

# Epsilon-regularity for almost-minimizers of anisotropic free interface problem with Hölder dependence on the position

L. Esposito, L. Lamberti, G. Pisante

May 30, 2024

## Abstract

We establish an  $\varepsilon$ -regularity result for almost-minimizers of a class of variational problems involving both bulk and interface energies. The bulk energy is of Dirichlet type. The surface energy exhibits anisotropic behaviour and is defined by means of an ellipsoidal density that is Hölder continuous with respect to the position variable.

**Keywords:** anisotropic surface energies, free boundary problem, epsilon-regularity, volume constraint

**MSC:** 49Q10, 49N60, 49Q20

## 1 Introduction and statements

The existence and regularity of solutions to variational problems, encompassing both bulk and interface energies, have been extensively studied across various disciplines and remain a focal point of much mathematical research. These problems serve to describe a broad spectrum of phenomena in applied sciences, including nonlinear elasticity, materials science and image segmentation in computer vision (see for instance [2, 5, 13, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36]). A model integral functional initially introduced to study minimal energy configurations of two conducting materials by R. V. Kohn & G. Strang and F. Murat & L. Tartar, [34, 42], and later recovered by L. Ambrosio & G. Buttazzo, and F. H. Lin, [3, 38], is the following:

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma_E(x) |\nabla u|^2 dx + P(E; \Omega), \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_E := \alpha \mathbb{1}_E + \beta \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus E}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \beta$ , with  $E \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ . Here,  $\mathbb{1}_E$  stands for the characteristic function of  $E$  and  $P(E; \Omega)$  denotes the perimeter of the set  $E$  in  $\Omega$ . In [3, 38], the authors proved the existence and regularity for minimal configurations  $(E, u)$  of (1). In a broader context, F. H. Lin & R. V. Kohn addressed more generalized Dirichlet energies as outlined in [39],

$$\int_{\Omega} (F(x, u, \nabla u) + \mathbb{1}_E G(x, u, \nabla u)) dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \partial^* E} \Psi(x, \nu_E(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x), \quad (2)$$

with the constraints

$$u = u_0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \text{ and } |E| = d.$$

Here,  $\nu_E$  is the measure-theoretic outward unit normal to the reduced boundary  $\partial^* E$  of  $E$ . The regularity for the minimizing pair  $(E, u)$  is quite intricate to establish, especially concerning the free boundary  $\partial E$  due to the interaction between the bulk term and the perimeter term. In order to illustrate the regularity results of the free boundary, we introduce the following notations. We define the set of regular points of  $\partial E$  as follows:

$$\text{Reg}(E) := \{x \in \partial E : \partial E \text{ is a } C^{1,\gamma} \text{ hypersurface in } B_{\varepsilon}(x) \subset \Omega, \text{ for some } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } \gamma \in (0, 1)\},$$

and accordingly we define the set of singular points of  $\partial E$  as

$$\Sigma(E) := (\partial E \cap \Omega) \setminus \text{Reg}(E).$$

The most notable advancements in regularity results regarding the free boundary  $\partial E$  of minimizers of the functional (1) have been accomplished by G. De Philippis & A. Figalli in [16] and N. Fusco & V. Julin in [29]. They proved that for minimal configurations of the functional (1) it turns out that

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\Sigma(E)) \leq n - 1 - \eta, \quad (3)$$

for some  $\eta > 0$  depending only on  $\alpha, \beta$ . In the more general case of integral functionals of the type (2), the theory of regularity is much less developed. The first regularity result established in the broader context of integral energies of the type (2) was accomplished by F. H. Lin and R. V. Kohn in 1999, indeed in [39] they proved, for minimal configurations  $(E, u)$  of (2), that  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma(E)) = 0$ . The assumptions made by Lin and Kohn to achieve such regularity results require  $C^k$  differentiability for  $F, G$  and  $\Psi$  as they appear in (2), where  $k \geq 2$  and  $F, G$  grow quadratically with respect to the gradient variable. On the other hand, nothing is proved concerning the Hausdorff dimension of  $\Sigma(E)$  like in (3).

We also point out that the problem can be set in a non-quadratic framework as well. This instance is less studied and only few regularity results are available (see [5, 10, 11, 12, 22, 27, 35]).

In some recent papers, such as [24, 25], the Hausdorff dimension estimate of  $\Sigma(E)$  has been attained, significantly relaxing the differentiability assumption required on  $F$  and  $G$ . Indeed, in [25], only Hölder continuous dependence of  $F$  and  $G$  with respect to  $x$  and  $u$  is necessary. However, it is worth noting that the aforementioned result is demonstrated under the assumption that  $\Psi(\nu) = |\nu|$ , representing the conventional perimeter.

In this paper we will deal with the anisotropic case. Anisotropic surface energies manifest in various physical phenomena, such as crystal formation (refer to [7, 8]), liquid droplets (see [13, 20, 30, 37, 41, 45]), and capillary surfaces (see [18, 19]). F. J. Almgren was a pioneer in investigating the regularity of surfaces that minimize anisotropic variational problems in his seminal paper [1]. Early studies in this field were primarily conducted within the framework of varifolds and currents. While these results can be applied to surfaces of any codimension, they necessitate relatively stringent regularity assumptions on the integrands of the anisotropic energies, as outlined in [9, 44]. More recently, the regularity assumptions on the integrands  $\Psi$  of the anisotropic energies have been relaxed, as highlighted in [21, 26], where it is assumed that  $\Psi(x, \cdot)$  is of class  $C^1$  and  $\Psi(\cdot, \xi)$  is Hölder continuous.

In this context, it is worth mentioning a very recent paper, [43], which establishes the regularity result for quasi-minimizers of anisotropic surface energies within the class of sets of finite perimeter, under the assumption of Hölder continuous dependence of  $\Psi$  on  $x$ . This outcome is derived within the scope of ellipsoidal variational energies, as detailed in (4). Notably, surface energies of this specific form were initially introduced in a paper [46] by J. Taylor. In more detail, in the case that the elliptic integrand is given by  $\Psi(x, \nu) = \langle A(x)\nu, \nu \rangle^{1/2}$ , where  $A(x) = (a_{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^n$  is an elliptic and bounded matrix, the surface energy takes the form

$$\Phi_A(E; G) := \int_{G \cap \partial^* E} \langle A(x)\nu_E, \nu_E \rangle^{1/2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x). \quad (4)$$

We assume that  $A$  is uniformly elliptic, that is there exist two constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < +\infty$  such that

$$\lambda|\xi|^2 \leq \langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \Lambda|\xi|^2, \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We require that  $A$  is Hölder continuous with exponent  $\mu \in (0, 1]$ , that is

$$[A]_{C^\mu(\Omega)} = \sup_{\substack{x \neq y \\ x, y \in \Omega}} \frac{|A(x) - A(y)|}{|x - y|^\mu} < +\infty.$$

To avoid excessive technicalities, we assume that the bulk energy follows a Dirichlet-type distribution, although the outcome could be generalized to functionals of type (2). Given a bounded open

set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we consider the following functional:

$$\mathcal{F}_A(E, u; \Omega) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_A(E; \Omega), \quad (5)$$

where  $\sigma_E = \alpha \mathbb{1}_E + \beta \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus E}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \beta$  and  $E \subset \Omega$ . The achieved  $\varepsilon$ -regularity result is presented within the scope of local almost-minimizers. This makes it applicable in a variety of concrete applications, as we will demonstrate, for example, in the case of constrained problems. The following definition naturally arises in several problems from material sciences (see for example [3, 23, 38, 39, 40], compare also with [43, Definition 2.2]).

**Definition 1.1** ( $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizers). *Let  $U \Subset \Omega$ . The energy pair  $(E, u)$  is a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer in  $U$  of the functional  $\mathcal{F}_A$ , defined in (5), if for every  $B_r(x_0) \subset U$*

$$\mathcal{F}_A(E, u; B_r(x_0)) \leq \mathcal{F}_A(F, v; B_r(x_0)) + \kappa |E \Delta F|^{\frac{n-1}{n} + \frac{\mu}{n}},$$

whenever  $(F, v)$  is an admissible test pair, namely,  $F$  is a set of finite perimeter with  $F \Delta E \Subset B_r(x_0)$  and  $v - u \in H_0^1(B_r(x_0))$ .

The main theorem proved in this paper is the following.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$ . Then*

- a) *there exists a relatively open set  $\Gamma \subset \partial E$  such that  $\Gamma$  is a  $C^{1,\sigma}$ -hypersurface, for all  $0 < \sigma < \frac{\mu}{2}$ ,*
- b) *there exists  $\eta > 0$  depending on  $n, \alpha, \beta$  such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1-\eta}((\partial E \setminus \Gamma) \cap \Omega) = 0.$$

We outline the strategy adopted to prove this result. In the regularity theory for  $\Lambda$ -minimizers of the perimeter, the regular part  $\Gamma$  of the boundary of  $E$  is detected by the points that have a uniformly small excess in some ball (see Definition 2.3). A decay relation for the excess plays a crucial role, as it triggers an iteration argument that shows that the unitary normal vector varies continuously along  $\Gamma$ , thus ensuring its smoothness.

For our problem, it is not possible to prove a decay relation for the excess without considering the interaction between the surface and the bulk energy. Indeed, as outlined in Section 7, if the excess of a point  $x_0$  in  $\partial E$  in some ball  $B_r(x_0)$  is small, we are only able to prove an improvement relation for the excess, which involves the rescaled Dirichlet integral of  $u$  in  $B_r(x_0)$  as well.

In this context,  $\Gamma$  is defined as the collection of the points of the boundary of  $E$  that are centers of balls  $B_r(x_0)$  where the excess  $\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r)$  and the rescaled Dirichlet integral  $\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r)$  (see (9)) of  $u$  are sufficiently small. In order to prove the smoothness of  $\Gamma$ , a decay relation for the sum of these quantities is required.

A decay relation for the rescaled Dirichlet integral of  $u$  around points of small excess is proved separately in Proposition 4.7.

A much finer argument is needed to establish an improvement relation for the excess (see Theorem 7.3). One of the key concepts enabling us to adapt the standard excess-decay arguments, commonly used in the context of perimeter minimizers, to the anisotropic setting is a specific change of variable  $T_{x_0}$ . This affine transformation, already used in [14, 32, 43], maps Wulff shapes of  $\Phi_A$ , which are ellipsoids, into balls  $B_r(x_0)$  (see Section 2). We first prove a version of the excess improvement theorem for transformed couples  $(\tilde{E}, \tilde{u}) = (T_{x_0}(E), u \circ T_{x_0}^{-1})$ , which are  $(\kappa \lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}$  (see (7)). The proof of the latter is carried out by contradiction and is based on a blow-up argument. In this step, we can benefit of using the classical perimeter instead of the anisotropic one around  $x_0$ , being  $A_{x_0}(x_0) = I$  (see Proposition 6.1). The main ideas can be summarized as follows:

1. Density lower and upper bounds on the perimeter (see Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.4) guarantee that around points  $x_0$  of  $\partial \tilde{E}$  with small excess, the boundary of  $\tilde{E}$  almost coincides with the graph of a Lipschitz function  $f$  (see Theorem 4.9). Therefore, it is possible to apply the area formula directly along  $\partial \tilde{E}$  up to a small error. The portion of the boundary that does not match is controlled by the excess at that scale.

2. The function  $f$  is quasi-harmonic. We need a quantitative estimate of its quasi-harmonicity by a power of the excess with an exponent greater than  $\frac{1}{2}$ . In this step, the minimality of the optimal couple  $(\tilde{E}, \tilde{u})$  and the first variation formulae play a crucial role.
3. The direction of improvement of the excess is detected by the unitary normal vector to the graph of  $f$ . By means of a reverse Poincaré inequality (see Theorem 6.3), the excess at a smaller scale at  $x_0$  is controlled by the flatness of  $\partial\tilde{E}$  around  $x_0$ , which is in turn estimated by the excess via the good properties of  $f$ .

The paper is divided in sections, which reflect the proof strategy. Section 2 collects notation and preliminary definitions. In Section 3, some invariance properties of the excess and minimality under the transformation  $T_{x_0}$  and rescaling are proved. In Section 4, we establish density lower and upper bounds for the perimeter of  $E$  and their consequences, which are the decay of the rescaled Dirichlet energy and the Lipschitz approximation theorem. Section 5 is devoted to prove a compactness result for sequences of  $(\kappa, \alpha)$ -minimizers, which serves as a crucial tool for estimating the size of the singular set of  $E$ , as stated in Theorem 1.2. Section 6 includes the reverse Poincaré inequality, which is the counterpart of the well-known Caccioppoli's inequality for weak solutions of elliptic equations. Section 7 contains the proof of Theorem 1.2. The main ingredients to achieve such a result are a first variation formula for the bulk energy of the functional  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}$  and two versions of the excess improvement theorem. Finally, Section 8 deals with the application of the regularity result to a volume constrained problem via a penalization argument.

## 2 Notation and preliminaries

In the rest of the paper we will write  $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle$  for the inner product of vectors  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and consequently  $|\xi| := \langle \xi, \xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$  will be the corresponding Euclidean norm. As usual  $\omega_n$  stands for the Lebesgue measure of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  the unit sphere of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

We will write  $x = (x', x_n)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  collects the first  $n-1$  components of  $x$  and  $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$  is its  $n$ -th component. Accordingly, we denote by  $\nabla' = (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}})$  the gradient with respect to the first  $n-1$  components.

The  $n$ -dimensional ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with center  $x_0$  and radius  $r > 0$  is denoted as

$$B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < r\}.$$

If  $x_0 = 0$ , we simply write  $B_r$  in place of  $B_r(x_0)$ . The  $(n-1)$ -dimensional ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  with center  $x'_0$  and radius  $r > 0$  is denoted by

$$\mathbf{D}_r(x'_0) = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |x' - x'_0| < R\}.$$

If  $u$  is integrable in  $B_R(x_0)$ , we set

$$u_{x_0, r} = \frac{1}{\omega_n r^n} \int_{B_r(x_0)} u \, dx = \int_{B_r(x_0)} u \, dx.$$

If  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the set of points of  $E$  of density  $t$  is defined as

$$E^{(t)} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |E \cap B_r(x)| = t|B_r(x)| + o(r^n) \text{ as } r \rightarrow 0^+\}.$$

Given a Lebesgue measurable set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we say that  $E$  is of locally finite perimeter if there exists a  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued Radon measure  $\mu_E$  (called the Gauss-Green measure of  $E$ ) such that

$$\int_E \nabla \phi \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi \, d\mu_E, \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Moreover, we denote the perimeter of  $E$  relative to  $G \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $P(E; G) = |\mu_E|(G)$ .

