proof will proceed as follows: we will now scan horizontally the cut-set E from its bottom h_{min} and proceed upwards until we reach $h_{min} + T'$. We will be left with showing that $h_{max} - T$ cannot be much bigger than $h_{min} + T'$. In order to keep a control on $h_{max} - T$ versus $h_{min} + T'$, it will be important to use exactly the same combinatorial definitions when scanning from below.

Scanning the lower horizontal slices. We proceed in the same fashion. For any $1 \leq i \leq H - h_{min}$, we call the i^{th} lower layer, $L_i := [0, n]^{d-1} \times \{h_{min} + i\}$ and we define the following subset of L_i . Let $\hat{A}(i) \subset L_i$ be the set of all points $x \in L_i$ such that any path γ connecting x to $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{H\}$ inside the cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [h_{max} - i, H]$ necessarily intersects E . (Notice and this is a key point that the set $\hat{A}(i)$ is nothing but the previous set $A(j)$ with $j = h_{max} - h_{min} - i$).

We will need the following slight adaptation of Lemma 3.2 where we now add additional edges on the top of **the complement of $\hat{A}(i)$** .

Lemma 3.4. *For each $i \geq 1$, let $G_i := E \cap [0, n]^{d-1} \times [h_{min} + i, H]$, i.e. the set of all edges in E that belong to the layer L_i or are above that layer. Then for any $i \geq 1$, the set*

$$\hat{E}_i := G_i \cup \{\{x, x + \mathbf{e}_d\}, x \notin \hat{A}(i)\}$$

is a cut-set of the cylinder $[0, n]^{d-1} \times [0, H]$.

Proof. Let $\gamma = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ be any connected vertex-path connecting the bottom to the top of the cylinder. Let $1 \leq m < N$ be the last passage time of this path through the layer L_i . If $x_m \in \hat{A}(i)$, then by definition of this set, the rest of the connected path $\{x_m, \dots, x_N\}$ will go through an edge in G_i . If on the other hand $x_m \notin \hat{A}(i)$, then since x_m is the last passage through L_i , the next edge is necessarily a vertical edge $\{x_m, x_m + \mathbf{e}_d\}$ which belongs to $\{\{x, x + \mathbf{e}_d\}, x \notin \hat{A}(i)\}$, this ends the proof. \square

Similarly as for the upper layers, we define

$$\hat{T} := \min\{i \geq 1 \text{ s.t. } |(\hat{A}(i))^c| \geq (1 - \frac{a}{10b})(n+1)^{d-1}\}. \quad (12)$$

We claim that the exact same analysis as for the upper layers shows the following two facts:

- (1) for any $1 \leq k \leq \hat{T} - 1$, $|\Delta \hat{A}(k)| = |\Delta(\hat{A}(k)^c)| \geq \epsilon k^{d-2}$.
- (2) $\hat{T} \leq \bar{h}_0 n$.

To conclude our proof, it remains to show that the upper layer where we stop the scanning from above, i.e. $h_{max} - T$ cannot be much higher than the lower layer $h_{min} + \hat{T}$ at which we stop the scanning from below. In fact, with our choices of stopping times T and \hat{T} , we will show more in the next Lemma, i.e. that up to a safety margin of 1, the top exploration necessarily stops below the bottom exploration.

Lemma 3.5.

$$h_{min} + \hat{T} + 1 \geq h_{max} - T.$$

To prove this Lemma, now that we have analyzed upper and lower horizontal slices, it remains to understand what would happen for the intermediate slices if they were to exist.

Scanning the intermediate slices. Let us suppose by contradiction that $h_{min} + \hat{T} + 1 < h_{max} - T$. Introduce

$$M := h_{max} - T - h_{min} - \hat{T} \quad (M \geq 2),$$

the number of intermediate slices. Let us reparametrize the layers so that $i = 0$ corresponds to the height $h_{min} + \hat{T}$ while $i = M$ corresponds to the top intermediate layer $h_{max} - T$. We shall denote by $\{\tilde{A}(i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq M-1}$ the same sets as before (we use \tilde{A} instead of A or \hat{A} just because of the reparametrization). Note that we have $\tilde{A}(0) = \hat{A}(\hat{T})$ and $\tilde{A}(M) = A(T)$.

