



HAL
open science

Uniform concentration property for Griffith almost-minimizers

Camille Labourie, Antoine Lemenant

► **To cite this version:**

Camille Labourie, Antoine Lemenant. Uniform concentration property for Griffith almost-minimizers. 2024. hal-04328837v2

HAL Id: hal-04328837

<https://hal.science/hal-04328837v2>

Preprint submitted on 22 Mar 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

UNIFORM CONCENTRATION PROPERTY FOR GRIFFITH ALMOST-MINIMIZERS

CAMILLE LABOURIE AND ANTOINE LEMENANT

ABSTRACT. We prove that a Hausdorff limit of Griffith almost-minimizers, is still a Griffith almost-minimizer. For that purpose we present a new approach to the uniform concentration property of Dal Maso, Morel and Solimini which avoids the use of the coarea formula, not available for the symmetric gradient. We then obtain several applications, as for instance a general procedure to perform blow-up limits.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Definitions and statement of the main result	4
3. Preliminaries about limits	9
4. Weak limiting properties	12
5. Fine lower density bound for quasiminimizers	18
5.1. Initialization of the jump	19
5.2. Size of holes through a projection.	22
5.3. Proof of Proposition 5.1	24
6. Uniform concentration property	25
7. Applications	34
7.1. Existence of blow-up limits	34
7.2. Equivalent definitions of the singular part	36
7.3. Dimension of the singular part	40
Appendices	42
A. Auxiliary lemmas about affine maps	42
Acknowledgements	43
References	43

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, a lot of attention has been given to the minimizers of the so-called Griffith functional,

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

defined on pairs function-set (u, K) , where $K \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a relatively closed set and $u : \Omega \setminus K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ a displacement field. Here, $e(u) = (\nabla u + \nabla u^T)/2$ stands for the symmetrized gradient of u and \mathbb{C} is an elasticity tensor.

Date: March 22, 2024.

Since the functional is related to the variational model of crack propagation in linearized elasticity, it has been the central object of many works in the literature [3, 12, 45, 4, 13, 15, 16, 10, 11, 9, 20, 8, 14, 19, 18, 42, 41]. Besides, the mathematical study of minimizers, that falls into the area of “free-discontinuity problems”, brings a lot of technical difficulties compared to the well known scalar analogue, the Mumford-Shah functional.

A powerful approach to study the Griffith functional, which is usually referred to the “weak formulation”, is to relax the problem in the $GSBD$ space introduced by DAL MASO in [18], where the pair (u, K) is replaced by $u \in GSBD$ and $K = J_u$. Several existence and regularity results have been obtained in the $GSBD$ context in many recent papers (see for instance [11, 15, 12]).

In this paper we shall not work in the $GSBD$ class but work directly on pairs (u, K) . Our results apply for instance to the class of topological almost-minimizers for which K may not be represented by the jump set of a $GSBD$ function. In this respect our work is more in the spirit of the approaches introduced for the Mumford-Shah functional by DAVID [22], BONNET [5] or DAL MASO, MOREL and SOLIMINI [17].

The main contribution of the present paper is a limiting result for sequences of Griffith almost-minimizers converging with respect to the Hausdorff convergence of sets, see Theorem 2.7. The difficulty in this context is to prove the semicontinuity behavior of the surface term. This issue was already the main subject of previous works on the $GSBD$ space and was the key point in order to get the existence of a minimizer (see for instance [18, 13]) but the literature does not deal with the convergence in the Hausdorff sense. Yet, extracting converging sequences for the Hausdorff distance is instrumental for the regularity theory, as for instance to construct blow-up limits of minimizers, or to perform any argument by contradiction and compactness. We present at the end of the paper, several applications.

We shall prove along the way that Griffith almost-minimizers enjoy the so-called uniform concentration property, which was first introduced by DAL MASO, MOREL and SOLIMINI [17], [49] in their work on the Mumford-Shah functional. This property says that every ball contains a smaller ball (but not too much smaller) where the density of the singular set is almost larger than 1. The point is to guarantee the lower-semicontinuity of the surface area along a converging sequence, similarly as in Golab’s theorem.

The uniform concentration property for Mumford-Shah minimizers was established by DAL MASO, MOREL, SOLIMINI [17] in dimension 2 and MADDALENA, SOLIMINI [52], [47] in higher dimensions. Their technique, known as the excision method, does not extend to the symmetric gradient because it relies on the full gradient bound $\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq Cr^{N-1}$ to control the Hölder norm of u outside of a suitable neighborhood of the singular set. Another approach is due to RIGOT [50], who derived the uniform concentration from the uniform rectifiability of the singular set. However, the uniform rectifiability of Mumford-Shah minimizers [24], [21] is proven via the co-area formula which does not adapt to the symmetric gradient. It is worth mentioning that the piecewise Korn inequality [36], [37] proved successful for substituting the co-area formula in the Griffith setting. This technique was utilized in [44] to show almost-everywhere regularity and uniform rectifiability of Griffith minimizers, but it is limited to the dimension 2.

We present a novel approach to the uniform concentration property which is suitable to the Griffith functional in any dimension. It also yields a new proof of the uniform concentration in the scalar context of Mumford-Shah minimizers, which we believe is more elementary. It does not rely on the co-area formula, neither on powerful tools such as uniform rectifiability or the piecewise Korn inequality. Here is one of our main result (we refer to Section 2 for the Definition of a topological Griffith almost-minimizer).

Theorem 1.1 (Uniform concentration property). *For each constant $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $C_0 \geq 1$ (depending on $N, \mathbb{C}, \varepsilon$) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be*

a topological Griffith almost-minimizer with any gauge h in Ω . For all $x_0 \in K$ and for all $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$, there exists $x \in B(x_0, r_0/2)$ and $r \in (C_0^{-1}r_0, r_0/2)$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\omega_{N-1}r^{N-1},$$

where ω_{N-1} is the measure of the $(N - 1)$ -dimensional unit disk.

We now provide a brief overview of our proof of the uniform concentration property, in order to highlight the distinctive features of our work, for a specialist reader. The principle is to use Carleson estimates to find many balls $B(x, r)$ where the elastic energy of u is very small and to show that in such a ball,

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

This latter point is given by Proposition 6.2 and finds its intuition in the fact that the singular set of a Griffith minimizer behaves like a minimal sets (which are known to have density ≥ 1) in regime of low elastic energy.

The proof of Proposition 6.2 is by contradiction. After a suitable rescaling, we assume that there exists a sequence of almost-minimizers $(u_i, K_i)_i$ in $B(0, 1)$ with vanishing elastic energy but with density uniformly bounded from above by $1 - \varepsilon$. We extract a subsequence which converges to a pair (u, K) and we aim to show that the limit K is a minimal set and that the area sequence is lower semi-continuous along the sequence.

For this purpose, our starting point is inspired by the works of FANG [34], [33] and a series of works by DE LELLIS ET AL [26], [27] and DE PHILIPPIS ET AL [28], [29] on lower semi-continuity of the area for minimizing sequences of sets. The key point of these works is to establish the rectifiability of the limit. This is not straightforward as in general, a limit of rectifiable sets may not be rectifiable. In the context of Mumford-Shah minimizers, the rectifiability along limits follows from the projection property introduced by DIBOS, KOEPFLER [31] and generalized in every dimension by SOLIMINI [52]. Nevertheless, the proof of the projection property is based on the excision method, which, as discussed above, does not adapt to the symmetric gradient. Thus, one of the first difficulty of Proposition 6.2 will be to prove that K is rectifiable and this will done by use of a Federer-Fleming projection technique.

Thanks to this approach, we are reduced to showing that (1) holds for a Griffith almost-minimizer in $B(x, r)$ in the situation where *both* the flatness and the elastic energy are small. In this case, the geometry of K is under control via the flatness and this allows to bound the density by a constructive argument. This is done in Proposition 5.1 and the proof consists in estimating the “size of holes” not directly for K , but for the orthogonal projection of K onto a hyperplane. Since the projection has less area, it is enough to bound from below the projection of K in order to get (1). Then to estimate the projection, we first prove that under a small flatness and normalized energy, the normalized “jump” has to be greater than some threshold $\tau_0 > 0$. This is Lemma 5.3 which is proved using the construction of a suitable competitor. Our notion of normalized jump in $B(x, r)$ is defined by

$$J(x, r) := \frac{|b_1 - b_2| + r|A_1 - A_2|}{\sqrt{r}},$$

where $b_1 + A_1x$ and $b_2 + A_2x$ are two rigid movements that approximates u above and below the approximative plane P in $B(x, r)$. Then we can estimate the size of holes for the projection of K onto P , in $B(x, r)$, by integrating $u \cdot \nu$ along segments in the direction ν passing “through” the holes, where ν is orthogonal to P . This is done in Lemma 5.4 and explains why we can avoid the use of the coarea formula.

To be more precise, our argument has a degree of subtlety because only one direction ν is admissible as passing “through the holes”, and we cannot integrate along an almost vertical family of non colinear directions: therefore, we choose one good almost vertical direction that “represents well” the jump or in other words we slightly turn the plane P on which we project. By doing so, we loose a constant in the estimates, but since we have a universal control on the threshold $\tau_0 > 0$ which initialises the jump, the estimates are flexible enough to get the desired conclusion. This is done in Section 5 in the proof of Proposition 5.1.

With the uniform concentration at hand, we can prove a general principle for limits of sequences of almost minimizers, as stated in a second main result Theorem 2.7. We then use it to get several applications. The first one is a general strategy to take blow-up limits, and prove that any blow-up sequence must converge to a global minimizer, which is the purpose of Section 7.1. In Proposition 7.3, we prove that any global minimizer in dimension 2 whose singular set is a cone, must be a line, a half-line, or a triple junction. Finally, in Proposition 7.7, we extend the theorem of AMBROSIO, FUSCO and HUTCHINSON [1] to the Griffith setting. This result estimates the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set via the integrability exponent of the symmetric gradient.

Let us now introduce some definitions and state our main result more precisely.

2. DEFINITIONS AND STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULT

Our working space is an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, where $N \geq 2$. We say that a constant is *universal* when it depends only on N . We define a rigid motion as an affine map $a : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ of the form $a(x) = b + Ax$, where $b \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is a skew-symmetric matrix.

Elasticity tensor. Given two matrices $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, the notation $\xi : \eta$ denotes the Frobenius inner product of ξ and η ,

$$\xi : \eta := \sum_{ij} \xi_{ij} \eta_{ij}.$$

The Frobenius norm is then given by $|\xi| := \sqrt{\sum_{ij} (\xi_{ij})^2}$. We fix for the whole paper a symmetric linear map $\mathbb{C} : \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ such that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$,

$$\mathbb{C}(\xi - \xi^T) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{C}\xi : \xi \geq c_0^{-1} |\xi + \xi^T|^2.$$

for some constant $c_0 \geq 1$. Note that \mathbb{C} defines a scalar product on the space $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N}$ of symmetric matrices.

(Coral) pairs. We define an *admissible pair* as a pair (u, K) such that K is a relatively closed subset of Ω and $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus K; \mathbb{R}^N)$. We say that a relatively closed set $K \subset \Omega$ is *coral* if for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$,

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

where \mathcal{H}^{N-1} is the Hausdorff measure of dimension $N - 1$. We also say that a pair (u, K) is coral when K is coral.

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

$$L \setminus B(x, r) = K \setminus B(x, r) \quad \text{and} \quad v = u \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega \setminus (K \cup B(x, r)). \quad (2)$$

Given a relatively closed set $K \subset \Omega$, a *topological competitor*¹ of K in $B(x, r)$ is a relatively closed subset $L \subset \Omega$ such that $L \setminus B(x, r) = K \setminus B(x, r)$ and

$$\text{all points } x, y \in \Omega \setminus (K \cup B) \text{ which are separated by } K \text{ are also separated by } L. \quad (3)$$

This means that if $x, y \in \Omega \setminus (K \cup B)$ belongs to different connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$, they also belong to different connected components of $\Omega \setminus L$. We say that a pair (v, L) is a topological competitor of (u, K) if it is a competitor of (u, K) as in (2) and if in addition, L is a topological competitor of K as in (3).

Remark 2.1. An example of topological competitors are sets of the form $L = f(K)$, where $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is a continuous map such that $f = \text{id}$ in $K \setminus B$ and $f(K \cap B) \subset B$. More precisely, the theory of Borsuk maps ([32, Chap. XVII, 4.3]) shows that if A is a compact set of \mathbb{R}^N which separates two points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus A$ and if $\phi : A \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is a continuous map such that

$$\phi(\cdot, 0) = \text{id} \quad \text{and} \quad p, q \notin \phi(A \times [0, 1]),$$

then p and q are still separated by $\phi(A, 1)$. In our case, we consider two points $p, q \in \Omega \setminus (K \cup B)$ which are separated by K and we proceed by contradiction to show that they are separated by $f(K)$. We consider a continuous path γ connecting p, q in $\Omega \setminus f(K)$ and an open set $V \subset \subset \Omega$ such that $\gamma \cup B \subset V$. We introduce the compact set

$$A := (K \cap \bar{V}) \cup \partial V$$

and we observe that since p, q belong to V and lie in distinct connected components of $\Omega \setminus K$, they also lie in distinct connected components of $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus A$. We extend f continuously on A by setting $f = \text{id}$ on ∂V . The function f satisfies $f(A \cap B) \subset B$ and $f = \text{id}$ in $A \setminus B$ so p, q stays outside $\phi(A \times [0, 1])$, where $\phi(x, t) = (1 - t)x + tf(x)$. The theory of Borsuk map then shows that that p and q lie in distinct connected components of $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus f(A)$ but this contradicts the fact that γ is disjoint from $f(A) \subset f(K) \cup \partial V$.

Quasiminimizers. We define a *gauge* as a non-decreasing function $h : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that $h(r) < +\infty$ for sufficiently small r .

Definition 2.2 (Quasiminimizers). *Let $M \geq 1$ and let h be a gauge. A Griffith local M -quasiminimizer with gauge h in Ω is a coral pair (u, K) such that for all $x \in \Omega$, for all $r > 0$ with $\bar{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and for all competitor (v, L) of (u, K) in $B(x, r)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + M^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \\ \leq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus L} \mathbb{C}e(v) : e(v) \, dx + M \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x, r)) + h(r)r^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

- (i) a Griffith local minimizer is a pair which satisfies the above definition with $M = 1$ and $h = 0$;
- (ii) a Griffith local almost-minimizer is a pair which satisfies the above definition with $M = 1$ and a gauge h such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} h(r) = 0$;
- (iii) a Griffith local topological M -quasiminimizer (resp. almost-minimizer or minimizer) is a pair which satisfies the above definition but only with respect to topological competitors.