The support of  $\mu_E$  can be characterized by

$$\text{spt}\mu_E = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 < |E \cap B_r(x)| < \omega_n r^n, \forall r > 0\},$$

(see [40, Proposition 12.19]). It holds that  $\text{spt}\mu_E \subset \partial E$ . If  $E$  is of locally finite perimeter, then the *reduced boundary*  $\partial^* E$  of  $E$  is the set of those  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\nu_E(x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mu_E(B_r(x))}{|\mu_E|(B_r(x))}$$

exists and belongs to  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . In the following, the topological boundary  $\partial E$  must be understood by considering the representative  $E^{(1)}$  of  $E$ , for which it holds that  $\overline{\partial^* E} = \partial E$ .

The properties of the matrix  $A$  in the definition of the anisotropic perimeter (4) guarantee that  $\Phi_A(E; F)$  is comparable to the classical perimeter, as observed in [43].

**Remark 2.1** (Comparability to perimeter).  $\Phi_A(E; \cdot)$  is comparable to  $P(E; \cdot)$ , since for Borel sets  $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , by the uniform ellipticity of  $A$ , it follows that

$$\lambda^{1/2} P(E; F) \leq \Phi_A(E; F) \leq \Lambda^{1/2} P(E; F). \quad (6)$$

If  $A$  equals the identity matrix  $I$ , we have the isotropic case  $\Phi_A(E; \cdot) = P(E; \cdot)$ .

It will be useful in the sequel to build comparison sets by replacing regions within an open set. The anisotropic perimeter can be split as in the isotropic case.

**Proposition 2.2** (Comparison by replacement). *If  $E$  and  $F$  are sets of locally finite perimeter in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $G$  is an open set of finite perimeter in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial^* G \cap \partial^* E) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial^* G \cap \partial^* F) = 0,$$

then the set defined by

$$F_0 = (F \cap G) \cup (E \setminus G)$$

is a set of locally finite perimeter in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Moreover if  $G \Subset U$  and  $U$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$\Phi_A(F_0; U) = \Phi_A(F; G) + \Phi_A(E; U \setminus \overline{G}) + \Phi_A(G; E^{(1)} \Delta F^{(1)})$$

*Proof.* The proof can be easily obtained from [40, Theorem 16.16]. Its details can be found in [43, Proposition 4.3].  $\square$

In the following, for  $R > 0$  and  $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , we will denote the cylinder centered in  $x_0$  with radius  $R$  oriented in the direction  $\nu$  by

$$\mathbf{C}_R(x_0, \nu) := x_0 + \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\langle y, \nu \rangle| < R, |y - \langle y, \nu \rangle \nu| < R\},$$

and the cylinder of radius  $R$  oriented in the direction  $e_n$  with height 2 by

$$\mathbf{K}_R(x_0) := \mathbf{D}_R(x'_0) \times (-1, 1).$$

In the following, for simplicity of notation we will write  $\mathbf{C}_R = \mathbf{C}_R(0, e_n)$  and  $\mathbf{K}_R = \mathbf{K}_R(0)$ .

In addition we introduce some usual quantities involved in regularity theory.

**Definition 2.3** (Excess). *Let  $E$  be a set of locally finite perimeter,  $x \in \partial E$ ,  $r > 0$  and  $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . We define:*

- the **cylindrical excess** of  $E$  at the point  $x$ , at the scale  $r$  and with respect to the direction  $\nu$ , as

$$\mathbf{e}^C(E, x, r, \nu) := \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_r(x, \nu) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{|\nu_E - \nu|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_r(x, \nu) \cap \partial^* E} [1 - \langle \nu_E, \nu \rangle] d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

- the **spherical excess** of  $E$  at the point  $x$ , at the scale  $r$  and with respect to the direction  $\nu$ , as

$$\mathbf{e}(E, x, r, \nu) := \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{\partial^* E \cap B_r(x)} \frac{|\nu_E - \nu|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

- the **spherical excess** of  $E$  at the point  $x$  and at the scale  $r$ , as

$$\mathbf{e}(E, x, r) := \min_{\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \mathbf{e}(E, x, r, \nu).$$

We omit the dependence on the set when it is clear from the context.

### 3 Scaling and change of variables

Given a symmetric positive matrix  $A$ , the  $D$  matrix of his eigenvalues and the matrix  $V$  of orthonormal eigenvectors, we have  $A = VDV^{-1}$ . Accordingly we define  $A^{1/2} = VD^{1/2}V^{-1}$ . Being  $A^{-1/2}A^{1/2} = I$ , the anisotropic perimeter of  $E$  coincides with the standard perimeter of the image of  $E$  under the affine change of variable  $y = A^{-1/2}x$  up to the scaling factor  $\det(A^{-1/2})$ . Localizing this argument freezing the matrix  $A^{-1/2}(x)$  in a point  $x_0 \in \partial E$ , we define the affine change of variables

$$T_{x_0}(x) = A^{-1/2}(x_0)(x - x_0) + x_0, \quad T_{x_0}^{-1}(y) = A^{1/2}(x_0)(y - x_0) + x_0, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and the matrix-valued function

$$A_{x_0}(y) := A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)A(T_{x_0}^{-1}(y))A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

which satisfies  $A_{x_0}(x_0) = I$ . It can be easily verified that the set  $T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(x_0))$ , is the Wulff shape of  $\Phi_{A(x_0)}$ . Moreover the following inclusions hold:

$$B_{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(x_0) \subset T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(x_0)) \subset B_{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(x_0),$$

for any  $r > 0$  and  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Under the affine change of variable  $T_{x_0}$ , the minimality with respect to the functional  $\mathcal{F}_A$  will be rephrased through the following functional

$$\mathcal{F}_{x_0, D}(E, u; \Omega) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + \Phi_D(E; \Omega), \quad (7)$$

(see Proposition 3.1).

In the sequel, we collect two invariance properties of  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizers under the transformation  $T_{x_0}$  and rescaling.

**Proposition 3.1** (Invariance of almost-minimizers under  $T_{x_0}$ ). *Let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  in  $\Omega$  and  $x_0 \in \Omega$ . Then  $(T_{x_0}(E), u \circ T_{x_0}^{-1})$  is a  $(\kappa \lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}$  in the balls  $B_r(z)$  such that  $B_{(\Lambda/\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(z) \subset T_{x_0}(\Omega)$ .*

*Proof.* We use the notation  $E_0 := T_{x_0}(E)$  and  $u_0 := u \circ T_{x_0}^{-1}$ . Let  $B_r(z) \subset T_{x_0}(\Omega)$  be such that  $B_{(\Lambda/\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(z) \subset T_{x_0}(\Omega)$  and  $(F_0, v_0)$  be an admissible test pair, i.e.  $F_0$  is a set of finite perimeter with  $F_0 \Delta E_0 \Subset B_r(z)$  and  $v_0 - u_0 \in H_0^1(B_r(z))$ . First we notice that, setting  $F = T_{x_0}^{-1}(F_0)$ , as in [43, Proposition 4.1], we have

$$E \Delta F \Subset T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z)) \subset B_{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(T_{x_0}^{-1}(z)) \subset \Omega,$$

where the last condition is satisfied because  $r < \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{dist}(T_{x_0}^{-1}(z), \partial\Omega)$ . Moreover, for  $v = v_0 \circ T_{x_0}$ , we have  $v - u \in H_0^1(T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z)))$  whose extension to zero in  $B_{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(T_{x_0}^{-1}(z))$ , denoted again by  $v - u$ , belongs to  $H_0^1(B_{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(T_{x_0}^{-1}(z)))$ . It follows, by the hypothesis of  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimality of the pair  $(E, u)$ , that

$$\mathcal{F}_A(E, u; B_{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(T_{x_0}^{-1}(z))) \leq \mathcal{F}_A(F, v; B_{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}r}(T_{x_0}^{-1}(z))) + \kappa |E \Delta F|^{\frac{n-1+\mu}{n}}.$$

This simplifies to

$$\mathcal{F}_A(E, u; T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z))) \leq \mathcal{F}_A(F, v; T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z))) + \kappa |E \Delta F|^{\frac{n-1+\mu}{n}}.$$

We now calculate, using [43, formula (4.9)] and the change of variables  $y = T_{x_0}(x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}(E_0, u_0; B_r(z)) &= \int_{B_r(z)} \sigma_{E_0} |\nabla u_0 A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dy + \Phi_{A_{x_0}}(E_0; B_r(z)) \\ &= \det(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)) \left( \int_{T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z))} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_A(E; T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z))) \right) \\ &= \det(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)) \mathcal{F}_A(E, u; T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z))) \\ &\leq \det(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)) \left( \mathcal{F}_A(F, v; T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z))) + \kappa |E \Delta F|^{\frac{n-1+\mu}{n}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where with a slight abuse of notation we have denoted  $\sigma_{E_0} = \alpha \mathbb{1}_{E_0} + \beta \mathbb{1}_{T_{x_0}(\Omega) \setminus E_0}$ . The result follows by observing that  $\det(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)) \leq \lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}}$  and

$$\det(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)) \mathcal{F}_A(F, v; T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(z))) = \mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}(F_0, v_0; B_r(z)).$$

□

**Proposition 3.2** (Scaling of  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizers). *For  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r > 0$ , let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}$  in  $\Omega$  (or a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$ ). Then  $(\Psi_{x_0, r}(E), r^{-\frac{1}{2}}u \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1})$  is a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  in  $\Psi_{x_0, r}(\Omega)$ , (or respectively a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  in  $\Psi_{x_0, r}(\Omega)$ ), where*

$$\Psi_{x_0, r}(x) := \frac{x - x_0}{r}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

*Proof.* Let  $B_s(z) \subset \Psi_{x_0, r}(\Omega)$ . Applying the change of variables  $y = \Psi_{x_0, r}(x)$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(\Psi_{x_0, r}(E), u \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}; B_s(z)) \\ &= \int_{B_s(z)} \sigma_{\Psi_{x_0, r}(E)} |\nabla(u \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}) A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dy + \Phi_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(\Psi_{x_0, r}(E); B_s(z)) \\ &= \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \left( \int_{B_{rs}(x_0 + rz)} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_{x_0}}(E; B_{rs}(x_0 + rz)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}(E, u; B_{rs}(x_0 + rz)). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $(F, v)$  be such that  $F$  is a set of finite perimeter,  $F \Delta \Psi_{x_0, r}(E) \Subset B_s(z)$  and  $v \in (u \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}) + H_0^1(B_s(z))$ . It holds that  $\Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}(F) \Delta E \Subset B_{rs}(x_0 + rz) \subset \Omega$  and  $v \circ \Psi_{x_0, r} - u \in H_0^1(B_{rs}(x_0 + rz))$ . Using the  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimality of  $(E, u)$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(\Psi_{x_0, r}(E), u \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}; B_s(z)) = \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}(E, u; B_{rs}(x_0 + rz)) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} [\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}(\Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}(F), v \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}; B_{rs}(x_0 + rz)) + \kappa |\Psi_{x_0, r}(E) \Delta \Psi_{x_0, r}(F)|^{\frac{n-1+\mu}{n}}] \\ & = \mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(F, v; B_s(z)) + \kappa r^\mu |E \Delta F|^{\frac{n-1+\mu}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that  $(\Psi_{x_0, r}(E), r^{-\frac{1}{2}}u \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1})$  is a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  in  $\Psi_{x_0, r}(\Omega)$ . □

The following proposition will be useful in the proof of Theorem 7.3, where we need to compare the excess of the transformed couple and of the original couple.

**Proposition 3.3** (Comparability of the excess under change of variable  $T_{x_0}$  and radius). *There exists a positive constant  $c_1 = c_1(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$  such that if  $E$  is a set of locally finite perimeter and  $x_0 \in \partial E$ , then, for any  $r > 0$ ,*

$$c_1^{-1} \mathbf{e}(T_{x_0}(E), x_0, \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r) \leq \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r) \leq c_1 \mathbf{e}(T_{x_0}(E), x_0, \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r).$$

*Proof.* For  $r > 0$  and  $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , we define the ellipsoidal excess at the point  $x_0$ , at the scale  $r$  and with respect to the direction  $\nu$  the following quantity:

$$\mathbf{e}_W(E, x_0, r, \nu) := \min_{\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(x_0)) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{|\nu_E - \nu|^2}{2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

Leveraging the inclusions

$$T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_{\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r}(x_0)) \subset B_r(x_0) \subset T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r}(x_0)),$$

we infer that

$$c^{-1} \mathbf{e}_W(E, x_0, \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r, \nu) \leq \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r, \nu) \leq c \mathbf{e}_W(E, x_0, \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r, \nu), \quad (8)$$

for some positive constant  $c = c(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$ . In [43, Proposition 5.1], it is shown that

$$c^{-1} \mathbf{e} \left( T_{x_0}(E), x_0, s, \frac{A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu}{|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu|} \right) \leq \mathbf{e}_W(E, x_0, s, \nu) \leq c \mathbf{e} \left( T_{x_0}(E), x_0, s, \frac{A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu}{|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu|} \right),$$

for any  $s > 0$ . Using the previous inequalities from below for  $s = \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r$  and from above for  $s = \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r$ , and inserting them in (8), we get

$$c^{-1} \mathbf{e} \left( T_{x_0}(E), x_0, \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r, \frac{A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu}{|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu|} \right) \leq \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r, \nu) \leq c \mathbf{e} \left( T_{x_0}(E), x_0, \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}r, \frac{A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu}{|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)\nu|} \right).$$

Minimizing over  $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , we obtain the thesis.  $\square$

## 4 Energy density estimates

The main goal of this section is to prove density lower and upper bounds for the perimeter of a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer. As consequences, the decay of the associate rescaled Dirichlet energy, defined for  $u \in H^1(B_r(x_0))$  as

$$\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) := \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad (9)$$

and the Lipschitz approximation theorem will follow. In view of this aim, we mention a result stating a decay estimate for elastic minima around points where either the density of  $E$  is close to 0 or 1, or the set  $E$  is asymptotically close to a hyperplane. We address the reader to [29, Proposition 2.4] for the proof.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of the functional  $\mathcal{F}_A$ . There exists  $\tau_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that the following statement is true: for all  $\tau \in (0, \tau_0)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\tau) > 0$  such that if  $B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$  and one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i)  $|E \cap B_r(x_0)| < \varepsilon_0 |B_r(x_0)|$ ,
- (ii)  $|B_r(x_0) \setminus E| < \varepsilon_0 |B_r(x_0)|$ ,
- (iii) *There exists a halfspace  $H$  such that  $\frac{|(E \Delta H) \cap B_r(x_0)|}{|B_r(x_0)|} < \varepsilon_0$ ,*

then

$$\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, \tau r) \leq c_2 \tau \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r),$$

for some positive constant  $c_2 = c_2(n, \alpha, \beta)$ .