Lemma 3.6. *For each $1 \leq i \leq M - 1$, we have the following 2 constraints.*

- (1) $a|\tilde{A}(i)^c| \leq b|A(T)^c| \left(\leq \frac{a}{10} \frac{(n+1)^{d-1}}{2} \right)$
- (2) $a|\tilde{A}(i)| \leq b|\hat{A}(\hat{T})| \left(\leq \frac{a}{10} \frac{(n+1)^{d-1}}{2} \right)$

For the inequalities in the parenthesis, we used the definitions of our stopping times T and \hat{T} (given in (10) and (12)). Conditions 1) and 2) are incompatible. Therefore this lemma implies that such intermediate layers cannot exist. This implies Lemma 3.5. To conclude the proof of Proposition 2.1, we are thus left with proving Lemma 3.6.

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Let us start with item 1. Each point x in the intermediate layer i (i.e. at height $h_{min} + \hat{T} + i$) which belongs to the set $(\tilde{A}(i))^c$ has a path in its upper cylinder which connects it to $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{H\}$ without intersecting E . By concatenating this path together with a vertical path pointing down all the way from x to the bottom face $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}$, since E is a cut-set, it is necessary that at least one edges in this vertical path belongs to E . This implies in particular that we have at least $|(\tilde{A}(i))^c|$ edges of E which are located below layer i . Finally, there cannot be too many such edges since E is a minimal cut-set. Using Lemma 3.4 for the layer at height $h_{max} - T$ (or $i = M$), leads us precisely to the constraint 1).

Item 2 is proved in a similar way. For any point x which belongs to $\tilde{A}(i)$, if we follow the vertical path above x until we reach the top layer $[0, n]^{d-1} \times \{T\}$, then by definition of $\tilde{A}(i)$, the path will go through at least one edge of E . This implies in particular that there are at least $|\tilde{A}(i)|$ edges in E above (or touching) layer i . Now using Lemma 3.2 for the layer at height $h_{min} + \hat{T}$ (or $i = 0$) together with the fact that E is minimal leads us to constraint 2. \square

Remark 2. In the context of minimal surfaces in the continuum setting, a similar phenomenon of absence of “long thin chimneys” has been observed for example in [12].

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.2

Let us first prove the following proposition which states that it is unlikely that the minimal surface $\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)$ sticks to the bottom or the top of the cylinder.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists $n_0 = n_0(G) \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(j_0 \in \{1, 2\}) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(j_0 \in \left\{H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n, H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n - 1\right\}\right) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

To prove this proposition, we will need the following upper bound on the variance.

Proposition 4.2 (Efron–Stein). *There exists a constant $\beta > 0$ depending on G such that for all $n \geq 1$ and $H \geq 1$, we have*

$$\text{Var}(\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)) \leq \beta n^{d-1}.$$

Proof. The proof is a straightforward application of Theorem 1.5. Let e_1, \dots, e_N be a deterministic ordering of the edges of the cylinder $\text{cyl}([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$. Set $X = (t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_n})$ and $f(X) = \Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$. Let \mathcal{E}_{\min} be a minimal surface for X (chosen according to a deterministic rule in case of ties). Recall that $X^{(i)}$ denotes the vector X where the i -th edge has been resampled. Note that if $f(X) < f(X^{(i)})$ then e_i belongs \mathcal{E}_{\min} . By similar reasoning as in (8), we have

$$|\mathcal{E}_{\min}| \leq \frac{b}{a}(n+1)^{d-1}.$$

By applying Theorem 1.5, it follows that

$$\text{Var}(f(X)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N (b-a)^2 \mathbb{P}(e_i \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}) \leq (b-a)^2 \frac{b}{a}(n+1)^{d-1}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Thanks to Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{h_0}{2}n} X_i.$$

We will just prove the first inequality as the proof for the second inequality is similar. Let us assume by contradiction that

$$\mathbb{P}(j_0 = 1) = \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n} X_i + Y_i = X_1 + Y_1\right) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

We have for n large enough

$$|j_0 - 1| \geq \frac{H}{2} - n^\varepsilon - 1 > \frac{H}{2} - n^\delta + \frac{n^\delta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_1 \geq \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{2 \log n}.$$