¹We follow the terminology in [22] for *topological competitors*. These were first introduced by Bonnet [5] and are also called *MS-competitors* in [23] or *separation competitors* in [45].

In the following, we omit the word “local” and “Griffith” for convenience. Our terminology follows the spirit of [22]. Almost-minimizers look like a minimizer at small scales. They are expected to have fine regularity properties and one may hope to classify their local behaviors. On the other hand, quasiminimizers form a much broader class which has bilipschitz invariant properties. We stress that for an almost-minimizer, the gauge satisfies $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} h(r) = 0$ by definition whereas for a quasiminimizer, the gauge is allowed not to go to zero when $r \rightarrow 0$. For example, the gauge of a quasiminimizer might be a small constant. Our main result holds for almost-minimizers but some of our intermediate results hold more generally for quasiminimizers and are of independent interest. Note that our definition of quasiminimizers is easier to be satisfied than the one in [22, Definition 7.21], and thus has the advantage to include the minimizers of a larger class of functionals, see [45, Theorem 2.7]. The notion of quasiminimizer in the book of AMBROSIO, FUSCO, PALLARA [1] corresponds in our paper to an almost-minimizer with gauge $h(r) = h(1)r^\alpha$.

Remark 2.3 (Standard rescaling of quasiminimizers). If (u, K) is a (resp. topological) M -quasiminimizer with gauge h in a ball $B(x_0, r_0)$, then the pair (v, L) in $B(0, 1)$, defined by

$$v(x) := r_0^{-1/2}u(x_0 + r_0x) \quad \text{and} \quad L := r_0^{-1}(K - x_0),$$

is a (resp. topological) M -quasiminimizer with gauge $\tilde{h}(t) = h(r_0t)$ in $B(0, 1)$.

Definition 2.4 (Almost-minimal sets). *Let h be a gauge such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} h(r) = 0$. An almost-minimal set with gauge h in Ω is a relatively closed and coral subset $K \subset \Omega$ such that for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and for all topological competitor L of K in $B(x, r)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B) + h(r)r^{N-1}.$$

In the case $h = 0$, we say that it is a minimal set.

This property says that a topological competitor L for K cannot decrease the area of K , up to an error term. There are different notions of minimal sets in the literature such as the Almgren minimal sets which are only minimal under Lipschitz deformations. Definition 2.4 is however more suitable to understand Griffith almost-minimizers as they behave as minimal sets of Definition 2.4 in regime of low elastic energy.

Ahlfors-regularity. For each $M \geq 1$, there exist constants $\varepsilon_A \in (0, 1)$ and $C \geq 1$ (depending on N, \mathbb{C}, M) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be a topological quasiminimizer with any gauge h in Ω . Then for all $x \in \Omega \cap K$, for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r) \leq \varepsilon_A$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \geq C^{-1}r^{N-1}. \quad (4)$$

For details, we refer to [45] which extends the method of [11], [15] to topological quasiminimizers. Up to choose C a bit larger (still depending only on N, \mathbb{C}, M), it is standard that we also have that for all $x \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$,

$$\int_{B(x, r)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \leq C(1 + h(r))r^{N-1}. \quad (5)$$

When $h(r) \leq \varepsilon_A$, we directly assume that the right-hand side of (5) is bounded by Cr^{N-1} . A reasonable gauge should satisfy at least $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} h(r) < \varepsilon_A$ so that a quasiminimizer with gauge h is locally Ahlfors-regular. We will frequently refer to ε_A in the paper as we will need to assume that gauges are less than ε_A to take advantage of (4), (5).

Flatness. Let (u, K) be a pair in Ω . For any $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$, we define the flatness $\beta_K(x_0, r_0)$ of K in $B(x_0, r_0)$ as

$$\beta_K(x_0, r_0) := \inf_P \sup_{x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0)} \text{dist}(x, P),$$

where P runs among affine hyperplanes passing through x_0 . This is equivalently the infimum of all $\varepsilon > 0$ for which there exists an hyperplane P through x_0 such that

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

There always exists an hyperplane P which achieves the infimum. When there is no ambiguity, we write β instead of β_K . We can define similarly the bilateral flatness as

$$\beta_K^{\text{bil}}(x_0, r_0) := \inf_P \max \left(\sup_{x \in K \cap B(x_0, r_0)} \text{dist}(x, P), \sup_{x \in P \cap B(x_0, r_0)} \text{dist}(x, K) \right).$$

The flatness and the bilateral flatness are invariant under rescaling, see Remark 2.3

Normalized elastic energy. For any $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$, we define the *normalized elastic energy* of u in $B(x_0, r_0)$ as

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

More generally, for $p \geq 1$, we define

$$\omega_p(x_0, r_0) := r_0^{1-2N/p} \left(\int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K} |e(u)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Here the exponent on the radius is chosen in such a way that ω_p is invariant under rescaling, see Remark 2.3. Note that $\omega_2 = \omega$ and that for $p \in [1, 2]$, we have $\omega_p \leq \omega$ by Hölder inequality.

Local Hausdorff convergence of sets. We consider a sequence of open sets $(\Omega_i)_i \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and an open set Ω such that

$$\text{for all compact set } H \subset \Omega, \text{ we have } H \subset \Omega_i \text{ for } i \text{ large enough.} \quad (6)$$

Definition 2.5. Let $(K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , K_i is a relatively closed subset of Ω . We say that $(K_i)_i$ converges in local Hausdorff distance to a relatively closed subset $K \subset \Omega$ if for all compact set $H \subset \Omega$,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\sup_{x \in K_i \cap H} \text{dist}(x, K) + \sup_{x \in K \cap H} \text{dist}(x, K_i) \right) = 0.$$

This means for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an index i_0 such that for all $i \geq i_0$,

$$K_i \cap H \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, K) \leq \varepsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad K \cap H \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, K_i) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

One can check that this convergence is equivalent to the two inclusions

$$\{x \in \Omega \mid \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \text{dist}(x, K_i) = 0\} \subset K \subset \{x \in \Omega \mid \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \text{dist}(x, K_i) = 0\}.$$

Since the right-hand side is always a subset of the left-hand side, these inclusions are actually equalities and we have

$$K = \{x \in \Omega \mid \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \text{dist}(x, K_i) = 0\}.$$

As a consequence of the definition, we see that

$$\text{for all compact set } H \subset \Omega \setminus K, \text{ we have } H \subset \Omega_i \setminus K_i \text{ for } i \text{ big enough.} \quad (7)$$

It follows from (7) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{for all compact set } H \subset \Omega \setminus K \text{ and for all open set } V \subset \Omega, \\ & \text{if } K \cap H \subset V, \text{ then we have } K_i \cap H \subset \Omega_i \cap V \text{ for } i \text{ big enough.} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Convergence of pairs. We consider a sequence of open sets $(\Omega_i)_i \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and an open set Ω such that

for all compact set $H \subset \Omega$, we have $H \subset \Omega_i$ for i large enough.

Definition 2.6. Let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , (u_i, K_i) is a pair in Ω_i . We say that $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω if

- (i) $(K_i)_i$ converges to K in local Hausdorff distance;
- (ii) for all connected component \mathcal{O} of $\Omega \setminus K$, there exists a sequence of rigid motions $(a_i)_i$ such that for all compact set $H \subset \mathcal{O}$,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_H |u_i - a_i - u|^2 dx = 0.$$

This is the vectorial analogue of the convergence considered by BONNET [5]. Note that the limit displacement u is only determined up to a rigid motion in each connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$.

Now, here is the main result of our paper.

Theorem 2.7. Let $(\Omega_i)_i$ and Ω be a sequence of open sets as in (6). Let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , $(u_i, K_i)_i$ is a topological almost-minimizer with gauge h_i in Ω_i . We assume that $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω . We define for $r > 0$,

$$h(r) = \begin{cases} \lim_{t \rightarrow r^+} (\limsup_i h_i(t)) & \text{if this quantity is } < \varepsilon_A, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases},$$

and we assume that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \limsup_i h_i(t) = 0$. Then (u, K) is a topological almost-minimizer with gauge h in Ω . Moreover, for all $x \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) dx &\geq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) dx \\ \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) dx &\leq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) dx + h(r)r^{N-1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, r)) &\geq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \\ \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) &\leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h(r)r^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

If furthermore

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_H |e(u_i)| dx = 0 \quad \text{for all compact set } H \subset \Omega \setminus K,$$

then u is a rigid motion in each connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$ and K is an almost-minimal set with gauge h in Ω .

This result generalizes to the Griffith setting the known limiting theorems of the scalar case. The first theorem of this kind was due to BONNET [5, Theorem 2.2] for blow-up limits of Mumford-Shah minimizers in \mathbb{R}^2 . It was generalized to Mumford-Shah almost-minimizers in any dimension by MADDALENA, SOLIMINI [46, Theorem 11.1] and DAVID [22, Theorem 38.3]. The particular case where the Dirichlet energy goes to zero was also dealt with by AMBROSIO, FUSCO, HUTCHINSON [1, Theorem 5.4] and DE LELLIS, FOCARDI [25, Theorem 13]. Note that the notion of minimal set with respect to topological competitors (Definition 2.4) is slightly stronger than the notion of Almgren minimal set considered in [1, Theorem 5.4].

The assumption $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \limsup_i h_i(t) = 0$ makes sure that the limit gauge h satisfy $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} h(r) = 0$, as requested in the definition of almost-minimizers. The minimality properties of the limit are restricted to balls $B(x, r)$ such that $\limsup_i h_i(r) < \varepsilon_A$ because this guarantees that the sequence $(u_i, K_i)_i$ is uniformly Ahlfors-regular in $B(x, r)$, see (4) and (5).

Even if all the pairs $(u_i, K_i)_i$ are plain almost-minimizer (without the topological constraint on competitors), it is unavoidable that the limit may only be minimal with respect to topological competitors. As an example, if one takes a blow-up limit of a Mumford-Shah minimizer (u, K) at a smooth point $x_0 \in K$, the limit is a pair (u_∞, K_∞) such that K_∞ is an hyperplane and u_∞ is piecewise constant. It is known in this case that (u_∞, K_∞) is a topological minimizer but not a plain minimizer as one can find a better competitor by making a hole with suitable dimensions (see the comment just before [2, Proposition 6.8]).

3. PRELIMINARIES ABOUT LIMITS

We start this section by observing that the convergence of pairs is preserved under rescaling. We leave the details to the reader.

Remark 3.1. Let $(\Omega_i)_i$ and Ω be a sequence of open sets as in (6). Let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , (u_i, K_i) is a pair in Ω_i . We assume that $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω . Let us fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r_0 > 0$. Then the sequence of pairs $(v_i, L_i)_i$ in $r_0^{-1}(\Omega_i - x_0)$ defined by

$$v_i(x) = r_0^{-1/2} u_i(x_0 + r_0 x) \quad \text{and} \quad L_i = r_0^{-1}(K_i - x_0)$$

converge to (v, L) in $r_0^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)$, where

$$v(x) = r_0^{-1/2} u(x_0 + r_0 x), \quad \text{and} \quad L := r_0^{-1}(K - x_0).$$

We recall a standard compactness principle for the local Hausdorff convergence. This is a minor adaptation of [22, Proposition 34.6] and we omit the proof.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(\Omega_i)_i$ and Ω be a sequence of open sets as in (6). Let $(K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , K_i is a relatively closed subset of Ω . Then there exists a subsequence which converges to a relatively closed subset K of Ω .*

Then, we deduce a compactness principle for pairs.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(\Omega_i)_i$ and Ω be a sequence of open sets as in (6). Let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , (u_i, K_i) is a pair in Ω_i and assume that for all $x \in \Omega$, there exists $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and*

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K_i} |e(u_i)|^2 < +\infty.$$

Then there exists a subsequence of $(u_i, K_i)_i$ which converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω .

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, we can first extract a subsequence such that $(K_i)_i$ converges to a relatively closed subset $K \subset \Omega$. Now, we turn our attention to the functions $(u_i)_i$. We fix a connected component \mathcal{O} of $\Omega \setminus K$. We cover \mathcal{O} by non-empty open balls $(B_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that $B_n \subset\subset \mathcal{O}$ and for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_n} |e(u_i)|^2 dx < +\infty.$$

For all n , we have $B_n \subset \Omega_i$ for i big enough and we observe using the Korn-Poincaré inequality that there exists a rigid motion $a_{n,i}$ such that

$$\int_{B_n} |u_i - a_{n,i}|^2 dx \leq C \text{diam}(B)^2 \int_{B_n} |e(u_i)|^2 dx.$$

and

$$\int_{B_n} |\nabla u_i - \nabla a_{n,i}|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_n} |e(u_i)|^2 dx.$$

Therefore, we see that for all n , the sequence $(u_i - a_{n,i})_i$ is bounded in $W^{1,2}(B_n; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and by a diagonal extraction argument, we can extract a subsequence of $(u_i)_i$ (not relabelled) such that for all n , the sequence $(u_i - a_{n,i})_i$ converges in $L^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^N)$ to a function in $W^{1,2}(B_n; \mathbb{R}^N)$. Now we let $a_i := a_{0,i}$ (the rigid motion in the ball B_0) and we are going to show that for all $n \geq 0$, the sequence $(a_n - a_{n,i})_i$ converges locally uniformly in \mathbb{R}^N to a rigid motion. First we observe that for every $x \in \mathcal{O}$, there exists a finite chain of balls among $(B_n)_n$ linking B_0 to x . More precisely, there exists a finite number of indices $n(1), \dots, n(l)$ with $n(1) = 0$ and $x \in B_{n(l)}$, such that for all $0 \leq k < l$, $B_{n(k)} \cap B_{n(k+1)} \neq \emptyset$. This is a consequence of connectedness as the set of points $x \in \mathcal{O}$ satisfying this property is non-empty and is both relatively open and closed in \mathcal{O} . Now, we fix a ball B_n and by the above observation we can consider a finite number of indices $n(1), \dots, n(l)$ with $n(1) = 0$ and $n(l) = n$, such that for all $0 \leq k < l$, $B_{n(k)} \cap B_{n(k+1)} \neq \emptyset$. Since $(u_i - a_{n(k),i})_i$ converges in $L^2(B_{n(k)}; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and $(u_i - a_{n(k+1),i})_i$ converges in $L^2(B_{n(k+1)}; \mathbb{R}^N)$, we deduce that $(a_{n(k),i} - a_{n(k+1),i})_i$ converges in $L^2(B_{n(k)} \cap B_{n(k+1)}; \mathbb{R}^N)$. As this is a sequence of rigid motions and the intersection $B_{n(k)} \cap B_{n(k+1)}$ is set of positive measure contained in some ball $B(0, R)$ with $R > 0$, Lemma A.1 shows that the sequence converges in the normed space of affine maps. It follows that the sequence $(a_{n(k),i} - a_{n(k+1),i})_i$ converges locally uniformly in \mathbb{R}^N to a rigid motion. Then, a telescopic argument shows that $(a_i - a_{n,i})_i$ also converges locally uniformly in \mathbb{R}^N to a rigid motion. Our claim is proved. We deduce that for all $n \geq 0$, $(u_i - a_i)_i$ converges in $L^2(B_n; \mathbb{R}^N)$ to a function in $W^{1,2}(B_n; \mathbb{R}^N)$. Since the balls $(B_n)_n$ cover \mathcal{O} , we finally conclude that there exists a function $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that for all compact subset $H \subset \mathcal{O}$,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_H |u_i - a_i|^2 dx = 0.$$

In this procedure, we have extracted a subsequence of $(u_i)_i$ which depends on \mathcal{O} but as $\Omega \setminus K$ has countably many connected components, we can do a diagonal extraction again so that an analogue property holds for all connected components of $\Omega \setminus K$. \square

We now turn our attention to the semi-continuity properties of converging sequence of pairs.