The second result we want to mention, which will be used later, provides an upper bound for the whole energy  $\mathcal{F}_A$  on balls. The proof is rather standard and we address the reader to [25, Theorem 3] for the details. Here we just give a sketch of the proof, underlining the only points where the presence of the anisotropy entails different computations.

**Theorem 4.2** (Energy upper bound). *Let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  in  $\Omega$ . Then for every open set  $U \Subset \Omega$  there exists a positive constant  $c_3 = c_3(n, \alpha, \beta, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, U, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$  such that for every  $B_r(x_0) \subset U$  it holds*

$$\mathcal{F}_A(E, u; B_r(x_0)) \leq c_3 r^{n-1}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $B_r(x_0) \subset U \Subset \Omega$ . Testing the minimality of  $(E, u)$  with  $(E \setminus B_r(x_0), u)$ , we deduce that

$$\mathcal{F}_A(E, u; \Omega) \leq \mathcal{F}_A(E \setminus B_r(x_0), u; \Omega) + \kappa |E \Delta (E \setminus B_r(x_0))|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}}. \quad (10)$$

The only difference in our proof, compared to the isotropic case, is the use of the following formula concerning anisotropic perimeter and set operations. The latter follows from Proposition 2.2 applied with  $F = \emptyset$ ,  $G = B_r(x_0)$ , that is

$$\Phi_A(E \setminus B_r(x_0); U) = \Phi_A(E; U \setminus \overline{B_r(x_0)}) + \Phi_A(B_r(x_0); E).$$



Making  $\mathcal{F}_A$  explicit and getting rid of the common terms in (10) we obtain the following energy estimate on  $B_r(x_0) \cap E$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap E} (\beta - \alpha) |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_A(E; B_r(x_0)) &\leq \Phi_A(B_r(x_0); E) + \kappa |E \Delta (E \setminus B_r(x_0))|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}} \\ &\leq \Lambda^{1/2} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_r(x_0)) + c(n, \kappa) r^{n-1} \\ &\leq c(n, \Lambda, \kappa) r^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Starting from this estimate the proof follows verbatim the argument used in [25, Theorem 3], because henceforth only variations of the function  $u$  are used and the perimeter is not involved anymore. Indeed, using a blow up argument, it can be proved that there exist  $M = M(n, \alpha, \beta) > 0$  and  $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , depending on  $\Lambda/\lambda$ , such that for every  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $h_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for any  $B_r(x_0) \subset U$ , we have

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \leq h_0 r^{n-1} \quad \text{or} \quad \int_{B_{\tau r}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq M \tau^{n-\delta} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx,$$

from which the thesis follows.  $\square$

In the following lemma we show that the energy  $\mathcal{F}_A$  decays “fast” in the balls where the perimeter of  $E$  is “small”. Lemma 4.1 is utilized in its proof, specifically in instances (i) and (ii).

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer in  $\Omega$  of the functional  $\mathcal{F}_A$ . For every  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(\tau) > 0$  such that, if  $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$  and  $P(E; B_r(x_0)) < \varepsilon_1 r^{n-1}$ , then*

$$\mathcal{F}_A(E, u; B_{\tau r}(x_0)) \leq c_4 (\tau^n \mathcal{F}_A(E, u; B_r(x_0)) + (\tau r)^{\mu+n-1}),$$

for some positive constant  $c_4 = c_4(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) > 0$  independent of  $\tau$  and  $r$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  and  $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$ . We rescale  $(E, u)$  in  $B_1$  by setting  $E_r = \frac{E-x_0}{r}$  and  $u_r(y) = r^{-\frac{1}{2}} u(x_0 + ry)$ , for  $y \in B_1$ . Applying Proposition 3.2, we have that  $(E_r, u_r)$  is a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{A}}$  in  $B_1$ , where  $\tilde{A} = A \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}$ . Observing that  $r^{n-1} \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{A}}(E_r, u_r; B_\tau) = \mathcal{F}_A(E, u; B_{\tau r}(x_0))$ , we have to prove that there exists  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(\tau)$  such that, if  $P(E; B_1) < \varepsilon_1$ , then

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{A}}(E, u; B_\tau) \leq c_4 (\tau^n \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{A}}(E, u; B_1) + \tau^{\mu+n-1} r^\mu).$$

For simplicity of notation we will still denote  $E_r$  by  $E$ ,  $u_r$  by  $u$  and  $\tilde{A}$  by  $A$ . We note that, since  $P(E; B_1) < \varepsilon_1$ , by the relative isoperimetric inequality, either  $|B_1 \cap E|$  or  $|B_1 \setminus E|$  is small and thus Lemma 4.1 can be applied. We assume that  $|B_1 \setminus E| \leq |B_1 \cap E|$ , the other case being similar. By the coarea formula and the relative isoperimetric inequality we get

$$\int_\tau^{2\tau} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_\rho \setminus E) d\rho \leq |B_1 \setminus E| \leq c(n) P(E; B_1)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}.$$

Therefore, we may choose  $\rho \in (\tau, 2\tau)$ , independent of  $n$ , such that it holds  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial^* E \cap \partial B_\rho) = 0$  and

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_\rho \setminus E) \leq \frac{c(n)}{\tau} P(E; B_1)^{\frac{n}{n-1}} \leq \frac{c(n) \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{\tau} P(E; B_1). \quad (11)$$

Now we test the minimality of  $(E, u)$  with  $(F_0, u)$ , where  $F_0 := E \cup B_\rho$ . We remark that, being  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial^* E \cap \partial B_\rho) = 0$ , we can apply Proposition 2.2 with  $U = F = B_1$  and  $G = B_\rho$ , thus obtaining

$$\Phi_A(F_0; B_1) = \Phi_A(E \cup B_\rho; B_1) = \Phi_A(E; B_1 \setminus \overline{B_\rho}) + \Phi_A(B_\rho; B_1 \setminus E^{(1)}). \quad (12)$$

The  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimality of  $(E, u)$  supplies

$$\int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_A(E; B_1) \leq \int_{B_1} \sigma_{F_0} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_A(F_0; B_1) + \kappa r^\mu |E \Delta F_0|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}}.$$

Using (12) to get rid of the common perimeter terms and recalling that  $E = E^{(1)}$ , we deduce

$$\int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_A(E; B_\rho) \leq \int_{B_1} \sigma_{F_0} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_A(B_\rho; B_1 \setminus E) + \kappa r^\mu |E \Delta F_0|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}}.$$

Taking into account the comparability to the perimeter (6) and perimeter estimate (11), recalling that  $\rho \in (\tau, 2\tau)$  and getting rid of the common Dirichlet terms, we deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\tau} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx + \lambda^{1/2} P(E; B_\tau) &\leq \beta \int_{B_{2\tau}} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Lambda^{1/2} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_\rho \setminus E) + c(n, \kappa) r^\mu \tau^{\mu+n-1} \\ &\leq \beta \int_{B_{2\tau}} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{c(n) \Lambda^{1/2}}{\tau} \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{n-1}} P(E; B_1) + c(n, \kappa) r^\mu \tau^{\mu+n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we choose  $\varepsilon_1$  such that

$$c(n) \Lambda^{1/2} \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \leq \tau^{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad c(n) \varepsilon_1^{\frac{n}{n-1}} \leq \varepsilon_0 (2\tau) |B_1|,$$

where  $\varepsilon_0$  is from Lemma 4.1, thus getting

$$\int_{B_{2\tau}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq 2^n c_2 \tau^n \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 dx.$$

From this estimates the result easily follows applying again the comparability to the perimeter.  $\square$

Taking advantage of the established results, we are able to deduce a density lower bound estimate for the perimeter of a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$ .

**Theorem 4.4** (Density lower bound). *Let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  in  $\Omega$  and  $U \Subset \Omega$  be an open set. Then there exists a constant  $c_5 = c_5(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, U, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) > 0$ , such that, for every  $x_0 \in \partial E$  and  $B_r(x_0) \subset U$ , it holds*

$$P(E; B_r(x_0)) \geq c_5 r^{n-1}. \quad (13)$$

Moreover,  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}((\partial E \setminus \partial^* E) \cap \Omega) = 0$ .

*Proof.* The proof matches that of [25, Theorem 4] exactly, given the comparability to the perimeter. We start by assuming that  $x_0 \in \partial^* E$ . Without loss of generality we may also assume that  $x_0 = 0$ . Arguing by contradiction on (13), by using Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, we can easily prove by induction (see [25, Theorem 4] for the details) that

$$\mathcal{F}(E, u; B_{\sigma\tau^h r}) \leq \varepsilon_1(\tau) \tau^{\mu h} (\sigma\tau^h r)^{n-1},$$

where  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  are sufficiently small and  $\varepsilon_1$  is from Lemma 4.3. Starting from this, we deduce that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{P(E; B_\rho)}{\rho^{n-1}} = \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P(E; B_{\sigma\tau^h r})}{(\sigma\tau^h r)^{n-1}} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} 2\varepsilon_1(\tau) \tau^{\mu h} = 0,$$

which implies that  $x_0 \notin \partial^* E$ , that is a contradiction. We recall that we chose the representative of  $\partial E$  such that  $\partial E = \overline{\partial^* E}$ . Thus, if  $x_0 \in \partial E$ , there exists  $(x_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \partial^* E$  such that  $x_h \rightarrow x_0$  as  $h \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$P(E; B_r(x_h)) \geq C r^{n-1}$$

and  $B_r(x_h) \subset U$ , for  $h$  large enough. Passing to the limit as  $h \rightarrow +\infty$ , we get the result.  $\square$

**Definition 4.5** (Ahlfors regularity). *A Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be  $d$ -Ahlfors regular if there exist two positive constants  $c_A$  and  $r_0$  such that*

$$c_A^{-1} r^d \leq \mu(B_r(x)) \leq c_A r^d,$$

for all  $x \in \text{spt} \mu$  and  $0 < r < r_0$ . According to the notation used in [6], we denote

$$\mathcal{A}(c_A, r_0) := \left\{ E \subset \mathbb{R}^n : E \text{ is a set of locally finite perimeter satisfying} \right. \\ \left. \begin{aligned} &\partial E = \text{spt} \mu_E \text{ and its perimeter measure } |\mu_E| \text{ is} \\ &(n-1)\text{-Ahlfors regular with constants } r_0 \text{ and } c_A \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

**Remark 4.6.** *It is evident that Theorems 4.2 and 4.4 ensure the belonging of the  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  to the class  $\mathcal{A}(c_A, r_0)$ , for some constant  $c_A$  identified in such theorems. Naturally, for  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r > 0$ , the  $(\kappa\lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}}r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  obtained through the affine transformation  $T_{x_0}$  and the scaling  $\Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}$  (see Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2) belong to the class  $\mathcal{A}\left(c_A\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}, \frac{r_0}{r\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$ .*

The next result of this section establishes that around the points of the boundary of the set where the excess is “small”, the Dirichlet integral decays “fast”. In its proof, Lemma 4.1 plays a crucial role in instance (iii).

**Proposition 4.7** (Decay of the rescaled Dirichlet integral). *For every  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2(\tau) > 0$  such that if  $(E, u)$  is a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  in  $B_r(x_0)$ , with  $x_0 \in \partial E$ , and  $\mathbf{e}(x_0, r) \leq \varepsilon_2$ , then*

$$\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, \tau r) \leq c_6 \tau \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r),$$

for some positive constant  $c_6 = c_6(n, \alpha, \beta, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ .

*Proof.* Applying a usual scaling argument, by Proposition 3.2, we assume by contradiction that for some  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  there exist two positive sequences  $(\varepsilon_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(r_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  and a sequence  $((E_h, u_h))_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $(\kappa r_h^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_{A \circ \Psi_{x_0, r_h}^{-1}}$  in  $B_1$  with equibounded energies such that  $0 \in \partial E_h$ ,

$$\mathbf{e}(E_h, 0, 1) = \varepsilon_h \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{u_h}(0, \tau) > \overline{C} \tau \mathcal{D}_{u_h}(0, 1), \quad (14)$$

for some positive constant  $\overline{C}$  to be chosen. Thanks to the energy upper bound (Theorem 4.2) and the compactness of  $(E_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we may assume that  $E_h \rightarrow E$  in  $L^1(B_1)$  and  $0 \in \partial E$ . Since, by lower semicontinuity, the excess of  $E$  at 0 is null,  $E$  is a half-space in  $B_1$ , say  $H$ . In particular, for  $h$  large, it holds

$$|(E_h \Delta H) \cap B_1| < \varepsilon_0(\tau) |B_1|,$$

where  $\varepsilon_0$  is from Lemma 4.1, which gives a contradiction with the inequality (14), provided we choose  $\overline{C} > c_2$ , where  $c_2$  is also from Lemma 4.1.  $\square$

The last results also come as consequences of the density lower and upper bounds proved above. The height bound lemma is a standard step in the proof of regularity because it is one of the main ingredients to prove the Lipschitz approximation theorem. We remark that this is stated for  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$ , which are still Ahlfors regular (see Remark 4.6). The proof of this result can be found in [6, Theorem A.2].