For all $i \in [2n^\delta, 3H/4]$, we have $Y_i = 0$. On the event $\{\min_{1 \leq i \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0n} X_i + Y_i = X_1 + Y_1\}$, we have

$$X_1 \leq \min_{i \in [2n^\delta, 3H/4]} X_i - \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{2 \log n}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 \leq \min_{i \in [2n^\delta, 3H/4]} X_i - \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{2 \log n}\right) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Set

$$\mathcal{E}_j := \left\{ X_j \leq \min_{i \in [j+2n^\delta, 3H/4]} X_i - \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{2 \log n} \right\}.$$

Since the distribution of $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 3H/4}$ is the same as the distribution of $(X_i)_{j \leq i \leq 3H/4+j-1}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_j) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Set for $1 \leq k \leq H/4n^\delta$

$$I_k := [4kn^\delta, 2(2k+1)n^\delta] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_k := \bigcup_{j \in I_k} \mathcal{E}_j.$$

Let N be the number of $k \leq H/4n^\delta$ such that \mathcal{F}_k occurs, that is,

$$N := \sum_{1 \leq k \leq H/4n^\delta} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F}_k}.$$

We have

$$\mathbb{E}[N] \geq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq H/4n^\delta} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_k) \geq \frac{h_0 \sqrt{n}}{4n^\delta} \geq \frac{h_0}{2} n^{1/4} \quad (13)$$

where we recall that $H \geq h_0 n$. Let $i_1 < \dots < i_N$ be integers such that they all belong to different intervals in $(I_k, 1 \leq k \leq H/4n^\delta)$ and for all $1 \leq j \leq N$, the event \mathcal{E}_{i_j} occurs. Note that $i_{j+1} - i_j \geq 2n^\delta$ since they belong to different intervals. Moreover, on the event \mathcal{E}_{i_j} , we have

$$X_{i_j} \leq X_{i_{j+1}} - \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{2 \log n}.$$

We can prove by induction that for $0 \leq k \leq N-1$

$$X_{i_{N-k}} \leq \min_{H/2+1 \leq i \leq 3H/4} X_i - (k+1) \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{2 \log n}.$$

Hence,

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq H/2} X_i \leq \min_{H/2+1 \leq i \leq 3H/4} X_i - N \frac{n^{(d-1)/2}}{2 \log n}.$$

It follows that for $t \geq 0$ using Bienaymé–Chebyshev's inequality and Proposition 4.2

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N \geq 2t \log^2 n) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{H/2+1 \leq i \leq 3H/4} X_i - \min_{1 \leq i \leq H/2} X_i \geq tn^{(d-1)/2}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\text{Var}(\min_{1 \leq i \leq H/2} X_i)}{t^2 n^{d-1}} \leq \frac{2\beta}{t^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It yields that

$$\mathbb{E}(N) \leq 2(1+2\beta) \log^2 n.$$

This contradicts inequality (13) for n large enough depending on G . By the same reasoning we can prove that

$$\mathbb{P}(j_0 = 2) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

To prove Proposition 2.2, we will also need the following lemma on the regularity of influences under translation by \mathbf{e}_d .

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $n_0 = n_0(G)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, $H \geq h_0 n$ the following holds. Let e be an edge of $\text{cyl}(A, H)$ such that $e + 2\mathbf{e}_d \subset \text{cyl}(A, H)$, we have*

$$|\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) - \mathbb{P}(e + 2\mathbf{e}_d \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0))| \leq \frac{2}{n^{\varepsilon/2}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Let $(t_e)_{e \in \text{cyl}(A, h)}$. We define t'_e as follows

$$t'_e := \begin{cases} t_{e+2\mathbf{e}_d} & \text{if } e + 2\mathbf{e}_d \in \text{cyl}(A, H) \\ t''_e & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $(t''_e)_{e \in \text{cyl}(A, h)}$ is independent from (t_e) . Let $(Z_i)_{1 \leq i \leq M}$, $(Z'_i)_{1 \leq i \leq M}$ be two independent family of random variables that take the value -1 with probability $G(\{a\})$ and 1 with probability $1 - G(\{a\}) = G(\{b\})$. Set

$$S_k := \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i \quad \text{and} \quad S'_k := \sum_{i=1}^k Z'_i.$$