Lemma 3.4 (Lower semicontinuity of the elastic energy). *Let $(\Omega_i)_i$ and Ω be a sequence of open sets as in (6). Let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , (u_i, K_i) is a pair in Ω_i . If $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω , then for all open set $V \subset \Omega$, and for all real number $p \geq 1$,*

$$\int_{V \setminus K} [\mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u)]^{p/2} dx \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega_i \cap V \setminus K_i} [\mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u)]^{p/2} dx.$$

Proof. We start with the case where $V \subset\subset \Omega \setminus K$. Observe that the domain $\Omega \setminus K$ can be decomposed as a disjoint union of its connected component and for each component \mathcal{O} , we have $V \cap \mathcal{O} \subset\subset \mathcal{O}$ because $\partial\mathcal{O} \cap \Omega \setminus K = \emptyset$. Therefore, it suffices to deal with the case where there exists an connected component \mathcal{O} of $\Omega \setminus K$ such that $V \subset\subset \mathcal{O}$. We let $(a_i)_i$ be a sequence of rigid motions such that for all compact set $H \subset \mathcal{O}$,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_H |u_i - a_i| dx = 0. \quad (9)$$

We let $\phi \in C_c(V; \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N})$ be a smooth test function with compact support in V and which takes its values in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N}$. By integration by parts and (9), one can see that

$$\int \mathbb{C}e(u) : \phi dx = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : \phi dx.$$

Then, Hölder inequality and the dual representation of norms imply

$$\int_V [\mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u)]^{p/2} dx \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_V [\mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i)]^{p/2} dx.$$

For a general open set $V \subset \Omega$, we consider an exhaustion of $V \setminus K$ by an increasing sequence of open sets $(V^n)_n$ such that $V^n \subset\subset V \setminus K$. For each n and for i big enough, we have $V^n \subset \Omega_i \setminus K_i$ so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{V^n} [\mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u)]^{p/2} dx &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{V^n} [\mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i)]^{p/2} dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega_i \cap V \setminus K_i} [\mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i)]^{p/2} dx \end{aligned}$$

and then by letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\int_{V \setminus K} [\mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u)]^{p/2} dx \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega_i \cap V \setminus K_i} [\mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i)]^{p/2} dx.$$

□

For a sequence of sets converging in Hausdorff distance, we don't have the lower semi-continuity of the area in general but we have a rough control if the sequence is uniformly Ahlfors-regular. The limit is in particular, coral and Ahlfors-regular as well. We omit the proof, which is standard.

Lemma 3.5. *Let us fix an open ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Let $(K_i)_i$ be a sequence of relatively closed subsets of B which converges to a relatively closed subset K of B . We assume that there exists a constant $C_0 \geq 1$ such that for all i , for all $x \in K_i$, for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset B$, we have*

$$C_0^{-1} r^{N-1} \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, r)) \leq C_0 r^{N-1}.$$

Then, for all open set $V \subset B$ and for all compact set $H \subset B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap V) &\geq C^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap V) \\ \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap H) &\leq C \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap H), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$ which depends only on C_0 and N .

The last result of this section is a more precise variant of (7).

Lemma 3.6. *We consider a sequence of open sets $(\Omega_i)_i \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and an open set Ω as in (6). We let $(K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , K_i is a relatively closed subset of Ω and we assume that $(K_i)_i$ converges to a relatively closed subset $K \subset \Omega$. Then if a compact set H is contained in a connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$, it is contained in a connected component of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ for i big enough.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{O} be a connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$ and let H be a compact set such that $H \subset \mathcal{O}$. We can cover H by a finite family of balls B_1, \dots, B_p , where $B_h = B(y_h, r_h)$, where $y_h \in H$, $r_h > 0$, such that $\overline{B}_h \subset \mathcal{O}$. For all $h_1 \neq h_2$, there exists a continuous path $\gamma \subset \mathcal{O}$ from y_{h_1} to y_{h_2} . Since γ is a compact subset of $\Omega \setminus K$, it is also contained in $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ for i big enough. Thus for i big enough (depending on h_1 and h_2), the points y_{h_1} and y_{h_2} lie in a common connected component of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. If in addition i is also big enough (still depending on h_1 and h_2) such that $\overline{B}_{h_1}, \overline{B}_{h_2} \subset \Omega_i \setminus K_i$, we deduce that B_{h_1} and B_{h_2} lie in a common connected component of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. Since there is only a finite number of indices $h = 1, \dots, p$, we can find i_0 such that for all $i \geq i_0$ and for all $h_1 \neq h_2$, the balls B_{h_1} and B_{h_2} lie in a common connected component of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. Here we see that this connected component cannot depend on h_1 and h_2 so for $i \geq i_0$, all the balls B_h lie in the same connected component of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ and H as well. \square

4. WEAK LIMITING PROPERTIES

Our first step to prove Theorem 2.7 is a partial limiting result, where we don't know if the area is lower semi-continuous along the sequence. The goal of the two subsequent sections will be to complete this results by proving that the area is lower semi-continuous along sequence of almost-minimizers.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $(\Omega_i)_i$ and Ω be a sequence of open sets as in (6). Let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , (u_i, K_i) is a topological almost-minimizer with gauge h_i in Ω_i . We assume that $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω and we set for $r > 0$,*

$$h^+(r) := \lim_{t \rightarrow r^+} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(t).$$

Then for all $x \in \Omega$, for all $r > 0$ with $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and $h^+(r) < \varepsilon_A$, for all topological competitor (v, L) of (u, K) in $B(x, r)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\int_{B(x, r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \right) \\ \leq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus L} \mathbb{C}e(v) : e(v) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

If furthermore

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_H |e(u_i)| \, dx = 0 \quad \text{for all compact set } H \subset \Omega \setminus K,$$

then u is a rigid motion in each connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$. In this case, for all $x \in \Omega$, for all $r > 0$ with $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and $h^+(r) < \varepsilon_A$, for all topological competitor L of K in $B(x, r)$, we have

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}.$$

The gauge h^+ is well-defined because the function $\rho \mapsto \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(\rho)$ is non-decreasing on $(0, +\infty)$. One can also see that h^+ is right-continuous. The reason why we work in balls where $h^+(r) < \varepsilon_A$ is to ensure that the Ahlfors-regularity properties (4), (5) hold along the sequence.

Proof. We start by focusing on the first part of the statement: the limiting minimality property. The general strategy is clear: for a fixed ball $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and for every topological competitor (v, L) for (u, K) in $B(x, r)$, we need to define a suitable topological competitor (v_i, L_i) for (u_i, K_i) in a slightly larger ball $B(x, r + \delta)$ in order to exploit the minimality of (u_i, K_i) and then pass to the limit. For that purpose we will choose a good radius $\rho \in (r, r + \delta)$ satisfying a series of good properties before defining v_i and L_i . We now fix a ball $B = B(x, r)$ with $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B} \subset \Omega$ and $h(r) < \varepsilon_A$.

Step 1. Construction of the annulus. We let $0 < \delta \leq r$ be so small that

$$\overline{B}(x, r + 10\delta) \subset \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(r + 10\delta) < \varepsilon_A$$

and in particular,

$$\overline{B}(x, r + 10\delta) \subset \Omega_i \quad \text{and} \quad h_i(r + 10\delta) \leq \varepsilon_A \quad \text{for } i \text{ big enough.} \quad (10)$$

For convenience, we assume that it holds for all i . One of the consequence of (10) it that it allows to apply (4), (5), that is, for all i , for all open ball $B(y, t) \subset B(x, r + 10\delta)$, we have a uniform bound

$$\int_{B(y, t) \setminus K_i} |e(u_i)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(y, t)) \leq Ct^{N-1},$$

and if $y \in K_i$,

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(y, t)) \geq C^{-1} \text{diam}(B)^{N-1}$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$ which depends on N and \mathbb{C} . According to Lemma 3.5, this implies that for all open ball $B(y, t) \subset B(x, r + 5\delta)$ with $y \in K$, we have

$$C^{-1}t^{N-1}\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(y, t)) \leq Ct^{N-1}. \quad (11)$$

We let $\tau \in (0, 1)$ be a very small parameter which can depend on r and δ and such that $\tau r \leq \delta$. In what follows, the letter C denotes a generic constant ≥ 1 which is allowed to depend on N , \mathbb{C} and also r , δ . We consider a maximal subset $Y \subset K \cap \overline{B}(x, r + 2\delta)$ of points at mutual distance greater than or equal to τr . Therefore,

$$K \cap \overline{B}(x, r + 2\delta) \subset \bigcup_{y \in Y} B(y, \tau r) \quad (12)$$

and the balls $B(y, \tau r/2)$, $y \in Y$ are disjoint. We can use (11) to estimate the number of points of Y , denoted by $|Y|$. More precisely,

$$\sum_{y \in Y} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(y, \tau r/2)) \geq C^{-1}(\tau r)^{N-1}|Y|$$

and since the balls $B(y, \tau r/2)$ are disjoint and contained in $B(x, r + 3\delta)$,

$$\sum_{y \in Y} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(y, \tau r/2)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r + 3\delta)) \leq Cr^{N-1}.$$

Hence, Y has at most $C\tau^{1-N}$ points.

We will choose a suitable annulus of width τr which does not intersect too many balls $B(y, \tau r)$, $y \in Y$. More precisely, for $\rho \in (r, r + \delta)$, we let

$$Y_\rho := \{y \in Y \mid B(y, \tau r) \cap \overline{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The condition $y \in Y_\rho$ is equivalent to saying that $|y| \in (\rho - \tau r, \rho + 2\tau r)$, or equivalently again, $\rho \in (|y| - 2\tau r, |y| + 2\tau r)$. Then we use Fubini and the fact that Y has at most $C\tau^{1-N}$ points to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_r^{r+\delta} \left(\sum_{y \in Y_\rho} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial B(y, \tau r)) \right) d\rho &= \sum_{y \in Y} \int_r^{r+\delta} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial B(y, \tau r)) \mathbf{1}_{Y_\rho}(y) d\rho \\ &= \sum_{y \in Y} \int_r^{r+\delta} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial B(y, \tau r)) \mathbf{1}_{(|y|-2\tau r, |y|+2\tau r)}(\rho) d\rho \\ &\leq C\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that C is allowed to depend on r and δ . This implies that there are many $\rho \in (r, r + \delta)$ such that

$$\sum_{y \in Y_\rho} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial B(y, \tau r)) \leq C\tau,$$

where C is a bigger constant which is still allowed to depend on r and δ . Let us choose such a radius $\rho \in (r, r + \delta)$ and define

$$Z := \bigcup_{y \in Y_\rho} B(y, \tau r).$$

Then we consider a smooth scalar cut-off function $\xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N, [0, 1])$ such that $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$,

$$\xi = 1 \text{ in } B(x, \rho), \quad \xi = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(x, \rho + \tau r/2),$$

and

$$|\nabla \xi| \leq C\tau^{-1} \text{ everywhere.}$$

Let us finally define

$$Z' := \bigcup_{y \in Y_\rho} \partial B(y, \tau r),$$

so that $\partial Z \subset Z'$ and

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(Z') \leq C\tau.$$

By construction, $Z' \subset B(x, r + 4\tau r)$.

Step 2. Construction of the competitor. We now proceed to build a competitor (v_i, L_i) of (u_i, K_i) in $B(x, r + 4\tau r)$ which makes a transition between (u_i, K_i) outside of $B(x, \rho + \tau r)$ and (v, L) in $B(x, \rho)$. First of all, we observe that Z covers the sets K, K_i, L in the transition area. More precisely, we see from (12) and the definition of Y_ρ that

$$K \cap \overline{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset Z. \tag{13}$$

and thus, by convergence of $(K_i)_i$ to K ,

$$K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset Z \text{ for } i \text{ big enough.} \tag{14}$$

By the fact that L coincides with K outside of $B(x, r)$, we also have

$$L \cap \overline{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset Z. \tag{15}$$

For convenience, we assume that (14) holds for all i . We now define

$$L_i := (K_i \setminus B(x, \rho)) \cup Z' \cup (L \cap \overline{B}(x, \rho)),$$

which is a relatively closed subset of Ω_i and coincides with K_i in $\Omega_i \setminus B(x, r + 4\tau r)$. We then define v_i in a piecewise way. We first set

$$v = 0 \text{ in } Z \text{ and } v = u_i \text{ in } \Omega_i \setminus (B(x, \rho + \tau r) \cup L_i \cup \bar{Z}). \quad (16)$$

Then we build a transition between u_i and v (up to a suitable rigid motion) in $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (L_i \cup \bar{Z})$. By (13) and (14), we see that the annulus

$$\bar{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (B(x, \rho) \cup Z)$$

is a compact subset of $\Omega \setminus K$ and $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ (in particular, u_i is well-defined there). By compactness, this annulus is covered by a finite numbers of connected components $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_p$ of $\Omega \setminus K$. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, p$, there exists a sequence of rigid motions $(a_{i,\ell})_i$ such that for all compact set $H \subset \mathcal{O}_\ell$,

$$\text{the sequence } (u_i - a_{i,\ell})_i \text{ converges in } L^2 \text{ norm to } u \text{ on } H. \quad (17)$$

The compact sets we have in mind are the sets

$$H_\ell := \mathcal{O}_\ell \cap \bar{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (B(x, \rho) \cup Z).$$

Indeed, since $\mathcal{O}_\ell \cap \Omega \setminus K = \emptyset$ and $\bar{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (B(x, \rho) \cup Z) \subset \Omega \setminus K$, the set H_ℓ is a compact subset of \mathcal{O}_ℓ .