**Lemma 4.8** (Height bound). *For  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r > 0$ , let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  in  $B_1$ . There exist two positive constants  $\varepsilon_3$  and  $c_7$ , depending on  $n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ , such that if  $0 \in \partial E$  and*

$$\mathbf{e}(0, 1, e_n) < \varepsilon_3,$$

then

$$\sup_{y \in \partial E \cap B_{1/2}} |y_n - (x_0)_n| \leq c_7 \mathbf{e}(0, 1, e_n)^{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}}.$$

Proceeding as in [40], we state the following Lipschitz approximation lemma, which is a consequence of the height bound lemma. Its proof follows exactly as in [6, Theorem A.3]. It is a fundamental step in the long journey to the regularity because it provides a connection between the regularity theories for parametric and non-parametric variational problems. Indeed we are able to prove for  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizers that the smallness of the excess guaranties that  $\partial E$  can be locally almost entirely covered by the graph of a Lipschitz function.

**Theorem 4.9** (Lipschitz approximation). *For  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r > 0$ , let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  in  $B_1$ . There exist two positive constants  $\varepsilon_4$  and  $c_8$ , depending on  $n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ , such that if  $0 \in \partial E$  and*

$$\mathbf{e}(0, 1, e_n) < \varepsilon_4,$$

then there exists a Lipschitz function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |f(x')| \leq c_8 \mathbf{e}(0, 1, e_n)^{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}}, \quad \|\nabla' f\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1,$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}((\partial E \Delta \Gamma_f) \cap B_{1/2}) \leq c_8 \mathbf{e}(0, 1, e_n),$$

where  $\Gamma_f$  is the graph of  $f$ . Moreover,

$$\int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\nabla' f|^2 dx' \leq c_8 \mathbf{e}(0, 1, e_n).$$

## 5 Compactness for sequences of minimizers

In this section we prove a standard compactness result for sequences of  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizers. Given to positive constants  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , we set

$$B_{M_1, M_2} := \{A \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{R}^n) : A \text{ is symmetric, } [A]_{C^\gamma} < M_1, \|A\|_\infty < M_2\}.$$

We define

$$\mathcal{A} = \{A \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{R}^n) : \lambda|\xi|^2 \leq \langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \Lambda|\xi|^2, \forall x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \cap B_{M_1, M_2}. \quad (15)$$

**Lemma 5.1** (Compactness). *Let  $(E_h, u_h)$  be a sequence of  $(\kappa_h, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_{A_h}$  in  $\Omega$  such that  $\sup_h \mathcal{F}_{A_h}(E_h, u_h; \Omega) < +\infty$ ,  $A_h \rightarrow A_\infty$  uniformly on compact sets, where the matrix  $A_\infty, A_h$  are in the class  $\mathcal{A}$  defined in (15),  $\kappa_h \rightarrow \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . There exist a (not relabelled) subsequence and a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer  $(E, u)$  of  $\mathcal{F}_{A_\infty}$  in  $\Omega$  such that, for every open set  $U \Subset \Omega$ , it holds*

$$E_h \rightarrow E \text{ in } L^1(U), \quad u_h \rightarrow u \text{ in } H^1(U), \quad \Phi_{A_h}(E_h; U) \rightarrow \Phi_{A_\infty}(E; U).$$

In addition,

$$\text{if } x_h \in \partial E_h \cap U \text{ and } x_h \rightarrow x \in U, \text{ then } x \in \partial E \cap U, \quad (16)$$

$$\text{if } x \in \partial E \cap U, \text{ there exists } x_h \in \partial E_h \cap U \text{ such that } x_h \rightarrow x. \quad (17)$$

Finally, if we assume also that  $\nabla u_h \rightarrow 0$  weakly in  $L^2_{loc}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\kappa_h \rightarrow 0$ , as  $h \rightarrow +\infty$ , then  $E$  is a local minimizer of  $\Phi_{A_\infty}$ , that is

$$\Phi_{A_\infty}(E; B_r(x_0)) \leq \Phi_{A_\infty}(F; B_r(x_0)), \quad (18)$$

for every set  $F$  of locally finite perimeter such that  $F \Delta E \Subset B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$ .

*Proof.* Using the boundedness condition on  $\sup_h \mathcal{F}_{A_h}(E_h, u_h; \Omega)$ , we may assume that  $u_h$  weakly converges to  $u$  in  $H^1(U)$  and strongly in  $L^2(U)$ , and  $\mathbb{1}_{E_h}$  converges to  $\mathbb{1}_E$  in  $L^1(U)$ , as  $h \rightarrow +\infty$ . By a lower semicontinuity argument, we start proving the  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimality of  $(E, u)$ . Let us fix  $B_r(x_0) \Subset U$  and assume for simplicity of notation that  $x_0 = 0$ . Let  $(F, v)$  be a test pair such that  $F$  is a set of locally finite perimeter,  $F \Delta E \Subset B_r$  and  $\text{supp}(u - v) \Subset B_r$ . Possibly passing to a subsequence and using Fubini's theorem, we may choose  $0 < r_0 < \rho < r$  such that  $F \Delta E \Subset B_\rho$ ,  $E \setminus B_{r_0} = F \setminus B_{r_0}$ ,  $\text{supp}(u - v) \Subset B_\rho$ , and in addition,

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_\rho \cap \partial^* E) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_\rho \cap \partial^* E_h) = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_\rho \cap (F^{(1)} \Delta E_h^{(1)})) = 0. \quad (19)$$

Now we choose a cut-off function  $\psi \in C_0^1(B_r)$  such that  $\psi \equiv 1$  in  $B_\rho$  and define

$$v_h = \psi v + (1 - \psi)u_h, \quad F_h := (F \cap B_\rho) \cup (E_h \setminus B_\rho)$$

to test the minimality of  $(E_h, u_h)$ . Thanks to the  $(\kappa_h, \mu)$ -minimality of  $(E_h, u_h)$  and using also Proposition 2.2, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} \sigma_{E_h} |\nabla u_h|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_h}(E_h; B_r) \leq \int_{B_r} \sigma_{F_h} |\nabla v_h|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_h}(F_h; B_r) + \kappa_h |F_h \Delta E_h|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}} \\ & \leq \int_{B_r} \sigma_{E_h} (1 - \psi) |\nabla u_h|^2 dx + \int_{B_r} \sigma_{F_h} \psi |\nabla v|^2 dx + \int_{B_r} \nabla \psi |u - u_h|^2 dx \\ & + \Phi_{A_h}(F; B_\rho) + \Phi_{A_h}(E_h; B_r \setminus \overline{B_\rho}) + \Phi_{A_h}(B_\rho; F \Delta E_h) + \kappa_h |F_h \Delta E_h|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Using the uniform convergence  $A_h \rightarrow A_\infty$ , the strong convergence  $u_h \rightarrow u$  in  $L^2$ , condition (19), and getting rid of common terms, from the latter estimate we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} \sigma_{E_h} \psi |\nabla u_h|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_\infty}(E_h; B_\rho) \\ & \leq \int_{B_r} \sigma_{F_h} \psi |\nabla v|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_\infty}(F; B_\rho) + \kappa_h |F_h \Delta E_h|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}} + \varepsilon_h, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\varepsilon_h \rightarrow 0$ . By the lower semicontinuity of the anisotropic perimeter (see [43, Proposition 3.1]), the equi-integrability of  $(\nabla u_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the lower semicontinuity of Dirichlet integral, we infer that

$$\int_{B_r} \sigma_E \psi |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_\infty}(E; B_\rho) \leq \int_{B_r} \sigma_F \psi |\nabla v|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_\infty}(F; B_\rho) + \kappa |F \Delta E|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}}.$$

Letting  $\psi \downarrow \chi_{B_\rho}$  we get

$$\int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_\infty}(E; B_\rho) \leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_\infty}(F; B_\rho) + \kappa |F \Delta E|^{\frac{\mu+n-1}{n}}. \quad (21)$$

Similarly, choosing  $E = F$  and  $u = v$  in (20), and arguing as before we get

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \left( \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_{E_h} \psi |\nabla u_h|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_\infty}(E_h; B_\rho) \right) \leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E \psi |\nabla u|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_h}(E; B_\rho).$$

Letting  $\psi \downarrow \chi_{B_\rho}$  we conclude

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi_{A_h}(E_h; B_\rho) = \Phi_{A_\infty}(E; B_\rho), \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_{E_h} |\nabla u_h|^2 dx = \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx.$$

With a usual argument we can deduce  $u_h \rightarrow u$  in  $W^{1,2}(U)$  and  $\Phi_{A_h}(E_h; U) \rightarrow \Phi_{A_\infty}(E; U)$ , for every open set  $U \Subset \Omega$ . The topological information stated in (16) and (17) follows as in [40, Theorem 21.14], indeed they are a consequence of the lower and upper density estimates given above. Finally, if  $\nabla u_h \rightharpoonup 0$  weakly in  $L^2_{loc}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\kappa_h \rightarrow 0$ , we can choose  $v = u$  in (21), deriving (18).  $\square$

## 6 Reverse Poincaré inequality

In this section we derive a reverse Poincaré inequality which lets us estimate the excess around a point of the boundary of the transformed set with its flatness. The first step in the proof is to establish a weak form of this inequality.

In the following proposition, it is proved that if the anisotropy matrix valued in a point  $x_0$  is the identity, then around  $x_0$  the anisotropic perimeter is comparable to the perimeter.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r > 0$ . There exists a positive constant  $c_9 = c_9(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$  such that if  $(E, u)$  is a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  in  $B_1$ , with  $0 \in \partial E \cap B_1$ , then*

$$\int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(E; B_\rho)$$

$$\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(F; B_\rho) + c_9(\kappa + [A]_{C^\gamma}) r^\mu \rho^{n-1+\mu},$$

for every  $(F, v)$  such that  $F \triangle E \subseteq B_\rho \subset B_1$  and  $v \in u + H_0^1(B_\rho)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(F, v)$  be such that  $F \triangle E \subseteq B_\rho$  and  $v \in u + H_0^1(B_\rho)$ . We can assume that

$$\int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(E; B_\rho) \geq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(F; B_\rho).$$

We remark that  $A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}$  is Hölder continuous and

$$[A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}]_{C^\mu} \leq \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{\lambda} [A]_{C^\mu} r^\mu.$$

Since  $(A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1})(0) = I$ , by the Hölder continuity of  $A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}$  we infer

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu_E| &= \langle (A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1})(0) \nu_E, \nu_E \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \langle (A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1})(x) \nu_E, \nu_E \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2\lambda} [A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}]_{C^\mu} \rho^\mu \\ &\leq \langle (A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1})(x) \nu_E, \nu_E \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{2\lambda^2} [A]_{C^\mu} (r\rho)^\mu, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $x \in B_\rho$ . Integrating over  $B_\rho$  with respect to the measure  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner \partial^* E$  and adding to both sides the term  $\int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(E; B_\rho) &\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(E; B_\rho) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{2\lambda^2} [A]_{C^\mu} (r\rho)^\mu P(E; B_\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Arguing in a similar way, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(F; B_\rho) &\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(F; B_\rho) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{2\lambda^2} [A]_{C^\mu} (r\rho)^\mu P(F; B_\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the definition of  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimality of  $(E, u)$  and using the previous two inequalities, we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(E; B_\rho) \\ &\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(E; B_\rho) + \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{2\lambda^2} [A]_{C^\mu} (r\rho)^\mu P(E; B_\rho) \\ &\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + \Phi_{A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}(F; B_\rho) + \kappa r^\mu |E \triangle F|^{\frac{n-1+\mu}{n}} + \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{2\lambda^2} [A]_{C^\mu} (r\rho)^\mu P(E; B_\rho) \\ &\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(F; B_\rho) + c(n) \kappa r^\mu \rho^{n-1+\mu} \\ &\quad + \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{2\lambda^2} [A]_{C^\mu} (r\rho)^\mu [P(E; B_\rho) + P(F; B_\rho)] \\ &\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(F; B_\rho) + c(n) \kappa r^\mu \rho^{n-1+\mu} \\ &\quad + \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{\mu}{2}}}{2\lambda^2} [A]_{C^\mu} (r\rho)^\mu \left[ 2P(E; B_\rho) + \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_E |\nabla u|^2 dx \right] \\ &\leq \int_{B_\rho} \sigma_F |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(F; B_\rho) + c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, c_3) \left( \kappa + [A]_{C^\gamma} \right) r^\mu \rho^{n-1+\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_3$  is the constant appearing in Theorem 4.2, which leads to the thesis.  $\square$

At this point, we are able to establish a weak form of the reverse Poincaré inequality. The strategy for its proof is the same outlined in [40, Lemma 24.9] (see also [43, Lemma 7.3] or [25, Lemma 10]).