Let

$$\tau := \inf\{k \in \{1, \dots, M\} : S'_k \geq S_k + 2\}$$

where we use the convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. Finally, we set

$$i_0 := \sum_{k=1}^M Z_k \quad \text{and} \quad i'_0 := \sum_{k=1}^{\min(\tau, M)} Z'_k + \sum_{k=\min(\tau, M)+1}^M Z_k.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{E}'_{\min}(j'_0)$ the minimal cutset corresponding to the family $(t'_e)_{e \in \text{cyl}(A, h)}$ and i'_0 . It is easy to check that it has the same law as $\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)$. Moreover, there exists a universal $C > 0$ s.t.

$$\mathbb{P}(i'_0 - i_0 \neq 2) = \mathbb{P}(\tau = \infty) = \mathbb{P}(\forall k \in \{1, \dots, M\} \quad S_k - S'_k \geq 0) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{M}}.$$

On the event $\{i'_0 = i_0 + 2\} \cap \{j_0 \notin \{H - \frac{1}{2}h_0 n, H - \frac{1}{2}h_0 n - 1\}\} \cap \{j'_0 \notin \{1, 2\}\}$, we have

$$\forall 1 \leq j \leq H - \frac{1}{2}h_0 n - 2 \quad X_j(t_e) + Y_j(i_0) = X_{j+2}(t'_e) + Y_{j+2}(i'_0)$$

and $\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0) + 2\mathbf{e}_d = \mathcal{E}'_{\min}(j'_0)$. It yields

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) - \mathbb{P}(e + 2\mathbf{e}_d \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0))| \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(i'_0 - i_0 \neq 2) + \mathbb{P}(j_0 \in \{1, 2\}) + \mathbb{P}\left(j_0 \in \left\{H - \frac{1}{2}h_0 n, H - \frac{1}{2}h_0 n - 1\right\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by combining the two previous inequalities and using Proposition 4.1, it follows that for $n \geq n_0$ (where n_0 is as in the statement of Proposition 4.1)

$$|\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) - \mathbb{P}(e + 2\mathbf{e}_d \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0))| \leq \frac{2}{n^{\varepsilon/2}}$$

The result follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Let n_0 be as in the statement of Lemma 4.3. Let $n \geq n_0$. Let $m \geq 1$ that we will choose later depending on n . Set $k = \lfloor n/m \rfloor$. For $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{d-1}) \in \{1, \dots, k\}^{d-1}$, we define

$$A_{\mathbf{i}} := \prod_{j=1}^d [(i_j - 1)m, i_j m) \times \{0\}.$$

We denote by \mathbf{J} the set of cylinders that contain an edge such that $\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) \geq n^{-\varepsilon/8}$, that is,

$$\mathbf{J} := \left\{ \mathbf{i} \in \{1, \dots, k\}^{d-1} : \exists e \in \text{cyl}(A_{\mathbf{i}}, H) \quad \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) \geq n^{-\varepsilon/8} \right\}.$$

Note that the set J is deterministic. By definition, the edges $e \in \text{cyl}(A_i, H)$ for $i \notin J$ have a small influence. We need to make sure that there is a negligible number of edges with a large influence in $\text{cyl}(A_i, H)$ for $i \in J$. In particular, we need to avoid that the minimal surface has a too large intersection with these cylinders.

Let us first bound the size of J . Let us assume that there exists $e \in \text{cyl}(A_i, H)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) \geq n^{-\varepsilon/8}$. Without loss of generality assume that $e + \sqrt{n}\mathbf{e}_d \in \text{cyl}(A_i, H)$. By Proposition 4.3, we have

$$|\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) - \mathbb{P}(e + 2j\mathbf{e}_d \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0))| \leq \frac{2j}{n^{\varepsilon/2}}.$$

Hence, for every $j \leq n^{\varepsilon/4}/4$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(e + 2j\mathbf{e}_d \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) \geq \frac{1}{n^{\varepsilon/8}} - \frac{2j}{n^{\varepsilon/2}} \geq \frac{1}{2n^{\varepsilon/8}}.$$