Let us now consider a connected component V of $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (L_i \cup \bar{Z})$. If $V \subset B(x, \rho)$, there is no need to make a transition and we just set $v_i = 0$. Otherwise, $V \cap B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho)$ is non-empty and we are going to check that there exists a (necessarily unique) $\ell = 1, \dots, p$ such that

$$V \cap B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset \mathcal{O}_\ell. \quad (18)$$

Let $x, y \in V \cap B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho)$. By (15), we have

$$L \cap B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset Z$$

and by definition of L_i ,

$$L \cap \bar{B}(x, \rho) \subset L_i$$

so V , as a connected component of $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (L_i \cup \bar{Z})$, is disjoint from L . This shows that x and y lie in the same connected component of $\Omega \setminus L$ and since L is a topological competitor of K in $B(x, r)$, they also lie in the same connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$. This proves (18) and this leads us to set

$$v_i = \xi(v + a_{i,\ell}) + (1 - \xi)u_i \text{ in } V. \quad (19)$$

This achieves the definition of v_i in $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (L_i \cup \bar{Z})$. Combining (16) and (19), we see that

$$v_i = u_i \text{ in } \Omega_i \setminus (B(x, \rho + \tau r/2) \cup L_i \cup \bar{Z})$$

so there is no gluing problem along $\partial B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (L_i \cup \bar{Z})$. We conclude that (v_i, L_i) is a competitor of (u_i, K_i) in $B(x, r + 4\tau r)$. We now check that L_i is a topological competitor of K_i in $B(x, r + 4\tau r)$, for i big enough. First of all, we recall for each $\ell = 1, \dots, p$, the set

$$H_\ell = \mathcal{O}_\ell \cap \bar{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (B(x, \rho) \cup Z)$$

is a compact of \mathcal{O}_ℓ . Using Lemma 3.6 and since there are only a finite number of indices $\ell = 1, \dots, p$, we can find an index i_0 such that for all $i \geq i_0$ and for all $\ell = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\text{the set } H_\ell \text{ is contained in a connected component of } \Omega_i \setminus K_i. \quad (20)$$

Let us now consider $i \geq i_0$. We fix $y, z \in \Omega_i \setminus (B(x, r + 4\tau r) \setminus K_i)$ such that that y, z are connected by a continuous path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega_i \setminus L_i$ and we prove that they are connected in $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. We proceed by contradiction and assume that y and z lie in distinct connected

components of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. We first observe that $y, z \notin \bar{Z}$ since $\bar{Z} \subset B(x, r + 4\tau r)$. As the path γ is disjoint from L_i , it is in particular disjoint from Z' and therefore it must stay disjoint from \bar{Z} . If γ never meets $B(x, \rho)$, then γ is disjoint from K_i because L_i coincides with K_i outside of $B(x, \rho) \cap \bar{Z}$. In this case, y, z are connected by γ in $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ and we reach a contradiction. Next, we assume that γ meets $B(x, \rho)$ and we let y_1, z_1 denote the first and last point of γ on $\partial B(x, \rho)$. On the portion between y and y_1 , γ lies in the complement of $B(x, \rho)$ and then one can deduce as before that this portion lies in the complement of K_i . Therefore y and y_1 are connected in the $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. Similarly, z and z_1 are connected in $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. It follows that y_1 and z_1 lie in distinct connected components of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. The set of points of $\gamma \cap \partial B(x, \rho)$ which do not lie in the connected component of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ containing z_1 is non-empty (it contains x_1) and closed. Therefore, there is a last point of γ in this set, and we let it be denoted by y_2 . Observe that $y_2 \notin K_i$ because γ is disjoint from \bar{Z} and because of (14). Then, we let z_2 be the first of $\gamma \cap \partial B$ after y_2 . Here again, $z_2 \notin K_i$ for the same reason. We deduce that y_2 and z_2 lie in distinct connected components of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$. The portion of γ between y_2 and z_2 does not meet $\partial B(x, \rho)$ to it must be either in $\Omega_i \setminus \bar{B}(x, \rho)$ or in $B(x, \rho)$. In the first case, y_2 and z_2 are connected in $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ so we reach a contradiction. In the second case, y_2 and z_2 are connected in $\Omega \setminus L$ and since L is a topological competitor of K in $B(x, r)$, the points y_2 and z_2 must also be connected in $\Omega \setminus K$. We deduce that y_2 and z_2 lie in a common set H_ℓ for some $\ell = 1, \dots, p$ and thus in a common connected component of $\Omega_i \setminus K_i$ by (20). This is again a contradiction. We have proved that for all $i \geq i_0$, L_i is a topological competitor of K_i in $B(x, r + 4\tau r)$.

Step 3. Energy comparison. We finally apply the almost minimality property of (u_i, K_i) and compare its Griffith energy with (v_i, L_i) ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x, r+4\tau r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, r + 4\tau r)) \\ & \leq \int_{B(x, r+4\tau r) \setminus L_i} \mathbb{C}e(v_i) : e(v_i) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L_i \cap B(x, r + 4\tau r)) + h_i(r + 4\tau r)(r + 4\tau r)^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the facts that $L_i \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset (K_i \setminus B(x, \rho)) \cup Z'$, that $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(Z') \leq C\tau$ and that $|e(v_i)| \leq |e(u_i)|$ a.e. in $\Omega_i \setminus B(x, \rho + \tau r)$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x, \rho+\tau r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, \rho)) \\ & \leq \int_{B(x, \rho+\tau r) \setminus L_i} \mathbb{C}e(v_i) : e(v_i) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x, \rho)) + C\tau + h_i(r + 4\tau r)(r + 4\tau r)^{N-1}. \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate the contribution of $e(v_i)$ in $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus L_i$. The points in $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus L_i$ are either contained in Z , where $e(v_i) = 0$, or in a connected component V of $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (L_i \cup \bar{Z})$ such that

$$V \cap B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset \mathcal{O}_\ell \quad (22)$$

for some $\ell = 1, \dots, p$ (see (18)), and where

$$e(v_i) = \xi e(v) + (1 - \xi)e(u_i) + \nabla \xi \odot (v + a_{i,\ell} - u_i).$$

Here, given $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the notation $a \odot b$ denotes the matrix of coefficients

$$(a \odot b)_{ij} = \frac{a_i b_j + a_j b_i}{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}.$$

Note that one can bound $|a \odot b| \leq |a||b|$. The function $\xi \mapsto \mathbb{C}\xi : \xi$ is a positive definite quadratic form on the space $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N}$ of symmetric matrices and it is temporarily convenient to work with the underlying norm. We set

$$\|\xi\| := \sqrt{\mathbb{C}\xi : \xi} \quad \text{for } \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{N \times N}.$$

In a connected component V of $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (L_i \cup \bar{Z})$ where (22) holds, we have by triangular inequality

$$\|e(v_i)\| \leq \xi \|e(v)\| + (1 - \xi) \|e(u_i)\| + C |\nabla \xi| |u_i - a_{i,\ell} - v|.$$

The function $\nabla \xi$ is supported in $B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho)$, satisfies $|\nabla \xi| \leq C\tau^{-1}$ and we see from (22) that

$$V \cap B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus B(x, \rho) \subset H_\ell,$$

where

$$H_\ell = \mathcal{O}_\ell \cap \bar{B}(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus (B(x, \rho) \cup Z)$$

is a compact subset of \mathcal{O}_ℓ . Thus we can bound in $B(x, \rho + \tau r)$,

$$\|e(v_i)\| \leq \xi \|e(v)\| + (1 - \xi) \|e(u_i)\| + C\tau^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1, \dots, p} |u_i - a_{i,\ell} - v| \mathbf{1}_{H_\ell}. \quad (23)$$

We will be able to get rid of the last term when $i \rightarrow +\infty$ because we know from (17) that

$$\text{the sequence } (u_i - a_{i,\ell})_i \text{ converges in } L^2 \text{ norm to } v \text{ on } H_\ell.$$

Let us estimate the L^2 norm of $e(v)$ in $B(x, \rho + \tau r)$. We use (23), the elementary inequality

$$(a + b_1 + \dots + b_p)^2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)a^2 + p(1 + \varepsilon^{-1})(b_1^2 + \dots + b_p^2) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0$$

and the convexity of $t \mapsto t^2$ to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x, \rho + \tau r)} \|e(v_i)\|^2 dx &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{B(x, \rho + \tau r)} (\xi \|e(v)\| + (1 - \xi) \|e(u_i)\|)^2 dx \\ &\quad + C(p)\tau^{-2}(1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \sum_{\ell=1, \dots, p} \int_{H_\ell} |u_i - a_{i,\ell} - v|^2 dx \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{B(x, \rho + \tau r)} \xi \|e(v)\|^2 + (1 - \xi) \|e(u_i)\|^2 dx \\ &\quad + C(p)\tau^{-2}(1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \sum_{\ell=1, \dots, p} \int_{H_\ell} |u_i - a_{i,\ell} - v|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this in (21), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus K_i} \xi \|e(u_i)\|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, \rho)) \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{B(x, \rho + \tau r) \setminus L} \|e(v)\|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{B(x, \rho + \tau r)} \|e(u_i)\|^2 dx \\ &\quad + C(p)\tau^{-2}(1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \sum_{\ell=1, \dots, p} \int_{H_\ell} |u_i - a_{i,\ell} - v|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x, \rho)) + C\tau + h_i(r + 4\tau r)(r + 4\tau r)^{N-1}. \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

We recall that by (10), we can bound $\int_{B(x,\rho+\tau r)} \|e(u_i)\|^2 dx \leq C$. We use this bound, we come back to the notation $\mathbb{C}\xi : \xi$ and we pass to the limit $i \rightarrow +\infty$ in (24) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x,r)) \right) \\ \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{B(x,\rho+\tau r) \setminus L} \mathbb{C}e(v) : e(v) dx + C\varepsilon \\ + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B(x,\rho)) + C\tau + \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(r + 4\tau r)(r + 4\tau r)^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and then $\tau \rightarrow 0$ to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x,r)) \right) \\ \leq \int_{B(x,r) \setminus L} \mathbb{C}e(v) : e(v) dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x,r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 4. The case of a vanishing elastic energy. We pass to the last part of the statement. We assume that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_H |e(u_i)| dx = 0 \quad \text{for all compact set } H \subset \Omega \setminus K.$$

and we prove that the limit satisfies a simplified minimality condition. By Lemma 3.4, we know that $e(u) = 0$ almost-everywhere on $\Omega \setminus K$. Therefore, for each connected component \mathcal{O}_ℓ of $\Omega \setminus K$, there exists a rigid motion a_ℓ such that $u = a_\ell$ a.e. in \mathcal{O}_ℓ . Now, let L be a topological competitor of K in some ball $B(x,r) \subset \subset \Omega$. We are going to define a suitable function $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus L; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $v = u$ a.e. in $\Omega \setminus B(x,r)$. For each connected component V of $\Omega \setminus L$, we distinguish two cases. If $V \setminus \overline{B}(x,r) = \emptyset$, then there exists a unique connected component \mathcal{O}_ℓ of $\Omega \setminus K$ such that $V \setminus \overline{B}(x,r) \subset \mathcal{O}_\ell$. Indeed, the points of $V \setminus \overline{B}(x,r)$ belong to the same connected components of $\Omega \setminus L$, then they also belong to the same connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$. As $V \setminus \overline{B}(x,r)$ is non-empty, this connected component must be unique. In this case, we set $v = a_\ell$ in V and we note we have $v = u$ a.e. in $V \setminus \overline{B}(x,r) \subset \mathcal{O}_\ell$. If on the other hand, $V \subset \overline{B}(x,r)$, then we just set $v = 0$ inside V and this is compatible with the Dirichlet condition on v . Since both u and v are piecewise rigid, only the surface terms are involved in the energy comparison. \square

5. FINE LOWER DENSITY BOUND FOR QUASIMINIMIZERS

The main goal of this section is to prove the following proposition. We work in the general setting of quasiminimizers as the statements of this section have an independent interest.

Proposition 5.1. *For each $M \geq 1$ and $p \in (2(N-1)/N, 2]$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ (depending on N, \mathbb{C}, M, p) and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ (depending on $N, \mathbb{C}, M, p, \varepsilon$) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be a topological M -quasiminimizer with gauge h in Ω . For all $x_0 \in K$, for all $r_0 > 0$ with $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$, if*

$$\beta(x_0, r_0) + \omega_p(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_1$$

then we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\omega_{N-1}r_0^{N-1},$$

where ω_{N-1} is the measure of the $(N-1)$ -dimensional unit disk.

The proof will need several preliminary lemmas that we write below.

5.1. Initialization of the jump. We define the “normalized jump” similarly to [22]. Let (u, K) be a pair in Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $\beta_K(x_0, r_0) \leq 1/2$. We choose a hyperplane P_0 which achieves the infimum in the definition of $\beta(x_0, r_0)$ and we choose a unit normal ν_0 to P . We define a_1, a_2 as the two rigid motions that approximate u in the lower and upper part of $B(x_0, r_0)$, namely for $i = 1, 2$,

$$a_i(x) = b_i + A_i(x - x_0)$$

where $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ are such that

$$b_i = \int_{D_i} u(y) \, dy, \quad A_i = \int_{D_i} \frac{\nabla u(y) - \nabla u(y)^T}{2} \, dy \quad (25)$$

and $D_i \subset\subset B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K$ is the domain defined by

$$D_1 := B(x_0 + (3r_0/4)\nu_0, r_0/8), \quad D_2 := B(x_0 - (3r_0/4)\nu_0, r_0/8). \quad (26)$$

Then, we define the *normalized jump* of u in $B(x_0, r_0)$ as

$$J(x_0, r_0) := \frac{|b_1 - b_2| + r_0|A_1 - A_2|}{\sqrt{r_0}}.$$

This quantity is invariant under rescaling, see Remark 2.3. We also recall the definition of the p -normalized elastic energy, defined for $p \geq 1$ by

$$\omega_p(x_0, r_0) := r_0^{1-2N/p} \left(\int_{B(x_0, r_0) \setminus K} |e(u)|^p \, dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

A classical argument in [22], which is also a first step toward the proof of Proposition 5.1, says that when β and ω are small enough then J is bounded from below. We are going to adapt the argument to Griffith quasiminimizers. We first recall a basic estimate about the harmonic extension from a sphere to the ball. The proof is given in [22, Lemma 22.32].