**Lemma 6.2** (Weak reverse Poincaré inequality). *Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r > 0$ . If  $(E, u)$  is a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  in  $\mathbf{C}_4$  such that*

$$|x_n| < \frac{1}{8}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{C}_2 \cap \partial E,$$

$$\left| \left\{ x \in \mathbf{C}_2 \setminus E : x_n < -\frac{1}{8} \right\} \right| = \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbf{C}_2 \cap E : x_n > \frac{1}{8} \right\} \right| = 0,$$

and if  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and  $s > 0$  are such that

$$\mathbf{K}_s(z) \subset \mathbf{C}_2, \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial E \cap \partial \mathbf{K}_s(z)) = 0, \quad (22)$$

then, for every  $|c| < \frac{1}{4}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(E; \mathbf{K}_{\frac{s}{2}}(z)) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{s}{2}}(z)) &\leq c_{10} \left\{ \left[ P(E; \mathbf{K}_s(z)) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_s(z)) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \int_{\mathbf{K}_s(z) \cap \partial^* E} \frac{(x_n - c)^2}{s^2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \int_{\mathbf{K}_s(z)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + (\kappa + [A]_{C^\mu}) r^\mu, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $c_{10} = c_{10}(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that  $z = 0$ . The set function

$$m(G) = P(E; \mathbf{C}_2 \cap p^{-1}(G)) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G), \quad \text{for } G \subset \mathbf{D}_2,$$

defines a Radon measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , supported in  $\mathbf{D}_2$ . Since  $E$  is a set of locally finite perimeter, by [40, Theorem 13.8] there exist a sequence  $(E_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  of open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with smooth boundary and a vanishing sequence  $(\varepsilon_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$E_h \xrightarrow{\text{loc}} E, \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner \partial E_h \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner \partial E, \quad \partial E_h \subset I_{\varepsilon_h}(\partial E),$$

as  $h \rightarrow +\infty$ , where  $I_{\varepsilon_h}(\partial E)$  is a tubular neighborhood of  $\partial E$  with half-length  $\varepsilon_h$ . By the coarea formula we get

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial \mathbf{K}_{\rho s} \cap (E^{(1)} \Delta E_h)) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } \rho \in \left( \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4} \right).$$

Moreover, provided  $h$  is large enough, by  $\partial E_h \subset I_{\varepsilon_h}(\partial E)$ , we get:

$$|x_n| < \frac{1}{4}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{C}_2 \cap \partial E_h,$$

$$\left\{ x \in \mathbf{C}_2 : x_n < -\frac{1}{4} \right\} \subset \mathbf{C}_2 \cap E_h \subset \left\{ x \in \mathbf{C}_2 : x_n < \frac{1}{4} \right\}.$$

Therefore, given  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$  and  $|c| < \frac{1}{4}$ , we are in position to apply [40, Lemma 24.8] to every  $E_h$  to deduce that there exists  $I_h \subset (\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4})$ , with  $|I_h| \geq \frac{1}{24}$ , and, for any  $\rho \in I_h$ , there exists an open subset  $F_h$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of locally finite perimeter such that

$$F_h \cap \partial \mathbf{K}_{\rho s} = E_h \cap \partial \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_{\frac{s}{2}} \cap \partial F_h = \mathbf{D}_{\frac{s}{2}} \times \{c\},$$

$$P(F_h; \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\rho s}) \leq c(n) \left\{ \lambda \left( P(E_h; \mathbf{K}_s) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_s) \right) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbf{K}_s \cap \partial E_h} \frac{|x_n - c|^2}{s^2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right\} \quad (24)$$

Clearly  $\bigcap_{h \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{k \geq h} |I_k| \geq \frac{1}{24} > 0$  and thus there exist a divergent subsequence  $(h_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\rho \in (\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4})$  such that

$$\rho \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} I_{h_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial \mathbf{K}_{\rho s} \cap (E^{(1)} \Delta E_{h_k})) = 0.$$

We will write  $F_k$  in place of  $F_{h_k}$ . We consider the comparison set  $G_k = (F_k \cap \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) \cup (E \setminus \mathbf{K}_{\rho s})$ . By applying [40, formula (16.33)] we infer that

$$P(G_k; \mathbf{K}_s) = P(F_k; \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) + P(E; \mathbf{K}_s \setminus \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) + \sigma_k,$$

where, thanks to (23),  $\sigma_k = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial \mathbf{K}_{\rho s} \cap (E^{(1)} \Delta F_k)) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial \mathbf{K}_{\rho s} \cap (E^{(1)} \Delta E_{h_k})) \rightarrow 0$ , as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ . We apply Proposition 6.1, deducing the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\text{spt}(u-v)} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(E; B_{\bar{\rho}}) \\ & \leq \int_{\text{spt}(u-v)} \sigma_G |\nabla v A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx + P(G; B_{\bar{\rho}}) + c(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) (\kappa r^\mu + [A]_{C^\mu} r^\mu) \bar{\rho}^{n-1+\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

for every  $(G, v)$  such that  $G \Delta E \subseteq B_{\bar{\rho}} \subset \mathbf{C}_4$  and  $v \in u + H_0^1(B_{\bar{\rho}})$ .

Now we test the previous relation of minimality with  $(G_k, u)$ , as  $E \Delta G_k \subseteq \mathbf{K}_s \subset B_4 \subset \mathbf{C}_4$ , and get rid of the common terms obtaining

$$P(E; \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) \leq P(F_k; \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) + \sigma_k + c(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \left[ \int_{\mathbf{K}_{\rho s}} |\nabla u|^2 dx + (\kappa r^\mu + [A]_{C^\mu} r^\mu) \right]. \quad (25)$$

Thus, since  $m$  is nondecreasing and  $\rho \in (\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4})$ , by (25) and (24) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} P(E; \mathbf{K}_{\frac{s}{2}}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{s}{2}}) &= m(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{s}{2}}) \leq m(\mathbf{D}_{\rho s}) = P(E; \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\rho s}) \\ &\leq P(F_k; \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\rho s}) + \sigma_k + c \left[ \int_{\mathbf{K}_{\rho s}} |\nabla u|^2 dx + (\kappa + [A]_{C^\mu}) r^\mu \right] \\ &\leq c(n) \left\{ \lambda (P(E_{h_k}; \mathbf{K}_s) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_s)) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbf{K}_s \cap \partial E_{h_k}} \frac{|x_n - c|^2}{s^2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right\} \\ &+ c \left[ \int_{\mathbf{K}_s} |\nabla u|^2 dx + (\kappa + [A]_{C^\mu}) r^\mu \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $c = c(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ . Letting  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ , (22) implies that  $P(E_{h(k)}; \mathbf{K}_s) \rightarrow P(E; \mathbf{K}_s)$  and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P(E; \mathbf{K}_{\frac{s}{2}}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{s}{2}}) &\leq c \left\{ \lambda (P(E; \mathbf{K}_s) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_s)) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbf{K}_s \cap \partial E} \frac{|x_n - c|^2}{s^2} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{K}_{rs}} |\nabla u|^2 dx + (\kappa + [A]_{C^\mu}) r^\mu \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

for any  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ . If  $\lambda > \frac{1}{4}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} P(E; \mathbf{K}_{\frac{s}{2}}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{s}{2}}) &= m(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{s}{2}}) \leq m(\mathbf{D}_{\rho s}) \\ &\leq 4\lambda P(E; \mathbf{K}_{\rho s}) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{\rho s}) \leq c(n)\lambda (P(E; \mathbf{K}_s) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_s)), \end{aligned}$$

and thus (26) holds true for  $\lambda > 0$ , provided we choose  $c(n) \geq 4$ . Minimizing over  $\lambda$ , we get the thesis.  $\square$

Finally, we are able to prove the main result of this section.



**Theorem 6.3** (Reverse Poincaré inequality). *Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r > 0$ . There exist two positive constants  $c_{11} = c_{11}(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$  and  $\varepsilon_5 = \varepsilon_5(n)$  such that if  $(E, u)$  is a  $(\kappa r^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$  in  $\mathbf{C}_{4\tau}(0, \nu)$ , with  $0 \in \partial E$ ,  $\tau > 0$  and*

$$\mathbf{e}^C(0, 4\tau, \nu) < \varepsilon_5,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}^C(0, \tau, \nu) \leq & c_{11} \left( \frac{1}{\tau^{n+1}} \int_{\partial E \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\tau}(0, \nu)} |\langle \nu, x \rangle - c|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{\tau^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\tau}(0, \nu)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + (\kappa + [A]_{C^\mu})(\tau r)^\mu \right), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for every  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* The proof of this result follows the same strategy employed in [25, Theorem 6]. We emphasize only small differences between the two proofs. Up to a rotation and employing a usual scaling argument, by Proposition 3.2, with a small abuse of notation, we may assume that  $(E, u)$  is a  $(\kappa(\tau r)^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, \tau r}^{-1}}$  in  $\mathbf{C}_4$ , with  $0 \in \partial \tilde{E}$ . Leveraging the compactness of the perimeter and Theorem 4.9, it is possible to show that

$$\begin{aligned} |x_n| &< \frac{1}{4}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{C}_2 \cap \partial E, \\ \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbf{C}_2 \setminus E : x_n < -\frac{1}{8} \right\} \right| &= \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbf{C}_2 \cap E : x_n > \frac{1}{8} \right\} \right| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and  $s > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{K}_s(z) \subset \mathbf{C}_2, \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial E \cap \partial \mathbf{K}_s(z)) = 0,$$

we apply Lemma 6.2, deducing that, for every  $|c| < \frac{1}{4}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(E; \mathbf{K}_s(z)) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_s(z)) \leq & c \left\{ \left[ P(E; \mathbf{K}_{2s}(z)) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{D}_{2s}(z)) \right] \inf_{|c| < \frac{1}{4}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_2 \cap \partial E} |x_n - c|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + \int_{\mathbf{K}_s} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \kappa \tau r^\mu + [A]_{C^\mu}(\tau r)^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

for some positive constant  $c = c(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ . Hence, proceeding as in [25, Theorem 6], by a covering argument, it is possible to show that (28) implies (27).  $\square$

## 7 Proof of the main theorem

The strategy adopted to establish the main result involves two key steps: first proving a first variation formula for the bulk energy of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, r}^{-1}}$ , then establishing an excess improvement theorem for transformed couples, which in turn implies an analogous theorem for the original ones.

**Proposition 7.1** (First variation formula for the bulk term).  *$x_0 \in \Omega$ ,  $u \in H^1(B_1)$  and  $X \in C_c^1(B_1; \mathbb{R}^n)$ . We define  $\Phi_t(x) = x + tX(x)$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $t > 0$ . Accordingly, we define*

$$E_t := \Phi_t(E), \quad u_t := u \circ \Phi_t^{-1}.$$

There exist two constants  $c_{12} = c_{12}(\beta, \lambda, \nabla X) > 0$  and  $t_0 > 0$  such that it holds that

$$\int_{B_1} \sigma_{E_t} |\nabla u_t A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx - \int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx \leq c_{12}(t + o(t)) \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 dx,$$

for any  $0 < t < t_0$ .

*Proof.* Taking into account that

$$\nabla\Phi_t^{-1}(\Phi_t(x)) = I - t\nabla X(x) + o(t), \quad \mathbf{J}\Phi_t(x) = 1 + t\operatorname{div}X(x) + o(t),$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $t > 0$ , by the change of variable  $y = \Phi_t(x)$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1} \sigma_{E_t} |\nabla u_t A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dy - \int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{B_1} \sigma_E |[\nabla u - t\nabla u \nabla X + \nabla u o(t)] A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 (1 + t\operatorname{div}X + o(t)) dx - \int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{B_1} \sigma_E [|\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 + |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 (t\operatorname{div}X + o(t))] dx + H(t, \nabla u, \nabla X) \\ &\quad - \int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 (t\operatorname{div}X + o(t)) dx + H(t, \nabla u, \nabla X), \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, \nabla u, \nabla X) &= \int_{B_1} \sigma_E |[-t\nabla u \nabla X + \nabla u o(t)] A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 (1 + t\operatorname{div}X + o(t)) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{B_1} 2 \left\langle \nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0), (-t\nabla u \nabla X + \nabla u o(t)) A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0) \right\rangle (1 + t\operatorname{div}X + o(t)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate

$$\int_{B_1} \sigma_E |\nabla u A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 (t\operatorname{div}X + o(t)) dx \leq c(\beta, \lambda, \nabla X)(t + o(t)) \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 dx \tag{30}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, \nabla u, \nabla X) &\leq c(\beta, \lambda, \nabla X) \int_{B_1} (t + o(t))^2 |\nabla u|^2 (1 + t\operatorname{div}X + o(t)) dx \\ &\quad + c(\beta, \lambda, \nabla X) \int_{B_1} (t + o(t)) |\nabla u|^2 (1 + t\operatorname{div}X + o(t)) dx \\ &\leq c(\beta, \lambda, \nabla X)(t + o(t)) \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Inserting (31) and (30) in (29) we get the desired inequality.  $\square$

Here we present the proof of the excess improvement theorem for transformed couples.

**Theorem 7.2** (Excess improvement for the transformed couple). *For any  $\omega \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma} \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\tilde{M} > 0$ ,  $\tilde{\tau} \in (0, \frac{1}{16})$  there exists a constant  $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{M}, \tilde{\tau}) > 0$  such that if  $(\tilde{E}, \tilde{u})$  is a  $(\tilde{\kappa}, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}$  in  $B_{\tilde{r}}(x_0)$ , with  $x_0 \in \partial\tilde{E}$ , such that*

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}}(x_0, \tilde{r}) + \tilde{r}^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq \tilde{M}\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{r}),$$

then there exists a constant  $c_{13} = c_{13}(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{\tau}\tilde{r}) \leq c_{13}(\tilde{\tau}^2 \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) + \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}}(x_0, 4\tilde{\tau}\tilde{r}) + (\tilde{\tau}\tilde{r})^\mu).$$

*Proof.* Let us assume by contradiction that there exist a vanishing sequence  $(\tilde{r}_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$  and a sequence  $((\tilde{E}_h, \tilde{u}_h))_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $(\tilde{\kappa}, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A}$  in  $B_{\tilde{r}_h}(x_0)$ , with  $x_0 \in \partial\tilde{E}_h$ , such that

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, x_0, \tilde{r}_h) =: \varepsilon_h \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}_h}(x_0, \tilde{r}_h) + \tilde{r}_h^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq \tilde{M}\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, x_0, \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{r}_h),$$

and

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, x_0, \tilde{r}_h) > \bar{C}(\tilde{r}_h^2 \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, x_0, \tilde{r}_h) + \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}_h}(x_0, 4\tilde{r}_h) + (\tilde{r}_h)^\mu),$$

for some constant  $\bar{C} > 0$  to be chosen. Employing the usual scaling argument and applying Proposition 3.2, with a small abuse of notation we may assume that  $((\tilde{E}_h, \tilde{u}_h))_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of  $(\tilde{\kappa} \tilde{r}_h^\mu, \mu)$ -minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0} \circ \Psi_{x_0, \tilde{r}_h}^{-1}}$  in  $B_1$ , with  $0 \in \partial \tilde{E}_h$ , such that

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, 1) = \varepsilon_h \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}_h}(0, 1) + \tilde{r}_h^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq \tilde{M} \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, \tilde{\sigma}), \quad (32)$$

and

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, \tilde{\tau}) > \bar{C}(\tilde{\tau}^2 \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, 1) + \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}_h}(0, 4\tilde{\tau}) + (\tilde{\tau} \tilde{r}_h)^\mu).$$

Up to rotating each  $\tilde{E}_h$  we may also assume that, for all  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, 1) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap B_1} |\nu_{E_h} - e_n|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

**Step 1.** Thanks to the Lipschitz approximation theorem, for  $h$  sufficiently large, there exists a 1-Lipschitz function  $f_h: \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |f_h| \leq c_8 \varepsilon_h^{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}((\partial \tilde{E}_h \Delta \Gamma_{f_h}) \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq c_8 \varepsilon_h, \quad \int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\nabla' f_h|^2 dx' \leq c_8 \varepsilon_h. \quad (33)$$