It yields that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0) \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)|] \geq \frac{n^{\varepsilon/4}}{8n^{\varepsilon/8}} \geq \frac{1}{8}n^{\varepsilon/8}.$$

Hence, we get using inequality (8)

$$|J| \frac{n^{\varepsilon/8}}{8} \leq \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0) \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0) \cap \text{cyl}(A, H)|] \leq \frac{b}{a}(n+1)^{d-1},$$

it follows that for some positive constant β depending on a, b and d

$$|J| \leq \beta n^{d-1-\varepsilon/8}.$$

Next, we aim at upper bounding the total influence of edges in $\text{cyl}(A_i, H)$ for $i \in J$, that is $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0) \cap \cup_{i \in J} \text{cyl}(A_i, H)|]$.

Let \mathcal{E} be a cutset in the cylinder $\text{cyl}(A, h)$, one can check that $\mathcal{E} \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)$ is also a cutset from the top to the bottom for the cylinder $\text{cyl}(A_i, H)$. It follows that

$$\Phi(A_i, H) \leq T(\mathcal{E} \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)).$$

Hence, it yields

$$\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}^{d-1} \setminus J} \Phi(A_i, H) + a \sum_{i \in J} |\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0) \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)| \leq T(\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0)) \leq \Phi(A, H) + n^{(d-1)/2}.$$

Taking the expectation, we get

$$a\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i \in J} |\mathcal{E}_{\min}(j_0) \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)|\right] \leq \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A, H)] - \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}^{d-1} \setminus J} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A_i, H)] + n^{(d-1)/2}. \quad (14)$$

To control the right hand side, we will need a result of Zhang [27].

Let $K = \lceil n/(m - \lfloor m^{5/6} \rfloor) \rceil$. Set $A' := [0, K(m - \lfloor m^{5/6} \rfloor)]^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ where K was chosen in such a way that $A \subset A'$. Thanks to the fine study of Zhang [27, inequality (10.22)], there exists $C > 0$ such that we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi(A', H)] \leq \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, K\}^{d-1}} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A_i, H)] + C \frac{n^{d-1}}{m^{1/16}}. \quad (15)$$

Let us briefly explain how to prove this inequality. Let us assume we could prescribe in each cylinder $\text{cyl}(A_i, H)$ a boundary condition for the minimal surface (that is the trace of the surface on the lateral side) in such a way that these boundary conditions match for adjacent cylinders. In other words, by taking the union of all minimal cutsets in $\text{cyl}(A_i, H)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}^{d-1}$, one would get a cutset in the big cylinder $\text{cyl}(A, H)$ and so $\Phi(A, H) \leq \sum \Phi(A_i, H)$. The issue with this strategy is as follows: in order to prescribe a boundary condition without affecting too much the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\Phi(A_i, H)]$, one needs that the trace of the minimal cutset on the

lateral sides is negligible with n^{d-1} . Since this fact is not known, Zhang overpasses this issue by slightly reducing the dimensions of the cylinder's basis (it accounts for the $m - \lfloor m^{5/6} \rfloor$): since the total size of the minimal surface is of order m^{d-1} , we can find a smaller cylinder where the trace of the minimal surface on the lateral sides is negligible. Once we can prescribe a given boundary condition, we use the symmetry to prescribe to adjacent cylinders some symmetric matching boundary conditions. The union of all these cutsets form a cutset in the big cylinder. Since the cylinders with prescribed boundary conditions are smaller than the original ones, we need to use a larger $K \geq k$ to be sure that $A \subset A'$.

Let us now explain how we can control the right hand side of (14) using (15) from [27, inequality (10.22)]. The notation $\tau_{min}(k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}, m)$ corresponds to $\Phi(\prod_{i=1}^d [0, k_i] \times \{0\}, m)$. We apply the inequality with $k_1 = \dots = k_{d-1} = m$, $w_1 = \dots = w_{d-1} = K$, $\delta = 1/2$. With these notations, the left hand side in (10.22) is equal to $\mathbb{E}[\Phi(A', H)]$. Since $A \subset A'$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Phi(A, H)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A', H)]$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A, H)] - \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}^{d-1} \setminus J} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A_i, H)] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A, H)] - \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, K\}^{d-1}} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A_i, H)] + (|J| + (K - k)^{d-1})bm^{d-1} \\ \leq C \frac{n^{d-1}}{m^{1/16}} + b\beta n^{d-1-\varepsilon/8} m^{d-1} + b \frac{n^{d-1}}{m^{(d-1)/6}}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Finally, combining (14) and (16), we get

$$a \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in J} |\mathcal{E}_{min}(j_0) \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)| \right] \leq \frac{n^{d-1}}{m^{1/16}} + b\beta n^{d-1-\varepsilon/8} m^{d-1} + n^{(d-1)/2}.$$