Lemma 5.2. (*Estimate about an extension* [22, Lemma 22.32]) *For each $p \in (2(N-1)/N, 2]$, there is a constant $C \geq 1$ (which depends on N and p) such that if $B = B(x, r)$ is a ball in \mathbb{R}^N and $f \in W^{1,p}(\partial B)$ then there is a function $v \in W^{1,2}(B)$ such that*

$$\int_B |\nabla v|^2 \, dx \leq Cr^{N-\frac{2N}{p}+\frac{2}{p}} \left(\int_{\partial B} |\nabla f|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}$$

and v has a trace on ∂B that coincide with f almost-everywhere.

Lemma 5.3. (*Initialization of the jump*) *For each $M \geq 1$ and $p \in (2(N-1)/N, 2]$, there exists a constant $\tau_0 > 0$ (depending on N, \mathbb{C}, M and p) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be a topological M -quasiminimizer with gauge h in Ω . For all $x_0 \in K$, for all $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$,*

$$\beta_K(x_0, r_0) + \omega_p(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \tau_0,$$

and

$$K \text{ does not separate } D_1 \text{ and } D_2, \text{ see (26),} \quad (27)$$

then we have

$$J(x_0, r_0) \geq \tau_0.$$

The proof is similar to that of [22, Proposition 42.10]. We proceed by contradiction and by assuming $\beta + \omega + J^{-1} + h \ll 1$, one build a better competitor of u by removing $K \cap B(x_0, r_0)$ and making an interpolation between the two rigid motions a_1 and a_2 . The quantity J estimates the cost of such an interpolation. The assumption (27) means that D_1 and D_2 lie in the same connected component of $\Omega \setminus K$. This ensures that when one removes a piece of K , we still have a topological competitor. Note that if (u, K) is a plain quasiminimizer (without the topological constraint (3) on competitors), the assumption (27) is not needed.

Proof. We let the letter C denotes a constant ≥ 1 which depends only on N , \mathbb{C} , M and p . Since the statement is invariant under rescaling, we can assume that $B(x_0, r_0) = B(0, 1)$ and we choose a system of coordinates such that the infimum in the definition of the flatness is achieved for $P_0 = \{x_N = 0\}$. Let (u, K) be a topological M -quasiminimizer with gauge h in $B(0, 1)$. We let $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, 1/10)$ be a small parameter such that

$$\beta_K(0, 1) \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad \omega_p(0, 1) \leq \varepsilon_1, \quad h(1) \leq \varepsilon_2. \quad (28)$$

We let $a_1(x) = b_1 + A_1x$ and $a_2(x) = b_2 + A_2x$ be two rigid motions approximating u in the upper and lower part of $B(0, 1)$, as defined in (25). We introduce the open ring $R := B(0, 1) \setminus \overline{B}(0, 3/4)$. According to Korn-Poincaré inequality in the domains $\{x \in R \mid \pm x_N > \varepsilon_0\}$ (which are disjoint from K), we have

$$\int_{R \cap \{x_N > \varepsilon_0\}} |u - a_1|^p + |\nabla u - \nabla a_1|^p dx \leq C\omega_p(0, 1)^{p/2} \quad (29)$$

and similarly

$$\int_{R \cap \{x_N < -\varepsilon_0\}} |u - a_2|^p + |\nabla u - \nabla a_2|^p dx \leq C\omega_p(0, 1)^{p/2}. \quad (30)$$

Note that the constant C here is independent of $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1/10)$. We start by building an interpolation of these two rigid motions in the ring R . We consider a function $\varphi_0 \in C^\infty(R)$ such that $0 \leq \varphi_0 \leq 1$, $|\nabla \varphi_0| \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-1}$ and

$$\varphi_0 = 1 \text{ in } R \cap \{x_N > \varepsilon_0\}, \quad \varphi_0 = 0 \text{ in } R \cap \{x_N < -\varepsilon_0\}.$$

Then we let $\bar{u} : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be defined by

$$\bar{u}(x) = \varphi_0(x)a_1(x) + (1 - \varphi_0(x))a_2(x).$$

We compute

$$e(\bar{u}) = \nabla \varphi_0(x) \odot (a_1(x) - a_2(x)) \quad (31)$$

and we observe that the elastic energy of such an interpolation is controlled by J , namely,

$$\int_R |e(\bar{u})|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-2} J(0, 1)^2.$$

The inequalities (29) and (30) can be reformulated as

$$\int_{R \cap \{|x_N| > \varepsilon_0\}} |u - \bar{u}|^p + |\nabla u - \nabla \bar{u}|^p dx \leq C\omega_p(0, 1)^{p/2}$$

and this allows to select a radius $\rho \in (3/4, 1)$ such that

$$u - \bar{u} \in W^{1,2}(\partial B(0, \rho) \cap \{|x_N| > \varepsilon_0\}; \mathbb{R}^N)$$

with a tangential derivative given by the restriction of $\nabla u - \nabla \bar{u}$,

and

$$\int_{\partial B(0, \rho) \cap \{|x_N| > \varepsilon_0\}} |u - \bar{u}|^p + |\nabla u - \nabla \bar{u}|^p d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \leq C\omega_p(0, 1)^{p/2}. \quad (32)$$

Then, we make an extension of $u - \bar{u}$ from $\partial B(0, \rho) \cap \{|x_N| > \varepsilon_0\}$ to the whole sphere $\partial B(0, \rho)$. We set $B := B(0, \rho)$ and we consider a function $\varphi \in C^1(\partial B)$ such that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$,

$$\varphi = 1 \text{ in } \{x \in \partial B \mid |x_N| > 3\varepsilon_0\}, \quad \varphi = 0 \text{ in } \{x \in \partial B \mid |x_N| < 2\varepsilon_0\}$$

and $|\nabla\varphi| \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-1}$. We finally define $f(x) := \varphi(x)(u(x) - \bar{u}(x)) \in W^{1,2}(\partial B; \mathbb{R}^N)$. We have

$$|\nabla f| \leq |\varphi| |\nabla u - \nabla \bar{u}| + |\nabla\varphi| |u - \bar{u}|$$

and by (32) and the facts that $|\varphi| \leq 1$ and $|\nabla\varphi| \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-1}$, we can estimate

$$\int_{\partial B} |\nabla f|^p d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \leq C \int_{\partial B(0, \rho) \cap \{|x_N| > \varepsilon_0\}} |u - \bar{u}|^p + |\nabla u - \nabla \bar{u}|^p d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-p} \omega_p(0, 1)^{p/2}.$$

Then by Lemma 5.2, there exists a function $v \in W^{1,2}(B; \mathbb{R}^N)$ with a trace which coincides with f almost-everywhere on ∂B such that

$$\int_B |\nabla v|^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_{\partial B} |\nabla f|^p \right)^{2/p} \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-2} \omega_p(0, 1).$$

We finally define a competitor (u^*, K^*) of (u, K) in $B(0, 1)$ by

$$K^* := (K \setminus B(0, \rho)) \cup Z,$$

where $Z := \{x \in \partial B(0, \rho) \mid |x_N| \leq 3\varepsilon_0\}$, and

$$u^* := \begin{cases} v(y) + \bar{u}(y) & \text{in } B(0, \rho) \\ u(y) & \text{in } \Omega \setminus (B(0, \rho) \cup Z). \end{cases}$$

Remember that $f = u(y) - \bar{u}(y)$ on $\partial B(0, \rho) \setminus Z$ so the two functions glue well along $\partial B(0, \rho) \setminus Z$. We also need to check that it satisfies the topological condition (3), i.e., that all $x, y \in \Omega \setminus (K \cup \bar{B}(0, \rho))$ which are not separated by K^* , are not separated by K either. So let γ be a continuous path connecting x, y in the complement of K^* . If γ never meets $\bar{B}(0, \rho)$, then it also connects x, y in the complement of K because K^* coincides with K outside of $\bar{B}(0, \rho)$. If γ meets $\bar{B}(0, \rho)$, then it also meets $\partial B(0, \rho)$ and it can only be at a point of $\partial B(0, \rho) \setminus Z$. By considering the first time at which γ meets $\partial B(0, \rho)$, we see that x is connected to $\partial B(0, \rho) \setminus Z$ in the complement of K . The same holds for y . By assumption, there exists a connected component \mathcal{O} of $\Omega \setminus K$ which contains the domains D_1 and D_2 , defined in (26). The sets

$$\{x \in B(0, 1) \mid |x_N| > 3\varepsilon_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{x \in B(0, 1) \mid |x_N| < -3\varepsilon_0\}$$

are connected subset of $\Omega \setminus K$ which meet \mathcal{O} (because they contain D_1 and D_2) so they are also contained in \mathcal{O} . As a conclusion, we see that both x and y are connected to $\partial B(0, \rho) \setminus Z$ in the complement of K and $\partial B(0, \rho) \setminus Z \subset \mathcal{O}$ so x and y are connected in the complement of K .

The pair (u^*, K^*) is a topological competitor of (u, K) and (u^*, K^*) in all balls $B(0, t)$ where $t \in (\rho, 1)$ and we deduce

$$\int_{B(0, \rho)} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) dx + M^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \bar{B}(0, \rho)) \leq \int_{B(0, \rho)} \mathbb{C}e(u^*) : e(u^*) dx + M \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(Z) + h(1).$$

If $\varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon_A$, where ε_A is the required parameter for the density lower bound (4), then (28) yields $h(1) \leq \varepsilon_A$ so

$$M^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(0, \rho)) \geq C^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(Z) \leq C\varepsilon_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(0,\rho)} \mathbb{C}e(u^*) : e(u^*) \, dx &\leq C \int_{B(0,\rho)} |\nabla v|^2 \, dx + C \int_{B(0,\rho)} |e(w)|^2 \, dx \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0^{-2} (\omega_p(0,1) + J(0,1)^2) \end{aligned}$$

so the energy comparison yields

$$C^{-1} \leq C (\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon_0^{-2}\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_0^{-2}J(0,1)^2) + \varepsilon_2,$$

where now $C \geq 1$ is a fixed constant which depends only on N, \mathbb{C}, M, p . We fix ε_0 and ε_2 small enough such that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq C^{-1}/6$, and $\varepsilon_2 \leq C^{-1}/6$. Then we choose ε_1 small enough such that $C\varepsilon_0^{-2}\varepsilon_1 \leq C^{-1}/6$. We arrive at $C/2 \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-2}J(0,1)^2$, which bounds $J(0,1)$ from below by constant which depends only on N, \mathbb{C}, M and p . The statement follows for a suitable choice of τ_0 . \square

5.2. Size of holes through a projection. The following Lemma estimates the size of holes through a projection by a slicing technique. It reminds an argument that RIGOT [50] performed in the scalar case, but it is more intricate to use it here in the Griffith setting. This complexity arises because the estimates involves only the component of the jump in the direction of the slicing.

Lemma 5.4. *Let (u, K) be a pair in Ω . Let $x_0 \in K$, $r_0 > 0$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ be such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $\beta_K(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon$. Let P_0, ν_0 and a_1, a_2 be as in the beginning of Section 5.1. Then for all unit vector $\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ such that $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon$, we have*

$$J(\nu) \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, (1-4\varepsilon)r_0) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)))}{r_0^{N-1}} \right)^2 \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}\omega_1(x_0, r_0)^{1/2},$$

where $P = x_0 + \nu^\perp$, π_P is the orthogonal projection onto P ,

$$J(\nu) := \frac{|(b_1 - b_2) \cdot \nu| + r_0|(A_1 - A_2)\nu|}{\sqrt{r_0}}$$

and $C \geq 1$ is a universal constant.

Proof. The letter $C \geq 1$ denotes a universal constant whose value might change from one line to another. Since all the quantities involved in the inequality are invariant under standard rescaling, see Remark 2.3, we can assume that $B(x_0, r_0) = B(0, 1)$ without loss of generality. We let $\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ be a unit vector such that $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon$. First of all, we observe that since

$$K \cap B(0, 1) \subset \{|x \cdot \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon\},$$

and $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon$, we also have

$$K \cap B(0, 1) \subset \{|x \cdot \nu| \leq 2\varepsilon\}. \tag{33}$$

In what follows, we assume that ν is the last vector of the canonic basis to simplify the notations. We decompose each point $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as $x = x' + x_N e_N$, where $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ and $x_N = x \cdot e_N \in \mathbb{R}$.

Step 1. Building an auxiliary function. We build a function $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B(0, 1) \setminus K; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= a_1(x) \text{ in } B(0, 1) \cap \{x_N \geq 4\varepsilon\} \\ v(x) &= a_2(x) \text{ in } B(0, 1) \cap \{x_N \leq -4\varepsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the following estimate holds

$$\int_{B(0,1)\setminus K} |e(v)| \, dx \leq C \int_{B(0,1)\setminus K} |e(u)| \, dx.$$

We consider a smooth cut-off function $\varphi_1 : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ equal to 1 on $\{x_N \geq 4\varepsilon\}$, equal to 0 on $\{x_N \leq 2\varepsilon\}$, with $0 \leq \varphi_1 \leq 1$ and $|\nabla\varphi_1| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}$. We also consider another cut-off function $\varphi_- : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ equal to 1 on $\{x_N \leq -4\varepsilon\}$, equal to 0 on $\{x_N \geq -2\varepsilon\}$, with $0 \leq \varphi_- \leq 1$ and $|\nabla\varphi_-| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}$. We finally define

$$v(x) := \varphi_1(x)a_1(x) + \varphi_2(x)a_2(x) + (1 - \varphi_1(x))(1 - \varphi_2(x))u(x).$$

This function v defined above clearly belongs to $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B(0,1)\setminus K; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and satisfies properties (1) and (2) of the statement. Let us estimate the energy of v in the region $B(0,1) \cap \{x_N > 2\varepsilon\} \setminus K$. In this domain, we know that $\varphi_2 = 0$ so that the expression of v reduces to $v = \varphi_1 a_1 + (1 - \varphi_1)u$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |e(v)| &\leq |\nabla\varphi_1||a_1 - u| + (1 - \varphi_1)|e(u)| \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{-1}|a_1 - u| + |e(u)|. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that the rigid motion a_1 is the average rigid motion of u in the domain $D_1 := B((3/4)\nu_0, 1/8)$. Since $|e_N - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \leq 1/4$, we have $e_N \cdot \nu_0 \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2/2 > 5/6$ and thus for $x \in D_1$,

$$|x_N| \geq (3/4)(e_N \cdot \nu_0) - 1/8 > (3/4) \cdot (5/6) - 1/8 = 1/2. \quad (34)$$

Hence, D_1 is contained in $B(0,1) \cap \{x_N > 2\varepsilon\}$, which is a Lipschitz domain disjoint from K by (33). So by Korn-Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\int_{B(0,1) \cap \{x_N > 2\varepsilon\}} |u - a_1| \, dx \leq C \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u)| \, dx.$$

We conclude that

$$\int_{B(0,1) \cap \{x_N > 2\varepsilon\}} |e(v)| \, dx \leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u)| \, dx.$$

We can estimate the energy of v in $B(0,1) \cap \{x_N < -2\varepsilon\}$ in the same way. And in the domain $B(0,1) \cap \{-2\varepsilon < x_N < 2\varepsilon\} \setminus K$, we have $v = u$ so there is nothing to do.