We define

$$g_h(x') := \frac{f_h(x') - a_h}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}}, \quad \text{where } a_h = \int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} f_h dx',$$

and we assume, up to a subsequence, that  $\{g_h\}_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly in  $H^1(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}})$  and strongly in  $L^2(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}})$  to a function  $g$ . We prove that  $g$  is harmonic in  $\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . It is enough to show that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\langle \nabla' f_h, \nabla' \phi \rangle}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla' f_h|^2}} dx' = 0,$$

for all  $\phi \in C_0^1(\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}})$ . We fix  $\delta > 0$  so that  $\text{supp } \phi \times [-2\delta, 2\delta] \subset B_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and choose a cut-off function  $\psi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with  $\text{supp } \psi \subset (-2\delta, 2\delta)$ ,  $\psi = 1$  in  $(-\delta, \delta)$ . Let us define

$$\Phi_h(x) := x + \tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu} X(x), \quad \text{where } X(x) = \phi(x') \psi(x_n) e_n,$$

for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . We apply Proposition 6.1 to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tilde{E}_h; B_{\frac{1}{2}}) - P(\Phi_h(\tilde{E}_h); B_{\frac{1}{2}}) &\leq \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \sigma_{\Phi_h(\tilde{E}_h)} |\nabla(\tilde{u}_h \circ \Phi_h^{-1}) A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx - \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \sigma_{\tilde{E}_h} |\nabla \tilde{u}_h A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx \\ &\quad + c(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \left( \tilde{\kappa} \tilde{r}_h^\mu + [A]_{C^\mu} \tilde{r}_h^\mu \right) \frac{1}{2^{n-1+\mu}}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Using the first variation formula for the perimeter and Proposition 7.1, for  $h$  sufficiently large, we get:

$$P(\tilde{E}_h; B_{\frac{1}{2}}) - P(\Phi_h(\tilde{E}_h); B_{\frac{1}{2}}) = (\tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu} + O(\tilde{r}_h^{2\omega\mu})) \int_{\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}, \quad (35)$$

and

$$\int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \sigma_{\Phi_h(\tilde{E}_h)} |\nabla(\tilde{u}_h \circ \Phi_h^{-1}) A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx - \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \sigma_{\tilde{E}_h} |\nabla \tilde{u}_h A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dx$$

$$\leq c(\tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu} + o(\tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu})) \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\nabla \tilde{u}_h|^2 dx, \quad (36)$$

for some  $c = c(\beta, \lambda, \nabla\phi, \nabla\psi) > 0$ . Inserting (36) and (35) in (34), dividing by  $\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}(\tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu} + O(\tilde{r}_h^{2\omega\mu}))$  and taking (32) into account, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \int_{\partial\tilde{E}_h \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\ & \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}(\tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu} + O(\tilde{r}_h^{2\omega\mu}))} \left( (\tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu} + o(\tilde{r}_h^{\omega\mu})) \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\nabla \tilde{u}_h|^2 dx + \tilde{r}_h^\mu \right) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} (\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}_h}(0, 1) + \tilde{r}_h^{(1-\omega)\mu}) \\ & \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, \tilde{\sigma}) \leq c\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $c = c(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \tilde{\kappa}, \mu, [A]_{C^\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{M}, \nabla\phi, \nabla\psi) > 0$ . Replacing  $\phi$  with  $-\phi$ , we infer that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \left| \int_{\partial\tilde{E}_h \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| = 0. \quad (37)$$

Decomposing  $\partial\tilde{E}_h \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}} = ([\Gamma_{f_h} \cup (\partial\tilde{E}_h \setminus \Gamma_{f_h})] \setminus (\Gamma_{f_h} \setminus \partial\tilde{E}_h)) \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \int_{\partial\tilde{E}_h \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \left[ -\int_{\Gamma_{f_h} \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right. \\ & \left. - \int_{(\partial\tilde{E}_h \setminus \Gamma_{f_h}) \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + \int_{(\Gamma_{f_h} \setminus \partial\tilde{E}_h) \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since by the second inequality in (33) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \int_{(\partial\tilde{E}_h \setminus \Gamma_{f_h}) \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| \leq c_8 \sqrt{\varepsilon_h} \sup_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |\nabla' \phi|, \\ & \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \int_{(\Gamma_{f_h} \setminus \partial\tilde{E}_h) \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| \leq c_8 \sqrt{\varepsilon_h} \sup_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |\nabla' \phi|, \end{aligned}$$

then, by (37) and the area formula, we infer

$$0 = \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{-1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \int_{\Gamma_{f_h} \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle \nu_{\tilde{E}_h}, e_n \rangle \langle \nabla' \phi, \nu'_{\tilde{E}_h} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_h}} \int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\langle \nabla' f_h, \nabla' \phi \rangle}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla' f_h|^2}} dx'.$$

This proves that  $g$  is harmonic in  $\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**Step 2.** The proof of this step now follows exactly as in [29] using the height bound lemma and the reverse Poincaré inequality. We give here the proof for the sake of completeness. Setting

$$b_h := \frac{(f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}}{\sqrt{1 + |(\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}|^2}}, \quad \nu_h := \frac{(-\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}, 1}{\sqrt{1 + |(\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}|^2}}.$$

We want to estimate from above the flatness of  $\partial\tilde{E}_h$  towards the hyperplane  $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y, \nu_h \rangle = b_h\}$  in  $B_{4\tilde{\tau}}$  with the excess. More precisely, we show that

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_h \tilde{\tau}^{n+1}} \int_{\partial\tilde{E}_h \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |\langle \nu_h, x \rangle - b_h|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq c(n, c_8) \tilde{\tau}^2. \quad (38)$$

On one hand, by the mean value property of harmonic functions (see [40, Lemma 25.1]), Jensen's inequality, semicontinuity and the third inequality in (33) we deduce that

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_h \tilde{\tau}^{n+1}} \int_{\partial\tilde{E}_h \cap \Gamma_{f_h} \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |\langle \nu_h, x \rangle - b_h|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_h \tilde{\tau}^{n+1}} \int_{\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap \Gamma_{f_h} \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}} \frac{|\langle -(\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}, x' \rangle + f_h(x') - (f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}|^2}{1 + |(\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}|^2} \sqrt{1 + |\nabla' f_h(x')|^2} dx' \\
&\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_h \tilde{\tau}^{n+1}} \int_{\mathbf{D}_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |f_h(x') - (f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}} - \langle (\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}, x' \rangle|^2 dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{\tilde{\tau}^{n+1}} \int_{\mathbf{D}_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |g(x') - (g)_{4\tilde{\tau}} - \langle (\nabla' g)_{4\tilde{\tau}}, x' \rangle|^2 dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{\tilde{\tau}^{n+1}} \int_{\mathbf{D}_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |g(x') - g(0) - \langle \nabla' g(0), x' \rangle|^2 dx' \\
&\leq c(n) \tilde{\tau}^2 \sup_{x' \in \mathbf{D}_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |g(x') - g(0) - \langle \nabla' g(0), x' \rangle|^2 \\
&\leq c(n) \tilde{\tau}^2 \int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\nabla' g|^2 dx' \leq c(n) \tilde{\tau}^2 \liminf_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\nabla' g_h|^2 dx' \leq c(n, c_8) \tilde{\tau}^2, \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\mathbf{D}_{4\tilde{\tau}} \subset \mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{4}}$ , since  $\tilde{\tau} < \frac{1}{16}$ . On the other hand, from the height bound lemma (see Lemma 4.8) and (33), we immediately get that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_h} \int_{(\partial \tilde{E}_h \setminus \Gamma_{f_h}) \cap B_{2\tilde{\tau}}} |\langle \nu_h, x \rangle - b_h|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = 0. \tag{40}$$

Hence, combining (39) and (40), we conclude that (38) is satisfied. In order to apply the reverse Poincaré inequality, we show that the sequence  $\{\mathbf{e}_h(\tilde{E}_h, 4\tilde{\tau}, \nu_h)\}_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  is infinitesimal; indeed, by the definition of excess, Jensen's inequality and the third inequality in (33) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2(4\tilde{\tau})^{n-1} \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{e}_h(\tilde{E}_h, 0, 4\tilde{\tau}, \nu_h) &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |\nu_{\tilde{E}_h} - \nu_h|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\
&\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ 2 \int_{\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}} |\nu_{\tilde{E}_h} - e_n|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + 2|e_n - \nu_h|^2 \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}) \right] \\
&\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ 4\varepsilon_h + 2\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}) \frac{|((\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}, \sqrt{1 + |(\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}|^2} - 1)|^2}{1 + |(\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}|^2} \right] \\
&\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} [4\varepsilon_h + 4\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial E_h \cap B_{4\tilde{\tau}}) |(\nabla' f_h)_{4\tilde{\tau}}|^2] \\
&\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ 4\varepsilon_h + 4 \int_{\mathbf{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\nabla' f_h|^2 dx' \right] \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} [4\varepsilon_h + 4c_8\varepsilon_h] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying the reverse Poincaré inequality, (38) and observing that  $\mathbf{C}_{2\tilde{\tau}} \subset B_{4\tilde{\tau}}$ , we have for  $h$  large that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, \tau) &\leq \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, \tau, \nu_h) \\
&\leq c_{11} \left( \frac{1}{(2\tilde{\tau})^{n+1}} \int_{\partial \tilde{E}_h \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\tilde{\tau}}(0, \tilde{\tau})} |\langle \nu_h, x \rangle - b_h|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}_h}(0, 4\tilde{\tau}) + (\tilde{\kappa} + [A]_{C^\mu})(2\tilde{\tau}\tilde{r}_h)^\mu \right) \\
&\leq \tilde{C}(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) (\tilde{\tau}^2 \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}_h, 0, 1) + \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}_h}(0, 4\tilde{\tau}) + (\tilde{\tau}\tilde{r}_h)^\mu),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction if we choose  $\bar{C} > \tilde{C}$ . □

We use the previous theorem in the proof of the next result.

**Theorem 7.3** (Excess improvement). *For any  $\omega \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\sigma \in \left(0, \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$ ,  $M > 0$ ,  $\tau \in \left(0, \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{16\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$  there exists a constant  $\varepsilon_6 = \varepsilon_6(\sigma, M, \tau) > 0$  such that if  $(E, u)$  is a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  in  $B_r(x_0)$ , with  $x_0 \in \partial E$ , such that*

$$\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r) \leq \varepsilon_6, \quad \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq M\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \sigma r),$$

*then there exists a constant  $c_{14} = c_{14}(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \tau r) \leq c_{14}\tau^\mu (\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r) + \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^\mu).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma \in \left(0, \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$ ,  $M > 0$ ,  $\tau \in \left(0, \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{16\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$ , and let  $(E, u)$  be a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_A$  in  $B_r(x_0)$ , with  $x_0 \in \partial\tilde{E}$ , such that

$$\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r) \leq \varepsilon_6, \quad \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq M\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \sigma r).$$

Setting

$$(\tilde{E}, \tilde{u}) := (T_{x_0}(E), u \circ T_{x_0}^{-1}), \quad \tilde{\kappa} := \lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}}\kappa, \quad \tilde{r} := \theta r,$$

where  $\theta \in (0, \min\{\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}, 1\})$ , by Proposition 3.1 we have that  $(\tilde{E}, \tilde{u})$  is a  $(\tilde{\kappa}, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_{x_0, A_{x_0}}$  in  $B_{\tilde{r}}(x_0)$ . By Proposition 3.3, it holds that

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) \leq \bar{C}_1 \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r),$$

for some positive constant  $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_1(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$ . Furthermore, estimating

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}}(x_0, \tilde{r}) &= \frac{1}{(\theta r)^{n-1}} \int_{B_{\tilde{r}}(x_0)} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 dy = \frac{\det(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x_0))}{(\theta r)^{n-1}} \int_{T_{x_0}^{-1}(B_r(x_0))} |\nabla u A^{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)|^2 dy \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}} \Lambda}{(\theta r)^{n-1}} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dy = \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}} \Lambda}{\theta^{n-1}} \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) \end{aligned}$$

and applying again Proposition 3.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}}(x_0, \tilde{r}) + \tilde{r}^{(1-\omega)\mu} &\leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) (\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu}) \leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) M \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \sigma r) \\ &\leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) M \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \sigma \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} r) \leq \bar{C}_2 M \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{r}), \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $\bar{C}_2 = \bar{C}_2(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$ , where  $\tilde{\sigma} := \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\theta} \sigma < 1$ , since  $\sigma < \theta \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Choosing  $\varepsilon_6 > 0$  such that  $\bar{C}_1 \varepsilon_6 < \tilde{\varepsilon}$  and setting  $\tilde{M} := \bar{C}_2 M$ , we apply Theorem 7.2 to obtain

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) \leq C(\tilde{\tau}^2 \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) + \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}}(x_0, 4\tilde{r}) + (\tilde{r})^\mu),$$

for some positive constant  $C = C(n, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, \mu, \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ , where  $\tilde{\tau} := \frac{\tau}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta} < \frac{1}{16}$ , since  $\tau < \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta}{16}$ . Leveraging Proposition 3.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \tau r) &= \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \tilde{\tau} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{r}) \leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) \\ &\leq C(\tilde{\tau}^2 \mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) + \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}}(x_0, 4\tilde{r}) + (\tilde{r})^\mu). \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

On one hand, by Proposition 3.3 we observe that

$$\mathbf{e}(\tilde{E}, x_0, \tilde{r}) \leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{r}) \leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r), \tag{42}$$

being  $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{r} \leq r$ . On the other hand, choosing  $\varepsilon_6 < \varepsilon_2$ , by Proposition 4.7 it follows

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{u}}(x_0, 4\tilde{r}) \leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, 4\tilde{\tau} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{r}) \leq c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \tilde{\tau} \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r), \tag{43}$$

since  $4\tilde{\tau} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{r} \leq r$ , being  $\tau < \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{4\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ . Inserting (42) and (43) in (41), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, \tau r) &\leq C(\tilde{\tau}^2 \mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r) + \tilde{\tau} \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + \tilde{\tau}^\mu r^\mu) \\ &\leq C\tilde{\tau}^\mu (\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r) + \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^\mu) \\ &\leq C\tau^\mu (\mathbf{e}(E, x_0, r) + \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^\mu), \end{aligned}$$

which is the thesis.  $\square$

Leveraging the results proved in the previous sections, we are able to prove Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Let  $U \Subset \Omega$  be an open set. We prove that for every  $\omega \in (0, 1)$  and  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  there exist two positive constants  $\bar{\varepsilon} = \bar{\varepsilon}(\tau, U)$  and  $\bar{C}$  such that if  $x_0 \in \partial E$ ,  $B_r(x_0) \subset U$  and  $\mathbf{e}(x_0, r) + \mathcal{D}(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu} < \bar{\varepsilon}$ , then

$$\mathbf{e}(x_0, \tau r) + \mathcal{D}(x_0, \tau r) + (\tau r)^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq \bar{C} \tau^{(1-\omega)\mu} (\mathbf{e}(x_0, r) + \mathcal{D}(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu}). \quad (44)$$

We fix  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ . Setting

$$\bar{\tau} := \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{16\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \bar{\sigma} := \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\tau < \min \left\{ \bar{\tau}, \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \right\} = \bar{\tau}.$$

Furthermore we fix  $\sigma := 2\tau < \bar{\sigma}$ . We distinguish two cases.