Now choose $m = n^{\varepsilon/(16(d-1))}$. There exists $\xi \leq \varepsilon/16$ depending on ε such that for n large enough

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in J} |\mathcal{E}_{min}(j_0) \cap \text{cyl}(A_i, H)| \right] \leq n^{d-1-\xi}.$$

We conclude that

$$\left| \left\{ e \in \bigcup_{i \in J} \text{cyl}(A_i, H) : \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{min}(j_0)) \geq n^{-\xi/2} \right\} \right| \leq n^{d-1-\xi/2}.$$

Since $\xi \leq \varepsilon/16$, we have by definition of J

$$\left| \left\{ e \in \text{cyl}(A, H) : \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathcal{E}_{min}(j_0)) \geq n^{-\xi/2} \right\} \right| \leq n^{d-1-\xi/2}$$

(indeed, in the remaining cylinders, all edges have influence less than $n^{-\varepsilon/8}$ which is smaller than $n^{-\xi/2}$). As such, the result follows. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2 AND FLUCTUATIONS OF ANCHORED SURFACES

We start with the proof of Theorem 1.2 which relies on the martingale decomposition method from Newman–Piza [22].

Proof of Theorem 1.2.

Let e_1, \dots, e_N be a deterministic ordering of the edges of the cylinder $\text{cyl}([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$. Denote by \mathcal{F}_k the σ -algebra generated by t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_k} . To simplify the

notations, denote $f(t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_N}) = \Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$. We have the following martingale decomposition

$$\text{Var}(f) = \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{F}_k) - \mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}))^2].$$

Let (t'_e) be an independent family distributed as (t_e) and denote

$$t^k := (t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_k}, t'_{e_{k+1}}, \dots, t'_{e_N}), \quad t_a^k := (t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_{k-1}}, a, t'_{e_{k+1}}, \dots, t'_{e_N})$$

$$\text{and} \quad t_b^k := (t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_{k-1}}, b, t'_{e_{k+1}}, \dots, t'_{e_N}).$$

In particular, we have

$$f(t^k) = (t_{e_k} - a) \mathbf{1}_{f(t_b^k) - f(t_a^k) > 0} + f(t_a^k).$$

If $f(t_b^k) - f(t_a^k) > 0$ we say that the edge e_k is pivotal. We can rewrite the expression as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f) &= \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(f(t^k) - f(t^{k-1}) | (t_e)_e)^2] = \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}((t_{e_k} - t'_{e_k}) \mathbf{1}_{f(t_b^k) - f(t_a^k) > 0} | (t_e)_e)^2) \\ &\geq \text{Var}(t_e) \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{P}(f(t_b^k) - f(t_a^k) > 0)^2 \\ &\geq \text{Var}(t_e) \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{P}(e_k \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}, t_{e_k} = b)^2. \end{aligned}$$

When $G(\{b\}) > p_c(d)$, there exists $c > 0$ such that the number of disjoint paths from the top to the bottom of the cylinder with only edges of time b is at least cn^{d-1} with high probability (see for instance Theorem 7.68 in [18]). In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\#\{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}, t_e = b\}] \geq cn^{d-1}.$$

It follows that by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\text{Var}(f) \geq \frac{\text{Var}(t_e)}{N} \mathbb{E}[\#\{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}, t_e = b\}]^2 \geq c_0 \frac{n^{d-1}}{H}$$

where c_0 depends on G and d . \square

The same proof allows us to show that fluctuations for anchored surfaces are not superconcentrated under the following hypothesis **(H)** of localisation. For any sequence (h_n) such that h_n goes to infinity with n , we have

$$\lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^{d-1}} \mathbb{E}[\#\{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\min} : e \notin \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x \cdot \mathbf{e}_d - \frac{h_n}{2}| \leq C\}] = 0 \quad (\text{H})$$

where \mathcal{E}_{\min} is the minimal cutset for the anchored flow $\tau([0, n]^{d-1}, h_n)$.