Step 2. Controlling the size of holes in the projection by slicing. This step is based on the elementary observation that

$$\frac{d}{dt} [v(x + te_N) \cdot e_N] = (e(v)(x + te_N)e_N) \cdot e_N.$$

Let $E := P \cap B(0,1 - 4\varepsilon) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0))$, where we recall that $P = \{x_N = 0\}$. Then for all $x' \in E$, we can integrate along a vertical segment from $x^- = x' - 4\varepsilon e_N$ to $x^+ = x' + 4\varepsilon e_N$. This yields

$$(a_2(x^+) - a_1(x^-)) \cdot e_N = \int_{-4\varepsilon}^{4\varepsilon} (e(v)(x' + te_N)e_N) \cdot e_N \, dt.$$

Then we apply Fubini and integrate with respect to $x' \in E$, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |(a_2(x^+) - a_1(x^-)) \cdot e_N| dx' &= \int_E \int_{-4\varepsilon}^{4\varepsilon} (e(v)(x' + te_N) \cdot e_N) \cdot e_N dt dx' \\ &\leq \int_{B(0,1)} |e(v)| dx \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u)| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall that $a_i(x) = b_i + A_i x$, where A is a skew-symmetric matrix so

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(x' \pm 2\varepsilon e_N) \cdot e_N &= b_i \cdot e_N + (A_i x') \cdot e_N \pm 2\varepsilon (A_i e_N) \cdot e_N \\ &= b_i \cdot e_N - (A_i e_N) \cdot x' \end{aligned}$$

and we arrive at

$$\int_E |(b_2 - b_1) \cdot e_N - x' \cdot ((A_2 - A_1)e_N)| dx' \leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u)| dx.$$

In view of Lemma A.1 in Appendix (applied in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}), this gives finally

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E)^2 (|(b_2 - b_1) \cdot e_N| + |(A_2 - A_1)e_N|) \leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u)| dx,$$

and the proof is concluded. \square

5.3. Proof of Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. As usual, we let $C \geq 1$ denote a generic constant which depends only on N, \mathbb{C}, M and p . We let P_0, ν_0, D_1, D_2 and a_1, a_2 be as in the beginning of Section 5.1. We fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and we let $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, 1/4)$ be small parameters (they will be chosen small enough depending on ε) such that

$$\beta(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_1, \quad \omega_p(x_0, r_0) \leq \varepsilon_2, \quad h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

We consider a unit vector $\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ such that $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon_1$ and we let $P = x_0 + \nu^\perp$ and π_P denote the orthogonal projection onto P . Since orthogonal projections are 1-Lipschitz, we can bound the measure of K from below by the measure of its projection

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) &\geq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0))) \\ &\geq \omega_{N-1} r_0^{N-1} - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, r_0) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0))). \end{aligned}$$

Now the goal of the proof is to control

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, r_0) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)))$$

for a suitable choice of vector ν . We can first bound

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, r_0) \setminus B(x_0, (1 - 4\varepsilon_1)r_0)) \leq C\varepsilon_1 r_0^{N-1},$$

and are left to deal with

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, (1 - 4\varepsilon_1)r_0) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0))).$$

We focus first on the case where K separates the domain D_1 and D_2 . We recall the fact seen just below (34), that D_1 is contained in $B(0, 1) \cap \{x \cdot \nu > 2\varepsilon_1\}$ and D_2 is contained in $B(0, 1) \cap \{x \cdot \nu < -2\varepsilon_1\}$, which are convex domains disjoint from K . Hence, for all $x \in P \cap B(x_0, (1 - 4\varepsilon_1)r_0)$, the segment $x + [-2\varepsilon_1, 2\varepsilon_1]\nu$ must meet K otherwise it could be used to

connect D_1 and D_2 . Thus the projection $\pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0))$ contains $P \cap B(x_0, (1 - 4\varepsilon_1)r_0)$. We conclude in this case that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \geq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0))) \geq \omega_{N-1}r_0^{N-1} - C\varepsilon_1r_0^{N-1}.$$

It then suffices to choose ε_1 small enough (depending on N, ε) to conclude the theorem statement.

We now assume that K does not separate the domain D_1 and D_2 and this will allow us to use Lemma 5.3. We know by Lemma 5.4 that for all $\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ such that $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon_1$, we have

$$J(\nu) \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, (1 - 4\varepsilon_1)r_0) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)))}{r_0^{N-1}} \right)^2 \leq C\varepsilon_1^{-1}\omega_1(x_0, r_0)^{1/2},$$

where $P = x_0 + \nu^\perp$. We are then looking for a vector ν close to ν_0 such that $J(\nu)$ is bounded from below. To simplify the notations, we set $b := b_2 - b_1$ and $A := A_2 - A_1$. According to Lemma A.2), we have

$$\int_{\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1} \cap B(\nu_0, \varepsilon_1)} |b \cdot \nu| + |A\nu| \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\nu) \geq C(\varepsilon_1)^{-1} (|b| + r_0 |A|)$$

where $C(\varepsilon_1) \geq 1$ also depends on ε_1 and is allowed to take a bigger value in the next lines. We can thus find a vector $\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ such that $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon_1$ and

$$J(\nu) \geq C(\varepsilon_1)^{-1}J(x_0, r_0),$$

and for this choice of ν , we have

$$J(x_0, r_0) \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, (1 - 2\varepsilon_1)r_0) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)))}{r_0^{N-1}} \right)^2 \leq C(\varepsilon_1)\omega_1(x_0, r_0)^{1/2}.$$

Now, we let τ_0 be the constant of Lemma 5.3, which depends only on N, \mathbb{C}, M, p , and we take $\varepsilon_1 \leq \tau_0/3$, $\varepsilon_2 \leq \tau_0/2$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \tau_0/3$ so that $J(x_0, r_0) \geq \tau_0^{-1}$. Using also the fact that $\omega_1 \leq \omega_p$, we arrive at

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(x_0, (1 - 2\varepsilon_1)r_0) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)))}{r_0^{N-1}} \right)^2 \leq C(\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_2^{1/2}.$$

We conclude that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \geq \left(\omega_{N-1} - C\varepsilon_1 - C(\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_2^{1/2} \right) r_0^{N-1}.$$

We can first fix ε_1 such that $\varepsilon_1 \leq \omega_{N-1}\varepsilon/2$ and then ε_2 even smaller such that $C(\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_2^{1/2} \leq \omega_{N-1}\varepsilon/2$, which yields

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \geq \omega_{N-1}(1 - \varepsilon)r_0^{N-1},$$

and finishes the proof. \square

6. UNIFORM CONCENTRATION PROPERTY

In this section we will prove the uniform concentration property that was announced in the introduction, i.e. in Theorem 1.1. We start by recalling the definition of a uniformly concentrated sequence given in [22, Section 35].

Definition 6.1. Let $(E_i)_i$ and E be relatively closed subsets of Ω . We say that the sequence $(E_i)_i$ is uniformly concentrated with respect to E provided that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $C(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that the following holds. For all $x \in E$, there exists $r(x) > 0$ such that for all $0 < r \leq r(x)$, for all i large enough, we can find a ball $B(y_i, \rho_i) \subset \Omega \cap B(x, r)$ with $\rho_i \geq C(\varepsilon)^{-1}r$ and

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_i \cap B(y_i, \rho_i)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\omega_{N-1}\rho_i^{N-1},$$

where ω_{N-1} is the measure of the $(N - 1)$ -dimensional unit disk.

As mentioned in introduction, this property implies the lower semi-continuity of the area,

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_i). \quad (35)$$

We refer to [49] or [22, Theorem 35.4] for a proof. We then show that for a Griffith almost-minimizers, the density of K is greater than $1 - \varepsilon$ when the normalized elastic energy is small. This result improves Proposition 5.1 by removing the flatness assumption and finds its intuition in the fact that K behaves like a minimal sets in regime of low elastic energy.

Proposition 6.2. For each $p \in (2(N - 1)/N, 2]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ (depending on $N, \mathbb{C}, p, \varepsilon$) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be a topological almost-minimizer with gauge h in Ω . For all $x_0 \in K$ and for all $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and

$$\omega_p(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad (36)$$

we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x_0, r_0)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\omega_{N-1}r_0^{N-1},$$

where ω_{N-1} is the measure of the unit $(N - 1)$ -dimensional disk.

Contrary to Proposition 5.1, the statement of Proposition 6.2 does not hold for Griffith quasiminimizers in general. Indeed if K is a Lipschitz graph of codimension 1 in \mathbb{R}^N , then $(0, K)$ is a Griffith quasiminimizer (for a suitable constant $M \geq 1$) with gauge $h = 0$ and elastic energy $\omega = 0$. The pair $(0, K)$ satisfies (36) in all balls centred on K but K may not have not have a density ≥ 1 if $N \geq 3$. The result could be adapted to quasiminimizers in dimension $N = 2$, but we don't pursue in that direction.

Proof of Proposition 6.2. As usual, we let $C \geq 1$ denote a generic constant which depends only N, \mathbb{C}, p . By standard rescaling, we assume that $B(x_0, r_0) = B(0, 1)$ without loss of generality.

Step 1. Contradiction and compactness. We proceed by contradiction and find a parameter $c \in (0, 1)$ and sequence of topological almost minimizers (u_i, K_i) in $B(0, 1)$ such that $0 \in K_i$,

$$\int_{B(0,1)} |e(u_i)|^p dx + h_i(1) \rightarrow 0 \quad (37)$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(0, 1)) < (1 - c)\omega_{N-1}.$$

Since $h_i(1) \rightarrow 0$, we can extract a subsequence (not relabelled) such that for all i , $h_i(1) \leq \varepsilon_A$, where ε_A is the constant needed for (4) and (5). We thus have

$$\sup_i \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(0, 1)) < +\infty,$$

and we can extract a subsequence such that the measures $(\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner K_i)_i$ converges to a measure μ and such that the pairs $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in $B(0, 1)$. Since $h_i(1) \leq \varepsilon_A$

uniformly, there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ (depending only on N, \mathbb{C}) such that for all i , for all $x \in K_i$ and for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x_i, r) \subset B(0, 1)$, we have

$$C^{-1}r^{N-1} \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, r)) \leq Cr^{N-1}.$$

It follows that for all $x \in K$ and for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$, we have

$$C^{-1}r^{N-1} \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq Cr^{N-1}.$$

and

$$C^{-1}r^{N-1}\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \leq Cr^{N-1},$$

see Lemma 3.5. Moreover, by application of Proposition 4.1 and the fact that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(0,1)} |e(u_i)| dx + h_i(1) = 0,$$

we know that for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$ and for all topological competitor L of K in $B = B(x, r)$, we have

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x, r)). \quad (38)$$

Step 2. The limit K is rectifiable. It does not hold true in general that a limit of rectifiable sets is rectifiable so we have no other choice than to take advantage of the minimality property (38) satisfied by the limit. For this purpose, we borrow a Federer-Fleming type argument from [40]. Since K is a Borel set with finite measure in $B(0, 1)$, it can be decomposed as disjoint union $K = E \cup F$ of two Borel sets with E being rectifiable and F being purely unrectifiable. We also know by standard density theorems [48, Theorem 6.2(2)] that for \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -a.e. $x \in F$, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(x, r)) = 0.$$

Let us fix such a point $x \in K$ and let us consider a radius $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset \Omega$. For $z \in B(x, r) \setminus K$, we let $\phi_z : \overline{B}(x, r) \setminus \{z\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be the radial projection centered at z onto $\partial B(x, r)$. We are going to see that for a suitable choice of center z , the radial projection cancels the purely unrectifiable part of K . For $d = 1, \dots, N-1$, we let $G(N, d)$ denote the Grassmannian manifold of all d -dimensional linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^N . We let $\gamma_{N,d}$ denote the canonic probability measure on $G(N, d)$ and we refer to [48, Chapter 3, §3.9] for the definition. We shall know that for all Borel set $\mathcal{S} \subset G(N, d)$,

$$\gamma_{N,d}(\mathcal{S}) = \gamma_{N,N-d}(\{V^\perp \mid V \in \mathcal{S}\}).$$

We shall also know that for all Borel set $S \subset \partial B(0, 1)$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(S) \leq C\gamma_{N,1}(\{L \mid L \cap S \neq \emptyset\}). \quad (39)$$

Let us justify that for all shifted center $x_0 \in B(0, 1/2)$ and for all Borel set $S \subset \partial B(0, 1)$, we also have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(S) \leq C\gamma_{N,1}(\{L \mid (x_0 + L) \cap S \neq \emptyset\}). \quad (40)$$

If we let f denote the radial projection centered at x_0 onto $\partial B(x_0, 2)$, then the restriction of f on $S \subset \partial B(0, 1)$ is C -biLipschitz so $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(S) \leq C\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(f(S))$. Using a rescaled version of (39) in $B(x_0, 2)$, we can estimate