*Case 1:*  $\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq \tau^{-1} \mathbf{e}(x_0, \sigma r)$ . Choosing  $\bar{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon_6(\sigma, \tau, \tau)$  it follows from Theorem 7.3 that

$$\mathbf{e}(x_0, \tau r) \leq c_{14} \tau^\mu (\mathbf{e}(x_0, r) + \mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^\mu).$$

Furthermore, choosing  $\bar{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon_2(\tau)$ , applying Proposition 4.7 we get (44).

*Case 2:*  $\mathbf{e}(x_0, \sigma r) \leq \tau (\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu})$ . By the property of the excess at different scales, we infer

$$\mathbf{e}(x_0, \tau r) \leq 2^{n-1} \mathbf{e}(x_0, \sigma r) \leq 2^{n-1} \tau (\mathcal{D}_u(x_0, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu}),$$

obtaining (44).

Thus, choosing  $\bar{\varepsilon} = \min\{\varepsilon_2(\tau), \varepsilon_6(2\tau, \tau, \tau)\}$ , we conclude that the inequality (44) is verified.

We fix  $\sigma \in (0, \frac{(1-\omega)\mu}{2})$  and choose  $\tau_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\bar{C} \tau_0^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq \tau_0^{2\sigma}$  and we define

$$\Gamma \cap U := \{x \in \partial E \cap U : \mathbf{e}(x, r) + \mathcal{D}(x, r) + r^{(1-\omega)\mu} < \bar{\varepsilon}(\tau_0, U), \text{ for some } r > 0 \text{ such that } B_r(x_0) \subset U\}.$$

We note that  $\Gamma \cap U$  is relatively open in  $\partial E$ . We show that  $\Gamma \cap U$  is a  $C^{1,\sigma}$ -hypersurface. Indeed, inequality (44) implies via standard iteration argument that if  $x_0 \in \Gamma \cap U$  there exist  $r_0 > 0$  and a neighborhood  $V$  of  $x_0$  such that for every  $x \in \partial E \cap V$  it holds:

$$\mathbf{e}(x, \tau_0^k r_0) + \mathcal{D}(x, \tau_0^k r_0) + (\tau_0^k r_0)^{(1-\omega)\mu} \leq \tau_0^{2\sigma k}, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

In particular,  $\mathbf{e}(x, \tau_0^k r_0) \leq \tau_0^{2\sigma k}$  and, arguing as in [29], we obtain that for every  $x \in \partial E \cap V$  and  $0 < s < t < r_0$  it holds

$$|(\nu_E)_s(x) - (\nu_E)_t(x)| \leq ct^\sigma,$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, \tau_0, r_0)$ , where

$$(\nu_E)_t(x) = \int_{\partial E \cap B_t(x)} \nu_E d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

The previous estimate first implies that  $\Gamma \cap U$  is  $C^1$ . By a standard argument we then deduce again from the same estimate that  $\Gamma \cap U$  is a  $C^{1,\sigma}$ -hypersurface. Since  $\omega$  is arbitrary, we gain that  $\Gamma$  is a  $C^{1,\sigma}$ -hypersurface, for any  $\sigma \in (0, \frac{n}{2})$ . We define  $\Gamma := \cup_i (\Gamma \cap U_i)$ , where  $(U_i)_i$  is an increasing sequence of open sets such that  $U_i \Subset \Omega$  and  $\Omega = \cup_i U_i$ . We are left to prove that there exists  $\eta > 0$  such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1-\eta}(\partial E \setminus \Gamma) = 0.$$

Setting  $\Sigma = \left\{x \in \partial E \setminus \Gamma : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{D}(x, r) = 0\right\}$ , by [29, Lemma 2.1] we have that  $\nabla u \in L_{loc}^{2(1+\eta)}(\Omega)$  for some  $\eta = \eta(n, \alpha, \beta) > 1$  and we have that

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}} \left( \left\{x \in \Omega : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{D}(x, r) > 0\right\} \right) \leq n - 1 - \eta.$$

The conclusion follows in a standard way as in [29] (see also [15] and [17]) showing that  $\Sigma = \emptyset$  if  $n \leq 7$  and  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\Sigma) \leq n - 8$  if  $n \geq 8$ . In both cases, Lemma 5.1 will be employed.  $\square$

## 8 An application to a constrained problem

In this section we show an application of Theorem 1.2 to the following constrained problem:

$$\min_{\substack{E \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega) \\ v \in u_0 + H_0^1(\Omega)}} \{ \mathcal{F}_A(E, v; \Omega) : |E| = d \}, \quad (P_c)$$

where  $u_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$ ,  $0 < d < |\Omega|$  are given and  $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$  is the class of all subsets of  $\Omega$  with finite perimeter. We assume that  $\Omega$  is connected.

In this perspective we need to distinguish the Hölder exponent of the matrix  $A$ , which we denote here with  $\gamma$ , from the exponent  $\mu$  appearing in the Definition 1.1. In Theorem 8.2, we show that, for sufficiently large values of  $\kappa > 0$ , minimizing couples of  $(P_c)$  are solutions of the following penalized problem

$$\min_{\substack{E \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega) \\ v \in u_0 + H_0^1(\Omega)}} \mathcal{F}_\kappa(E, v; \Omega), \quad (P)$$

where the functional  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_\kappa(E, v; \Omega) := \mathcal{F}_A(E, v; \Omega) + \kappa ||E| - d|^\gamma.$$

Now we prove the penalization theorem. For simplicity of notation, we denote

$$a(x, \nu) = \langle A(x)\nu, \nu \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall x, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It will be advantageous to have some estimates about the dependence of the integrand  $a$  on  $x$  and  $\nu$ .

**Remark 8.1** (Continuity of  $a$  with respect to  $x$  and  $\nu$ ). *It is straightforward to check that the following inequalities hold:*

$$|a(x, \nu) - a(y, \nu)| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} [A]_{C^\mu} |x - y|^\mu, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad |\nu| = 1. \quad (45)$$

$$|a(x, \xi) - a(x, \eta)| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda}} |\xi - \eta|, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (46)$$

As explained before, the proof of the equivalence between the solution of the constrained problem  $(P_c)$  and the penalized problem  $(P)$  follows. We adapt a result proved in [23] to our setting.

**Theorem 8.2.** *There exists  $\kappa_0 > 0$  such that if  $(E, u)$  is a minimizer of the functional*

$$\mathcal{F}_\kappa(F, w) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma_F |\nabla w|^2 dx + \Phi_A(F; \Omega) + \kappa ||F| - d|^\gamma, \quad (47)$$

for some  $\kappa \geq \kappa_0 > 0$ , among all configurations  $(F, w)$  such that  $w = u_0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , then  $|E| = d$  and  $(E, u)$  is a minimizer of problem  $(P_c)$ . Conversely, if  $(E, u)$  is a minimizer of problem  $(P_c)$ , then it is a minimizer of (47), for all  $\kappa \geq \kappa_0$ .

*Proof.* The argument is very similar to the one in [23, Theorem 1] (see also [24] and [25]). For reader's convenience, we give here the sketch of the proof, emphasizing main ideas and some differences with respect to the case treated in [23].

The first part of the theorem can be proved by contradiction. We assume that there exist a positive sequence  $(\kappa_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\kappa_h \rightarrow +\infty$ , as  $h \rightarrow +\infty$ , and a sequence of configurations  $(E_h, u_h)$  minimizing  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}$  and such that  $u_h = u_0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and  $|E_h| \neq d$ , for all  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ . We choose an arbitrary fixed  $E_0 \subset \Omega$  with finite perimeter and such that  $|E_0| = d$ . We point out that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}(E_h, u_h) \leq \mathcal{F}(E_0, u_0) := \Theta. \quad (48)$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that  $|E_h| < d$ , the case  $|E_h| > d$  being similar. Our aim is to show that for  $h$  sufficiently large, there exists a configuration  $(\tilde{E}_h, \tilde{u}_h)$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}(\tilde{E}_h, \tilde{u}_h) <$



$\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}(E_h, u_h)$ , thus proving the result by contradiction.

By condition (48), it follows that the sequence  $(u_h)_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in  $H^1(\Omega)$ , the perimeters of the sets  $E_h$  in  $\Omega$  are uniformly bounded and  $|E_h| \rightarrow d$ . Therefore, possibly extracting a not relabelled subsequence, we may assume that there exists a configuration  $(E, u)$  such that  $u_h \rightarrow u$  weakly in  $H^1(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbb{1}_{E_h} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_E$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , where the set  $E$  is of finite perimeter in  $\Omega$  and  $|E| = d$ . The couple  $(E, u)$  will be used as a reference configuration for the definition of  $(\tilde{E}_h, \tilde{u}_h)$ .

**Step 1.** *Construction of  $(\tilde{E}_h, \tilde{u}_h)$ .* Proceeding exactly as in [23], since  $\Omega$  is connected, we can take a point  $x \in \partial^* E \cap \Omega$ . We observe that, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, we can find around  $x$  a point  $x'$  and  $r > 0$  such that

$$|E \cap B_{r/2}(x')| < \varepsilon r^n, \quad |E \cap B_r(x')| > \frac{\omega_n r^n}{2^{n+2}}.$$

We assume without loss of generality that  $x' = 0$ , and from now on we denote by  $B_r$  the balls centered at the origin. From the convergence of  $E_h$  to  $E$  we have that, for  $h$  sufficiently large,

$$|E_h \cap B_{r/2}| < \varepsilon r^n, \quad |E_h \cap B_r| > \frac{\omega_n r^n}{2^{n+2}}. \quad (49)$$

Now we define the following bi-Lipschitz map used in [23] which maps  $B_r$  into itself:

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} (1 - \sigma_h(2^n - 1))x & \text{if } |x| < \frac{r}{2}, \\ x + \sigma_h \left(1 - \frac{r^n}{|x|^n}\right)x & \text{if } \frac{r}{2} \leq |x| < r, \\ x & \text{if } |x| \geq r, \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

for some  $0 < \sigma_h < 1/2^n$  such that, setting

$$\tilde{E}_h = f(E_h), \quad \tilde{u}_h = u_h \circ f^{-1},$$

we have  $|\tilde{E}_h| < d$ . It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}(u_h, E_h) - \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{E}_h) &= \left[ \int_{B_r} \sigma_{E_h} |\nabla u_h|^2 dx - \int_{B_r} \sigma_{\tilde{E}_h} |\nabla \tilde{u}_h|^2 dx \right] \\ &+ [\Phi_A(E_h, \bar{B}_r) - \Phi_A(\tilde{E}_h, \bar{B}_r)] + \kappa_h [(d - |E_h|)^\gamma - (d - |\tilde{E}_h|)^\gamma] \\ &= I_{1,h} + I_{2,h} + I_{3,h}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

For simplicity of notation we will denote in the following

$$g(y) = f^{-1}(y), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We will use in the sequel some estimates for the map  $f$  that can be easily obtained by direct computations (see [23] for the explicit calculations). These estimates are trivial for  $|x| < r/2$ , whereas they can be deduced by the explicit expression of  $\nabla f$  for  $r/2 < |x| < r$ , that is

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(x) = \delta_{ij} + \sigma_h \left[ \left(1 - \frac{r^n}{|x|^n}\right) \delta_{ij} + nr^n \frac{x_i x_j}{|x|^{n+2}} \right], \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

There exists a constant  $C = C(n)$  depending only on  $n$  such that,

$$\|\nabla g(y) - I\| \leq C(n)\sigma_h, \quad \forall y \in B_r, \quad (52)$$

$$1 + C(n)\sigma_h \leq Jf(x) \leq 1 + 2^n n \sigma_h, \quad \forall x \in B_r. \quad (53)$$

**Step 2.** *Estimate of  $I_{1,h}$ .* Performing the change of variables  $y = f(x)$ , and observing that  $\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{E}_h} \circ f = \mathbb{1}_{E_h}$ , we get

$$I_{1,h} = \int_{B_r} \sigma_{E_h}(x) [|\nabla u_h(x)|^2 - |\nabla u_h(x) \circ \nabla f^{-1}(f(x))|^2 Jf(x)] dx.$$

By means of the same computation as in [23], Using (52) and (53) we deduce that

$$I_{1,h} \geq -\bar{C}_1 \Theta \sigma_h, \quad (54)$$

for some positive constant  $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_1(n)$ .