Proposition 5.1. *Under the hypothesis **(H)**, the variance of the anchored flow $\tau([0, n]^{d-1}, H)$ (defined at the end of the introduction) is in $\Omega(n^{d-1})$.*

6. CHAOTICITY OF THE MINIMAL SURFACE

Consider the notations of the previous section: $f(t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_N}) = \Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$. Set $X := (t_{e_1}, \dots, t_{e_N})$. Let X' be an independent vector distributed as X . Consider (U_1, \dots, U_N) an i.i.d. family of uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$. For any $t \in [0, 1]$, we define

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq N \quad X_i^t := \begin{cases} X_i & \text{if } U_i \geq t \\ X'_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Denote by \mathcal{P}_t the set of pivotal edges for $f(X^t)$ and by \mathcal{I}_t the set of edges that are in the intersection of all the minimal surfaces for $f(X^t)$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{I}_t \subset \mathcal{P}_t$. Following [8], we obtain the following Corollary of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 6.1. *There exists a positive constant C such that for any $n \geq 1$ and $H \geq h_0 n$*

$$\forall t \geq 0 \quad \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{I}_0 \cap \mathcal{I}_t|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}_t|] \leq C \frac{n^{d-1}}{t \log n \operatorname{Var}(t_e)}.$$

More precisely, this result follows from the following mild extension of Lemma 3.3 from [26].

Lemma 6.2 (Small extension of Lemma 3.3 in [26]). *For any $n \geq 1$ and $H \geq h_0 n$, we have*

$$\operatorname{Var}(\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)) = \operatorname{Var}(t_e) \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}_t|] dt.$$

Moreover, the function $t \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}_t|]$ is non-increasing.

7. OPEN QUESTIONS

Open question 1. *Prove that anchored maximal flow / minimal surfaces are not superconcentrated in high enough dimension d . (Thanks to Proposition 5.1, this boils down to showing that Hypothesis (H) holds).*

Open question 2. *Prove superconcentration for maximal flows/minimal surfaces in more general domains, as considered for example in [5, 6, 7]. In fact, even extending Theorem 1.1 to the case of tilted cylinders with a rational slope appears to be challenging as Zhang's inequality from [27] relies strongly on symmetry and does not adapt easily to rational directions.*

Open question 3. *In this work, we focused on distributions G taking two values $0 < a < b$. It would be interesting to extend this analysis to more general distributions. The works [2, 11] by Benaïm–Rossignol and Damron–Hanson–Sosoe, where they extend the study of [3] to more general distributions are likely to play a key role here.*

Note that for a continuous distribution G , the chaoticity property proved in Corollary 6.1 would be more meaningful as the minimal surface would then be a.s. unique. In particular one would control the true intersection of minimal surfaces before and after noise.

Open question 4. *Our main result, Theorem 1.1, only works for thick enough cylinders ($H \geq h_0 n$, for some large enough constant h_0). This barrier h_0 is there only for technical reasons (coming from Proposition 2.1). Show that the result still holds for any $H \geq \Omega(n^\epsilon)$.*

Open question 5. *How do the fluctuations scale with n ? Is there an exponent $\alpha(d) \in (d-2, d-1)$ which describes the variance of $\Phi([0, n]^{d-1} \times \{0\}, H)$ when H is, say, linear in n ?*