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(f(S)) \leq C\gamma_{N,1}(\{L \mid (x_0 + L) \cap f(S) \neq \emptyset\})$$

and we observe from the definition of f that $(x_0 + L) \cap \phi(S) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $(x_0 + L) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. This proves (40). Let us come back to the ball $B(x, r)$ and the radial projection ϕ_z centered on z

onto $\partial B(x, r)$. Using a rescaled version of (40) in $B(x, r)$, we deduce that for all $z \in B(x, r/2) \setminus K$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\phi_z(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r))) \leq Cr^{N-1} \gamma_{N,1} (\{L \mid (L+z) \cap K \cap \overline{B}(x, r) \neq \emptyset\}).$$

With the help of Fubini, we can estimate that on average

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x, r/2) \setminus K} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\phi_z(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r))) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(z) \\ & \leq Cr^{-1} \int_{B(x, r/2) \setminus K} \int_{G(N,1)} \gamma_{N,1} (\{L \mid (x_0 + L) \cap K \cap \overline{B}(x, r) \neq \emptyset\}) \, dL \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(z) \\ & \leq Cr^{-1} \int_{G(N,1)} |\{z \in B(x, r/2) \mid (x_0 + L) \cap K \cap \overline{B}(x, r) \neq \emptyset\}| \, dL \\ & \leq Cr^{-1} \int_{G(N, N-1)} |\{z \in B(x, r/2) \mid (x_0 + V^\perp) \cap K \cap \overline{B}(x, r) \neq \emptyset\}| \, dV \\ & \leq C \int_{G(N, N-1)} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(p_V(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r))) \, dV. \end{aligned}$$

According to the Besicovitch-Federer projection Theorem [48, Theorem 18.1], we know that for almost-all hyperplanes $V \in G(N, N-1)$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(p_V(F \cap \overline{B}(x, r))) = 0$$

and from the fact that orthogonal projections are 1-Lipschitz, we know that for all $V \in G(N, N-1)$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(p_V(E \cap \overline{B}(x, r))) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap \overline{B}(x, r)).$$

We thus conclude that

$$\int_{B(x, r/2) \setminus K} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\phi_z(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r))) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(z) \leq C\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap \overline{B}(x, r)).$$

This allows to find a center $z \in B(x, r) \setminus K$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\phi_z(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r))) \leq C\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap \overline{B}(x, r)).$$

We extend ϕ_z out of $\overline{B}(x, r)$ by setting $\phi_z = \text{id}$ and thus $L = \phi_z(K)$ is a topological competitor of K in all balls $B(x, t)$ where $t > r$ and $\overline{B}(x, t) \subset \Omega$, see Remark 2.1. We apply (38) and we use $\mu(B(x, r)) \geq C^{-1}r^{N-1}$ to obtain

$$C^{-1}r^{N-1} \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap \overline{B}(x, r)).$$

Remember that x is a point such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E \cap B(x, r)) = 0$ so we find a contradiction if r is small enough. This proves that we actually have $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(F) = 0$ and thus K is rectifiable. Note that as a standard consequence of rectifiability and Ahlfors-regularity, we have for \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -a.e. $x \in K$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta_K(x, r) = 0.$$

Step 3. Lower semi-continuity of the area. Our goal now is to prove that for \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -a.e. $x \in K$, we have

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{\omega_{N-1} r^d} \geq 1. \quad (41)$$

It will follow from standard density theorems [48, Theorem 6.9(2)] that $\mu \geq \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner K$. Let us fix $x \in K$ such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta_K(x, r) = 0$. By convergence in Hausdorff distance, there exists a sequence of points $x_i \in K_i$ such that $x_i \rightarrow x$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we let $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ be the associated constant given by Proposition 5.1. There exists a small radius $r(x) > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r(x)) \subset B(0, 1)$ and for all $0 < r \leq r(x)$, it holds $\beta_K(x, 2r) < \varepsilon_1/8$. The radius r being fixed, let us check that for i big enough, we have $\beta_{K_i}(x_i, r) \leq \varepsilon_1/2$. There exists an hyperplane P passing through x such that

$$K \cap B(x, 2r) \subset \{y : \text{dist}(y, P) < \varepsilon r/4\}.$$

As $x_i \rightarrow x$ and $K_i \rightarrow K$, more precisely using (8), we see that for i big enough

$$K_i \cap B(x_i, r) \subset K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, 3r/2) \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, P) < \varepsilon_1 r/4\}.$$

Let P_i be the hyperplane parallel to P passing through x_i . For i big enough, we have $|x_i - x| \leq \varepsilon_1 r/4$ and in particular P_i is a distance $\leq \varepsilon_1 r/4$ from P so

$$K_i \cap B(x_i, r) \subset \{\text{dist}(\cdot, P_i) < \varepsilon_1 r/2\}$$

and this justifies that $\beta_{K_i}(x_i, r) \leq \varepsilon_1/2$. For i big enough, we also have

$$r^{1-2N/p} \left(\int_{B(x_i, r)} |e(u_i)|^p dx \right)^{2/p} \leq \varepsilon_1/2$$

and $h_i(r) \leq \varepsilon_0$ because of the initial assumption (37). We can then apply Proposition 5.1 in $B(x_i, r)$ for i big enough, which shows that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x_i, r)) \geq \omega_{N-1}(1 - \varepsilon)r^{N-1}.$$

Passing to the limit, we arrive at

$$\mu(\overline{B}(x, r)) \geq \omega_{N-1}(1 - \varepsilon)r^{N-1}.$$

From the fact that this holds for $\mu(\overline{B}(x, r))$ for all $0 < r \leq r(x)$, one can also deduce that this holds for $\mu(B(x, r))$ for all $0 < r \leq r(x)$. We conclude

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{\omega_{N-1}r^{N-1}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

and we finally let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to prove our claim (41).

Step 4. Conclusion. Given that $\mu \geq \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner K$, the minimality condition (38) actually yields that for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$ and for all topological competitor L of K in $B(x, r)$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x, r)).$$

In fact, it is possible to remove the closure of the ball at the right-hand side. Here are more details. For small $t > r$ such that $\overline{B}(x, t) \subset B(0, 1)$, the set L is a topological competitor of K in $B(x, t)$ so we can replace $B(x, r)$ by $B(x, t)$ in the above inequality. Then we let $t \rightarrow r^+$ to obtain $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x, r))$ and we use the fact that K coincides with L on $\partial B(x, r)$ to recover

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

This means that K is a minimal set, see Definition 2.4, and in particular, it has a minimal area under continuous deformation, see Remark 2.1. These sets have monotone densities ([23,

Proposition 5.16] or [51, Chapter 3 §17]), i.e., for all $x \in K$ and for all $0 < r < R$ such that $B(x, R) \subset B(0, 1)$, we have

$$r^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \leq R^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, R)).$$

As a consequence, the limit

$$\theta(x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r))$$

exists and is finite at all points $x \in E$. We also know by rectifiability that for \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -a.e. $x \in K$, we have $\theta(x) = \omega_{N-1}$. As K is coral and contains 0, we have $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(0, \varepsilon)) > 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and therefore we can find $x \in E \cap B(0, \varepsilon)$ such that $\theta(x) = \omega_{n-1}$. Then, we estimate by monotonicity

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{N-1} &\leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, 1 - \varepsilon)) \\ &\leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(0, 1)) \end{aligned}$$

and letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$\omega_{N-1} \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(0, 1)).$$

This contradicts the fact that $\mu \geq \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner K$ and the initial assumption that $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(0, 1)) \leq \omega_{N-1}(1 - c)$. \square

We are now ready to prove the concentration property stated in Theorem 1.1. Notice that in the Mumford-Shah setting, uniform concentration is also known to hold for quasiminimizers. We expect that this should also be the case in the Griffith setting but our approach, which relies on Proposition 6.2, is not suitable for quasiminimizers. Nevertheless, Theorem 1.1 will be sufficient to deduce our main limiting theorem for almost-minimizers, i.e. Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The letter $C \geq 1$ denotes a generic constant which depends only on N and \mathbb{C} . Let us fix an exponent $p \in (2(N-1)/N, 2]$, say the middle point in the interval so that it depends only on N . Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let ε_0 be the associated constant given by Proposition 6.2. We want to find a smaller shifted ball where Proposition 6.2 applies and for this, we recall the Carleson estimate proved in [22]. It says that for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, 2r) \subset \Omega$ and $h(2r) \leq \varepsilon_A$, we have

$$\int_{y \in K \cap B(x, r)} \int_0^r \omega_p(y, t) \frac{dt}{t} d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \leq Cr^{N-1}.$$

The proof in [22] is performed with $|\nabla u|^2$ but readily applies with $|e(u)|^2$ since it only uses the Ahlfors-regularity properties (4), (5). We are going to use this inequality to find a constant $C_0 \geq 1$ (depending on N , \mathbb{C} , ε_0) such that the following holds: for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r) \leq \varepsilon_A$, there exists $y \in K \cap B(x, r/2)$ and $t \in (C_0^{-1}r, r/2)$ such that $\omega_p(y, t) \leq \varepsilon_0/2$. Indeed, if this is not the case for a given constant $C_0 \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} Cr^{N-1} &\geq \int_{y \in K \cap B(x, r/2)} \int_0^{r/2} \omega_p(y, t) \frac{dt}{t} d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \geq \int_{y \in K \cap B(x, r/2)} \int_{C_0^{-1}r}^{r/2} \omega_p(y, t) \frac{dt}{t} d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r/2)) \ln \left(\frac{C_0}{2} \right) \\ &\geq C^{-1} \varepsilon_0 \ln \left(\frac{C_0}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We reach a contradiction if C_0 is too big (depending on N , \mathbb{C} , ε_0). We conclude that for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r) \leq \varepsilon_A$, there exists $y \in K \cap B(x, r/2)$ and

$t \in (C_0^{-1}r, r/2)$ such that $\omega_p(y, t) \leq \varepsilon_0/2$. Assuming furthermore $h(r) \leq \min(\varepsilon_0/2, \varepsilon_A)$, we can apply Proposition 6.2 in $B(y, t)$ which yields

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(y, t)) \geq \omega_{N-1}(1 - \varepsilon)r^{N-1},$$

and concludes the proof. \square

We are going to deduce that the area is lower-semicontinuous along sequence of almost-minimizers.

Corollary 6.3 (Lower semicontinuity of the area). *Let $(\Omega_i)_i$ and Ω be a sequence of open sets as in (6). Let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , (u_i, K_i) is an almost-minimizer with gauge h_i in Ω_i . If $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω and*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(r) = 0,$$

then for all open set $V \subset \Omega$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap V) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap V).$$

Proof. We first deal with the case where $V \subset\subset \Omega$, in particular $V \subset \Omega_i$ for i big enough. We show that the sequence $(K_i \cap V)_i$ is uniformly concentrated with respect to $K \cap V$ in the ambient space V , see Definition 6.1. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $C_0 \geq 1$ be the associated constant given by Theorem 1.1. Let $x \in E \cap V$ and let us fix a radius $r(x)$ such that $B(x, 2r(x)) \subset V$ and $\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(r(x)) < \varepsilon_0$. In particular, for i big enough $V \subset \Omega_i$ and $h_i(r(x)) \leq \varepsilon_0$. For $0 < r \leq r(x)$ and for i big enough, there exists $x_i \in K_i$ such that $|x_i - x| \leq r/2$ and thus $B(x_i, r/2) \subset B(x, r) \subset V \subset \Omega_i$. Since $h_i(r/2) \leq \varepsilon_0$, Theorem 1.1 applied in $B(x_i, r/2) \subset \Omega_i$ shows that there exists $y_i \in K_i \cap B(x_i, r/4)$ and $t_i \in (C_0^{-1}r, r/4)$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(y_i, t_i)) \geq \omega_{N-1}(1 - \varepsilon)t_i^{N-1}.$$

We also clearly have $B(y_i, t_i) \subset B(x_i, r/2) \subset B(x, r) \cap V$. Definition 6.1 is thus satisfied and by (35), we deduce that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap V) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap V).$$

For a general open set $V \subset \Omega$, we consider an exhaustion of V by open sets $(V^n)_n$ such that $V^n \subset\subset V$. Thus, for all n ,

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap V^n) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap V^n) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap V)$$

whence by letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap V) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap V),$$

as desired. \square

We finally prove Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. We let $(u_i, K_i)_i$ be a sequence such that for all i , (u_i, K_i) is a topological almost-minimizer with gauge in Ω_i . We assume that $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u, K) in Ω and that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(t) = 0.$$

This assumption implies by Lemma 3.5 that K is coral and it will also allow us to apply Corollary 6.3. We know by Proposition 4.1 that for all open ball $B(x, r) \subset\subset \Omega$ such that $h^+(r) < \varepsilon_A$ and for all topological competitor (v, L) of (u, K) in $B(x, r)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\int_{B(x, r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \right) \\ \leq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus L} \mathbb{C}e(v) : e(v) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where $h^+(r) := \lim_{t \rightarrow r^+} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_i(t)$. As the elastic energy and the area are lower semi-continuous by Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 6.3, we have in particular

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, r)) \\ \leq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus L} \mathbb{C}e(v) : e(v) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Here, it is in fact possible to remove the closure $\overline{B}(x, r)$ at the right-hand side. Indeed, for all small $t > r$ such that $h^+(t) < \varepsilon_A$, the pair (v, L) is still a topological competitor of (u, K) in $B(x, t)$ so the energy comparison (43) holds when one replaces $B(x, r)$ by $B(x, t)$. Then one can let $t \rightarrow r^+$ and use the fact that $K \cap \partial B(x, r) = L \cap \partial B(x, r)$ to deduce the inequality with $B(x, r)$ on both sides (without closure). Here we have also used the fact that h^+ is right-continuous. It is clear that if we set $h(r) = h^+(r)$ when $h^+(r) < \varepsilon$ and $h(r) = +\infty$ otherwise, then (u, K) is an almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge h .