**Step 3. Estimate of  $I_{2,h}$ .** In order to estimate  $I_{2,h}$  we can use a generalized area formula for maps between rectifiable sets involving anisotropies. We recall that (see [40, Proposition 17.1]), if  $E$  is a set of locally finite perimeter in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $f(E)$  is a set of locally finite perimeter in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and

$$\partial^* f(E) = f(\partial^* E), \quad \nu_{f(E)}(y) = \frac{[\nabla g(y)]^t (\nu_E(y))}{|[\nabla g(y)]^t (\nu_E(y))|}, \quad \forall y \in \partial^* f(E).$$

Using [40, formula (17.6)] we can easily deduce that

$$\int_{\partial^* f(E)} \phi(f^{-1}(y)) d\mathcal{H}_y^{n-1} = \int_{\partial^* E} \phi(x) Jf(x) |(\nabla g \circ f)^t \nu_E(x)| d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \quad (55)$$

for any Borel function  $\phi$  defined on  $\partial^* E$ . If we choose  $\phi(x) = a(f(x), \nu_{f(E)}(f(x)))$  in (55) we deduce that

$$\Phi_A(f(E)) = \int_{\partial^* E} a(f(x), [\nabla g(f(x))]^t \nu_E(x)) Jf(x) d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1}.$$

For the proof of the aforementioned formula in a more general framework the reader is addressed to [43, Proposition A.1]. Now we are ready to estimate the following quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,h} &= [\Phi_A(E_h, \bar{B}_r) - \Phi_A(\tilde{E}_h, \bar{B}_r)] \\ &= \int_{\partial^* E_h \cap \bar{B}_r} [a(f(x), [\nabla g(f(x))]^t \nu_{E_h}(x)) - a(f(x), \nu_{E_h}(x))] Jf(x) d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial^* E_h \cap \bar{B}_r} [a(f(x), \nu_{E_h}(x)) - a(x, \nu_{E_h}(x))] Jf(x) d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial^* E_h \cap \bar{B}_r} [Jf(x) - 1] a(x, \nu_{E_h}(x)) d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} = J_{1,h} + J_{2,h} + J_{3,h}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (52) and (46) we deduce

$$|J_{1,h}| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \int_{\partial^* E_h \cap \bar{B}_r} Jf(x) |[(\nabla g)^t - I] \nu_{E_h}(x)| d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \leq C(n) \Theta \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \sigma_h.$$

Applying (45) we obtain

$$|J_{2,h}| \leq \frac{[A]_{C^\gamma}}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} \int_{\partial^* E_h \cap \bar{B}_r} Jf(x) |f(x) - x|^\gamma d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \leq \frac{[A]_{C^\gamma}}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} C(n) \Theta \sigma_h^\gamma.$$

Finally from (53) we have

$$|J_{3,h}| \leq \int_{\partial^* E_h \cap \bar{B}_r} n 2^n a(x, \nu_{E_h}(x)) \sigma_h d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \leq n 2^n \Theta \sqrt{\Lambda} \sigma_h.$$

Summarizing we conclude that

$$I_{2,h} \geq -\bar{C}_2 \Theta \sigma_h^\gamma, \quad (56)$$

for some positive constant  $\bar{C}_2 = \bar{C}_2(n, \lambda, \Lambda, [A]_{C^\gamma})$ .

**Step 4. Estimate of  $I_{3,h}$ .** The following estimate is contained in [25, Theorem 2] and we detail it for reader's convenience.

First we recall (49), (50), (53), thus getting

$$|\tilde{E}_h| - |E_h| = \int_{E_h \cap B_r \setminus B_{r/2}} (Jf(x) - 1) dx + \int_{E_h \cap B_{r/2}} (Jf(x) - 1) dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \left( \frac{\omega_n}{2^{n+2}} - \varepsilon \right) \sigma_h r^n - [1 - (1 - (2^n - 1)\sigma_h)^n] \varepsilon r^n \\
&\geq \sigma_h r^n \left[ \frac{\omega_n}{2^{n+2}} - \varepsilon - (2^n - 1)n\varepsilon \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we choose  $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}(n)$ , for some  $\bar{\varepsilon}$  sufficiently small, we have that

$$\kappa_h(|\tilde{E}_h| - |E_h|) \geq \kappa_h C(n) \sigma_h r^n. \quad (57)$$

Moreover, if denoting  $\delta_h := d - |E_h|$ , we choose  $\sigma_h$  in such a way that  $|\tilde{E}_h| - |E_h| \leq \delta_h/2$  thus respecting the condition  $|\tilde{E}_h| < d$ . Taking this into account, proceeding as before and using (53), we have

$$|\tilde{E}_h| - |E_h| = \int_{E_h \cap B_r} (Jf(x) - 1) dx \leq n2^n \sigma_h r^n.$$

Then we choose  $\sigma_h$  such that

$$\delta_h \leq \sigma_h \leq \frac{\delta_h}{n2^{n+1}r^n}.$$

We remark that in the last condition we imposed also that  $\sigma_h$  is comparable with  $\delta_h$ , which is crucial in the following estimate. Resuming (57) we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{3,h} &= \kappa_h [(d - |E_h|)^\gamma - (d - |\tilde{E}_h|)^\gamma] \geq \kappa_h \frac{\gamma}{(d - |E_h|)^{1-\gamma}} (|\tilde{E}_h| - |E_h|) \\
&= \kappa_h \gamma (d - |E_h|)^\gamma \frac{|\tilde{E}_h| - |E_h|}{d - |E_h|} \geq \kappa_h \gamma \delta_h^\gamma \frac{c_2(n) \sigma_h r^n}{\delta_h} \\
&\geq \kappa_h \bar{C}_3 \sigma_h^\gamma r^n,
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $\bar{C}_3 = \bar{C}_3(n, \gamma)$ .

From the previous inequality, recalling (51), (54) and (56), we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}(u_h, E_h) - \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_h}(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{E}_h) \geq \sigma_h^\gamma (\kappa_h \bar{C}_3 r^n - \Theta(\bar{C}_1 + \bar{C}_2)) > 0,$$

if  $\kappa_h$  is sufficiently large. This contradicts the minimality of  $(E_h, u_h)$ , thus concluding the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 8.3.** *Theorem 8.2 allows us to prove the regularity of solutions of the free boundary problem under the constraint  $|E| = d$ . Under the assumption*

$$\gamma \in \left( \frac{n-1}{n}, 1 \right),$$

*the parameter  $\mu := \gamma n - n + 1$  is positive and, by Theorem 8.2, any minimizing couple  $(E, u)$  of  $(P_c)$  is a  $(\kappa, \mu)$ -minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ , for  $\kappa \geq \kappa_0$ , where  $\kappa_0$  is the constant appearing in Theorem 8.2. Thus, we are in position to implement the regularity theory of the previous sections to  $(E, u)$  by applying Theorem 1.2.*

*Acknowledgements* The authors are members of the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM). The authors wish to acknowledge financial support from IN-dAM GNAMPA Project 2024 "Regolarità per problemi a frontiera libera e disuguaglianze funzionali in contesto finisleriano". The work of GP was partially supported by the project "Start" within the program of the University "Luigi Vanvitelli" reserved to young researchers, Piano strategico 2021-2023

**Data Availability** Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

**Declarations**

**Conflicts of interest** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

## References

- [1] F.J. Almgren, Existence and regularity almost everywhere of solutions to elliptic variational problems among surfaces of varying topological type and singularity structure, *Ann. Math.* **87** (1968), 321–391.
- [2] H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli, Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary, *J.Reine Angew. Math.* **325** (1981), 107-144.
- [3] L. Ambrosio and G. Buttazzo, An optimal design problem with perimeter penalization, *Calc. Var.* **1** (1993), 55-69.
- [4] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco and D. Pallara, *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*, 1st ed., Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [5] A. Arroyo-Rabasa, Regularity for free interface variational problems in a general class of gradients, *Calc. Var.* **55** (2016), 1–44.
- [6] S. Bortz, M. Engelstein, M. Goering, T. Toro and Z. Zhao, Two phase free boundary problem for Poisson kernels, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **71**(1) (2022), 251–306.
- [7] G. Bellettini, M. Novaga and M. Paolini, On a Crystalline Variational Problem, Part I: First Variation and Global  $L^\infty$  Regularity, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **157** (2001), 165–191.
- [8] G. Bellettini, M. Novaga and M. Paolini, On a Crystalline Variational Problem, Part II: BV Regularity and Structure of Minimizers on Facets, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **157** (2001), 193–217.
- [9] E. Bombieri, Regularity theory for almost minimal currents, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **78** (1982), 99-130.
- [10] M. Carozza, L. Esposito and L. Lamberti, Quasiconvex Bulk and Surface Energies:  $C^{1,\alpha}$  Regularity, preprint (2023). <https://cvgmt.sns.it/paper/6164/>
- [11] M. Carozza, I. Fonseca and A. Passarelli Di Napoli, Regularity results for an optimal design problem with a volume constraint, *ESAIM: COCV*, **20 no. 2** (2014), 460–487.
- [12] M. Carozza, I. Fonseca and A. Passarelli Di Napoli, Regularity results for an optimal design problem with quasiconvex bulk energies, *Calc. Var.*, **57**, 68 (2018).
- [13] R. Choksi, R. Neumayer and I. Topaloglu, Anisotropic liquid drop models, *Adv. Calc. Var.* **15**, no. 1, (2022), 109–131.
- [14] G. David, M. Engelstein, M. Smit Vega Garcia and T. Toro, Regularity for almost-minimizers of variable coefficient Bernoulli-type functionals, *Math. Z.* **299** (2021), 2131–2169.
- [15] C. De Lellis, M. Focardi and B. Ruffini, A note on the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set for minimizers of the Mumford–Shah energy, *Adv. Calc. Var.* **7 no. 5** (2014), 539–545.
- [16] G. De Philippis and A. Figalli, A note on the dimension of the singular set in free interface problems, *Differ. Integral Equ.* **28** (2015), 523–536.
- [17] G. De Philippis and A. Figalli, Higher integrability for minimizers of the Mumford-Shah functional, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **213, no. 2** (2014), 491–502.
- [18] G. De Philippis, N. Fusco and M. Morini, Regularity of capillarity droplets with obstacle, preprint (2022), <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.15272>.
- [19] G. De Philippis and F. Maggi, Dimensional estimates for singular sets in geometric variational problems with free boundaries, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **725** (2017), 217–234.

- [20] G. De Philippis, J. Hirsch and G. Vescovo, Regularity of minimizers for a model of charged droplets, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **401** (2023), 33–78.
- [21] F. Duzaar and K. Steffen, Optimal interior and boundary regularity for almost minimizers to elliptic variational integrals, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **546** (2002), 73–138.
- [22] L. Esposito, Density lower bound estimate for local minimizer of free interface problem with volume constraint, *Ric. Mat.* **68**, no. 2 (2019), 359–373.
- [23] L. Esposito and N. Fusco, A remark on a free interface problem with volume constraint, *J. Convex Anal.* **18** n.2 (2011), 417–426.
- [24] L. Esposito and L. Lamberti, Regularity Results for an Optimal Design Problem with lower order terms, *Adv. Calc. Var.* **16** n.4 (2023), 1093–1122.
- [25] L. Esposito and L. Lamberti, Regularity results for a free interface problem with Hölder coefficients, *Calc. Var.* **62** (2023), 156.
- [26] A. Figalli, Regularity of codimension-1 minimizing currents under minimal assumptions on the integrand, *J. Differential Geom.* **106** (2017), 371–391.
- [27] I. Fonseca and N. Fusco, Regularity results for anisotropic image segmentation models, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa* **24** (1997), 463–499.
- [28] I. Fonseca, N. Fusco, G. Leoni and M. Morini, Equilibrium configurations of epitaxially strained crystalline films: existence and regularity results, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **186** (2007), 477–537.
- [29] N. Fusco and V. Julin, On the regularity of critical and minimal sets of a free interface problem, *Interfaces Free Boundaries* **17** (1) (2015), 117–142.
- [30] A. Figalli and F. Maggi, On the Shape of Liquid Drops and Crystals in the Small Mass Regime, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **201** (2011), 143–207.
- [31] M. Gurtin, On phase transitions with bulk, interfacial, and boundary energy, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **96** (1986), 243–264.
- [32] S. Jeon, A. Petrosyan and M. Smit Vega Garcia, Almost minimizers for the thin obstacle problem with variable coefficients, 2020 (to appear in *Interfaces Free Bound.*). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.07349>
- [33] V. Julin and G. Pisante, Minimality via second variation for microphase separation of diblock copolymer melts, *J. fur Reine Angew. Math.* **729** (2017), 81–117.
- [34] R. V. Kohn and G. Strang, Optimal design and relaxation of variational problems, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **39** (1986), 113–137, 139–182, 353–377.
- [35] L. Lamberti, A regularity result for minimal configurations of a free interface problem, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.* **14** (2021), 521–539.
- [36] C. J. Larsen, Regularity of components in optimal design problems with perimeter penalization, *Calc. Var.* **16** (2003), 17–29.
- [37] H. Li, T. Halsey and A. Lobkovsky, Singular shape of a fluid drop in an electric or magnetic field, *Europhys. Lett.* **27** (1994), 575–580.
- [38] F. H. Lin, Variational problems with free interfaces, *Calc. Var.* **1** (1993), 149–168.
- [39] F. H. Lin and R. V. Kohn, Partial regularity for optimal design problems involving both bulk and surface energies, *Chin. Ann. of Math.* **20B** (1999), 137–158.

- [40] F. Maggi, *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems. An introduction to geometric measure theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 135. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [41] E. Mukoseeva and G. Vescovo, Minimality of the ball for a model of charged liquid droplets, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **40**, no. 2, (2023), 457–509.
- [42] F. Murat and L. Tartar, Optimality conditions and homogenization. *Proceedings of "Nonlinear Variational Problems"*, Isola d'Elba 1983 (Res. Notes in Math. **127**, pp. 1–8) London: Pitman 1985.
- [43] D. A. Simmons, Regularity of almost-minimizers of Hölder-coefficient surface energies, *Discrete. Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **42**(7) (2022), 3233–3299.
- [44] R. Schoen and L. Simon, A new proof of the regularity theorem for rectifiable currents which minimize parametric elliptic functionals, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **31** (1982), 415–434.
- [45] G. I. Taylor, Disintegration of water drops in an electric field, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **280** (1964), 383–397.
- [46] J. E. Taylor, The structure of singularities in solutions to ellipsoidal variational problems with constraints in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , *Ann. Math., Second Series* **103** (1976), 541–546.

Luca Esposito, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Salerno, Via Giovanni Paolo II 132, Fisciano 84084, Italy  
 luesposi@unisa.it

Lorenzo Lamberti, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Salerno, Via Giovanni Paolo II 132, Fisciano 84084, Italy  
 llamberti@unisa.it

Giovanni Pisante, Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università della Campania *Luigi Vanvitelli*, viale Lincoln 5, Caserta 81100, Italy  
 giovanni.pisante@unicampania.it