Acknowledgments. We wish to thank Itai Benjamini, Guy David, Simon Masnou, Ron Peled and Hugo Vanneuville for useful discussions. The research of B.D is supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 851565). The research of C.G. is supported by the Institut Universitaire de France (IUF) and the French ANR grant ANR-21-CE40-0003.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daniel Ahlberg and Christopher Hoffman. Random coalescing geodesics in first-passage percolation, 2019.
- [2] Michel Benaïm and Raphaël Rossignol. Exponential concentration for first passage percolation through modified Poincaré inequalities. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 44(3):544 – 573, 2008.
- [3] Itai Benjamini, Gil Kalai, and Oded Schramm. First passage percolation has sublinear distance variance. *Ann. Probab.*, 31:1970–1978, January 2003.
- [4] Béla Bollobás and Imre Leader. Edge-isoperimetric inequalities in the grid. *Combinatorica*, 11(4):299–314, 1991.
- [5] Raphaël Cerf and Marie Thérét. Law of large numbers for the maximal flow through a domain of \mathbb{R}^d in first passage percolation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(7):3665–3702, 2011.
- [6] Raphaël Cerf and Marie Thérét. Lower large deviations for the maximal flow through a domain of \mathbb{R}^d in first passage percolation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 150:635–661, 2011.
- [7] Raphaël Cerf and Marie Thérét. Upper large deviations for the maximal flow through a domain of \mathbb{R}^d in first passage percolation. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 21(6):2075–2108, 2011.
- [8] Sourav Chatterjee. *Superconcentration and related topics*, volume 15. Springer, 2014.
- [9] Sourav Chatterjee. Spin glass phase at zero temperature in the edwards-anderson model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04112*, 2023.
- [10] Michael Damron and Jack Hanson. Bigeodesics in first-passage percolation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 349(2):753–776, 2017.
- [11] Michael Damron, Jack Hanson, and Philippe Sosoe. Sublinear variance in first-passage percolation for general distributions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 163(1):223–258, Oct 2015.
- [12] Guy David and Stephen Semmes. Quasiminimal surfaces of codimension 1 and john domains. *pacific journal of mathematics*, 183(2):213–277, 1998.
- [13] Barbara Dembin, Dor Elboim, and Ron Peled. Coalescence of geodesics and the bks midpoint problem in planar first-passage percolation, 2022.
- [14] Barbara Dembin and Marie Thérét. Large deviation principle for the streams and the maximal flow in first passage percolation, 2020.
- [15] Barbara Dembin and Marie Thérét. Large deviation principle for the cutsets and lower large deviation principle for the maximal flow in first passage percolation, 2021.
- [16] Hugo Duminil-Copin, Aran Raoufi, and Vincent Tassion. Sharp phase transition for the random-cluster and potts models via decision trees. *Annals of Mathematics*, 189(1):75–99, 2019.
- [17] Christophe Garban and Jeffrey E Steif. *Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and percolation*, volume 5. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [18] Geoffrey Grimmett. *Percolation*, volume 321 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1999.
- [19] Kurt Johansson. Shape fluctuations and random matrices. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 209(2):437–476, 2000.
- [20] Harry Kesten. Surfaces with minimal random weights and maximal flows: a higher dimensional version of first-passage percolation. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 31(1):99–166, 1987.
- [21] Cristina Licea and Charles M. Newman. Geodesics in two-dimensional first-passage percolation. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(1):399 – 410, 1996.
- [22] Charles M Newman and Marcelo ST Piza. Divergence of shape fluctuations in two dimensions. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 977–1005, 1995.
- [23] Ron Peled. High-dimensional lipschitz functions are typically flat. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(3):1351–1447, 2017.
- [24] Raphaël Rossignol and Marie Thérét. Lower large deviations and laws of large numbers for maximal flows through a box in first passage percolation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 46(4):1093–1131, 2010.
- [25] Michel Talagrand. On Russo’s Approximate Zero-One Law. *The Annals of Probability*, 22(3):1576 – 1587, 1994.
- [26] Vincent Tassion and Hugo Vanneuville. Noise sensitivity of percolation via differential inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04572*, 2020.
- [27] Yu Zhang. Limit theorems for maximum flows on a lattice. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, May 2017.

D-MATH, ETH ZÜRICH, RÄMISTRASSE 101, 8092 ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND
Email address: `barbara.dembin@math.ethz.ch`

UNIVERSITÉ CLAUDE BERNARD LYON 1, CNRS UMR 5208, INSTITUT CAMILLE
JORDAN, 69622 VILLEURBANNE, FRANCE , INSTITUT UNIVERSITAIRE DE FRANCE
(IUF) AND UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE (UNIGE)
Email address: `garban@math.univ-lyon1.fr`