It is left to check that for all open ball $B(x, r) \subset\subset \Omega$, we have

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \leq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + h(r)r^{N-1}$$

and

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h(r)r^{N-1}.$$

We can directly assume that $h^+(r) < \varepsilon_A$ so that $h(r) = h^+(r)$. Observe that for $t > r$ slightly bigger than r such that $\overline{B}(x, t) \subset \Omega$ and $h^+(t) < \varepsilon$, we have $B(x, t) \subset \Omega_i$ and $h_i(t) \leq \varepsilon_A$ for i big enough and this implies a uniform bound by (5),

$$\int_{B(x, t) \setminus K_i} |e(u_i)|^2 \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, t)) \leq Ct^{N-1}.$$

This makes sure that we will always deal with finite quantities in the argument below. We apply (42) with (u, K) being a competitor of itself in $B(x, r)$, and we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\int_{B(x, r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \right) \\ \leq \int_{B(x, r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

We first deal with the limit superior of $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r))$. It follows from (44) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \right) + \left(\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \right) \\ & \leq \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and we know by lower semicontinuity of the energy that

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \geq \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx$$

so we deduce that

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}.$$

We pass to the limit superior of $\int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx$. It follows from (44) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \right) + \left(\liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \right) \\ & \leq \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) + h^+(r)r^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By an argument which is now usual, this also holds when one replaces $B(x, r)$ by balls $B(x, t)$ where t is a radius slightly bigger than r such that $\overline{B}(x, t) \subset \Omega$ and $h^+(t) < \varepsilon_A$. We know by lower semicontinuity of the area that

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap \overline{B}(x, t)) \geq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, t))$$

so we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x,t) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \right) + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B(x, t)) \\ & \leq \int_{B(x,t) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, t)) + h^+(t)t^{N-1} \end{aligned}$$

and in particular

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \right) + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, r)) \\ & \leq \int_{B(x,t) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap \overline{B}(x, t)) + h^+(t)t^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then one can let $t \rightarrow r^+$ and use $K \cap \partial B(x, r) = L \cap \partial B(x, r)$ to deduce

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K_i} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \leq \int_{B(x,r) \setminus K} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + h^+(r)r^{N-1}.$$

□

7. APPLICATIONS

7.1. Existence of blow-up limits. We adapt the notion of global minimizers introduced by BONNET [5] from the Mumford-Shah to the Griffith setting.

Definition 7.1 (Global minimizer). *A Griffith global minimizer in \mathbb{R}^N is a coral pair (u, K) such that for all $x \in K$, for all $r > 0$ and for all topological competitor (v, L) of (u, K) in $B = B(x, r)$, we have*

$$\int_B \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K \cap B) \leq \int_B \mathbb{C}e(v) : e(v) \, dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(L \cap B).$$

This notion draw its importance from the fact that blow-up limits of Griffith minimizer are global minimizers. We will justify this soon but let us first describe the known (or expected) global minimizers. The first example of global minimizers are those for which u is piecewise rigid. In this case, K is a minimal set of codimension 1 in \mathbb{R}^N and a partial classification is known. In dimension $N = 2$, there are exactly two possibilities: a line or a triple junction (three half lines meeting with an angle $2\pi/3$). In dimension $N = 3$, there are exactly three possibilities: an hyperplane, a \mathbb{Y} cone (three half-planes meeting with an angle $2\pi/3$) or a \mathbb{T} cone (the cone over the edges of a regular tetrahedron). We refer to TAYLOR [53] or DAVID [23, Theorem 1.9] for a proof. As soon as $N \geq 4$, we know a few minimal sets of codimension 1 in \mathbb{R}^N but not the full classification. There is for example the cone over the $(N - 2)$ -skeleton of a cube [7] and the cone over the $(N - 2)$ -skeleton of a regular simplex [43]. What about the global minimizers for which u is not piecewise rigid, we expect the crack-tip in the plane (K is a half-line) and more generally, the crack-front in higher dimensions (K is a half-hyperplane). It is known that the crack-tip is a global minimizer in the scalar case [6] but this is not yet proved in the vectorial case. It is not known if there could be other kind of global minimizers.

Let us describe now the blow-up limit procedure. Let (u, K) be a topological almost-minimizer in Ω with a gauge h . In particular, we recall in this case that the gauge satisfy $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} h(r) = 0$, see Definition 2.2. We fix $x_0 \in K$. We consider a sequence of radii $(r_i)_i$ such that $r_i \rightarrow 0$ and for each i , we consider the the pair $(u_i, K_i)_i$ defined by

$$u_i(x) = r_i^{-1/2} u(x_0 + r_i x) \quad \text{and} \quad K_i := r_i^{-1}(K - x_0)$$

in the domain $\Omega_i = r_i^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)$. This is a topological almost-minimizer in Ω_i with gauge $h_i(t) = h(r_i t)$. Since Ω is an open set, one can see that

for all compact set $H \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we have $H \subset \Omega_i$ for i large enough.

If the sequence $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a pair (u_∞, K_∞) in \mathbb{R}^N , then we call (u_∞, K_∞) a *blow-up limit* of (u, K) at x_0 . One can also see that the limit gauge is identically zero because $h_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore, a blow-up limit is a global minimizer in \mathbb{R}^N by Theorem 2.7.

Note that we can always extract a subsequence such that the pairs $(u_i, K_i)_i$ above converge. Indeed, for all $R > 0$ and for i big enough such that $B(0, R) \subset \Omega_i$ and $h(r_i R) \leq \varepsilon_A$, we have by Ahlfors-regularity (5)

$$\int_{B(0, R)} |e(u_i)|^2 \, dx = r_i^{1-N} \int_{B(x_0, r_i R)} |e(u)|^2 \, dx \leq CR^{N-1}.$$

Therefore, we can apply Lemma 3.3 to extract a convergent subsequence. This shows that every point has blow-up limits but we don't know if there is uniqueness of the blow-up crack-set.

We observe that if (u_∞, K_∞) is a blow-up limit of (u, K) at x_0 , then for all $r > 0$, the rescaled pair (v_∞, L_∞) defined by

$$v_\infty(x) = r^{-1/2} u_\infty(rx) \quad \text{and} \quad L_\infty = r^{-1} K_\infty \tag{45}$$

is also a blow-up limit of (u, K) at x_0 . This is a direct application of Remark 3.1. If there exists a unique blow-up crack-set K_∞ at x_0 , it must therefore be a cone centred at 0. In Proposition 7.3 we will classify the possible global minimizers whose crack set is a cone when $N = 2$.

Proposition 7.2. *Let (u, K) be a topological almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge h . Let $x_0 \in K$ and let a sequence $(r_i)_i$ such that $r_i \rightarrow 0$ and such that the pairs*

$$u_i(x) = r_i^{-1/2} u(x_0 + r_i x) \quad \text{and} \quad K_i := r_i^{-1}(K - x_0)$$

converges to a pair (u_∞, K_∞) in \mathbb{R}^N . Then (u_∞, K_∞) is a global minimizer in \mathbb{R}^N . Moreover, for all open ball $B = B(y, t) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we have

$$\int_{B(y,t)} \mathbb{C}e(u_\infty) : e(u_\infty) \, dx = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} r_i^{1-N} \int_{B(x_0+r_i y, r_i t)} \mathbb{C}e(u) : e(u) \, dx \quad (46)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_\infty \cap B(y, t)) &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} r_i^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x_0 + r_i y, r_i t)) \\ \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_\infty \cap \bar{B}(y, t)) &\geq \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} r_i^{1-N} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x_0 + r_i y, r_i t)). \end{aligned}$$

If in addition $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega_2(x_0, r) = 0$, then u is piecewise rigid and K is a minimal set in \mathbb{R}^N .

Proof. This is a direct application of Theorem 2.7. \square

We investigate the possible global minimizers (u, K) in the plane when K is a cone. As mentioned above, this naturally happens if there is uniqueness of the blow-up crack-set. In the setting of Mumford-Shah global minimizers, a similar classification holds under the more general assumption that K is connected. However, this is not yet available for Griffith due to the lack of Bonnet monotonicity formula.

Proposition 7.3. *Assume that $\mathbb{C}e = \lambda \text{tr}(e) Id + 2\mu e$ where λ and μ are the Lamé coefficients satisfying $\mu > 0$ and $\mu + \lambda > 0$. Let (u, K) be a global minimizer in \mathbb{R}^2 and assume that K is a cone centred at 0. Then, either K is empty, a line, a triple junction or a half-line (crack-tip).*

Proof. Let (u, K) be a global minimizer in \mathbb{R}^2 and assume that K is a cone centred at 0. Since the density of K at 0 is bounded by Ahlfors-regularity, this cone can only be composed of a finite number of half-lines. We can directly assume that K is composed of at least two half lines, as the other cases are already described in the conclusion of the proposition. Thus, $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus K$ is composed of infinite angular sectors with aperture in $(0, 2\pi)$. It is standard that by taking outer variations, one obtains that u is a weak solution of the Lamé system: denoting the strain by $\sigma := \mathbb{C}e(u) = \lambda \text{tr}(e(u)) Id + 2\mu e(u)$, then in each connected component Ω of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus K$, we have in a weak sense

$$\begin{cases} \text{div}(\sigma) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \sigma \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In each angular domain of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus K$, we invoke the regularity theory for the Lamé system in polygonal domains. More precisely we shall use [35, Theorem 3.11 (Decay Estimate I)] and deduce that there exists $C_0, \alpha > 0$ for which the following decay property holds:

$$\int_{B(0,r) \setminus K} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \leq C_0 r^{1+\alpha} \int_{B(0,1) \setminus K} (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) \, dx, \quad \forall 0 < r < 1. \quad (47)$$

Note that from the definition of pairs, we just have $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus K; \mathbb{R}^2)$ but since each connected component of $B(0,1) \setminus K$ is a Lipschitz domain, the Korn-Poincaré inequality shows that we

actually have $u \in W^{1,2}(B(0,1) \setminus K; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Therefore the constant

$$C_1 := C_0 \int_{B(0,1)} (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx$$

is finite and we can reformulate (47) as

$$\int_{B(0,r) \setminus K} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C_1 r^{1+\alpha}, \quad \forall 0 < r < 1. \quad (48)$$

Now we proceed to a blow-up procedure: from the pair (u, K) we define $(u_n, K_n)_n$ as being the blow-up sequence

$$K_n := \frac{1}{r_n} K \quad \text{and} \quad u_n(x) = r_n^{-1/2} u(r_n x),$$

with $r_n = 1/n \rightarrow 0$. We can extract a subsequence which converges to a pair (u_∞, K_∞) and from Proposition 7.2, we know that (u_∞, K_∞) is still a global minimizer in the plane. Of course since K is assumed to be a cone, it holds $K_\infty = K$. Now we want to prove that $e(u_\infty) = 0$. For that purpose, we apply (48) and (46) from Proposition 7.2 to deduce that for any given $a > 0$,

$$\int_{B(0,a) \setminus K} |e(u_\infty)|^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{r_n} \int_{B(0,r_n a) \setminus K} |e(u)|^2 dx \leq C_1 a^{1+\alpha} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} r_n^\alpha = 0,$$

thus $e(u_\infty) = 0$ in $B(0, a)$. Since $a > 0$ is arbitrary, this shows that $e(u_\infty) = 0$ everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus K$. But then (u_∞, K_∞) is a global minimizer with $e(u_\infty) = 0$, so K_∞ is a minimal set in \mathbb{R}^2 . In virtue of [23, Theorem 10.1], we conclude that K must be a line or a triple junction. \square

7.2. Equivalent definitions of the singular part. We consider topological almost-minimizer (u, K) in Ω with gauge h . We define the *regular part* of K as the set of points $x \in K$ for which there exists a sequence $(r_i)_i$ going to 0 and an hyperplane P passing through x such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} r_i^{-1} \left(\sup_{y \in P \cap B(x, r_i)} \text{dist}(y, K) + \sup_{y \in K \cap B(x, r_i)} \text{dist}(y, P) \right) = 0.$$

We define the *singular part* of K as the set of non-regular points of K , denoted by the symbol $\Sigma(K)$.

This definition of a regular point is quite weak but is well suited for Proposition 7.7, which estimates dimension of the singular part using the integrability exponent of $e(u)$. This relation was first observed in the Mumford-Shah context in [1]. If the gauge h is decaying as power, we expect that regular points are equivalently characterized as points $x \in K$ in the neighborhood of which K is a smooth hypersurface. This is however still unknown for Griffith almost-minimizers.

We now investigate different equivalent characterisation of regular points. One can already see that regular points are characterized by the condition

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta^{\text{bil}}(x, r) = 0.$$

The goal of the rest of this section is to justify that they are also characterized by the condition

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta(x, r) + \omega(x, r) = 0.$$

We see first that the bilateral flatness is controlled by the flatness and the normalized elastic energy.

Proposition 7.4. *There exists a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ (which depends only on N and \mathbb{C}) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be a topological almost-minimizer with gauge h in an open set Ω . Then for all $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0$, we have*

$$\beta^{\text{bil}}(x_0, r_0/2) \leq C \left(\beta(x_0, r_0) + \omega_2(x_0, r_0)^{1/(6m)} \right),$$

where $m = N - 1$ and $C \geq 1$ is some constant which depends only on N and \mathbb{C} .

Proof. The letter $C \geq 1$ denotes a generic constant which depends only on N and \mathbb{C} . As usual, we assume that $B(x_0, r_0) = B(0, 1)$. We let $\tau_0 \in (0, 1/8)$ denote the constant of Lemma 5.3 for $p = 2$ and $M = 1$ (it depends only on N and \mathbb{C}). If $\beta(0, 1) \geq 1/8$, the inequality holds trivially because we always have $\beta^{\text{bil}}(0, 1/2) \leq 1$. Otherwise, we let P_0 denote an hyperplane which achieves the infimum in the definition of $\beta(0, 1)$ and we choose a unit normal ν_0 to P_0 . We let a_1, a_2 be defined as in the beginning of Section 5.1 Then we apply Lemma 5.4 with $\varepsilon = 1/8$ and this shows that for all unit vector $\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ such that $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq 1/8$, we have

$$J(\nu) \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(0, 1/2) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(0, 1)))^2 \leq C \omega_1(0, 1)^{1/2},$$

where $P := x_0 + \nu^\perp$, π_P is the orthogonal projection onto P , $J(\nu) := |b \cdot \nu| + |A\nu|$, and $b := b_1 - b_2$, $A := A_1 - A_2$. For any parameter $\varepsilon \in (\beta(0, 1), 1/8)$, Lemma A.2 shows that

$$\int_{\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1} \cap B(\nu_0, \varepsilon)} |b \cdot x| + |Ax| \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \geq C^{-1} \varepsilon^{N-1} (|b| + |A|).$$

This allows to find a vector $\nu \in \mathbf{S}^{N-1}$ such that $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon$ and $J(\nu) \geq C^{-1} \varepsilon^{N-1} J(0, 1)$, and thus

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(0, 1/2) \setminus \pi_P(K \cap B(0, 1)))^2 \leq C \varepsilon^{1-N} \omega_2(0, 1)^{1/2}, \quad (49)$$

where $P = x_0 + \nu^\perp$. Note that since

$$K \cap B(0, 1) \subset \{|x \cdot \nu_0| \leq \beta(0, 1)\}$$

and $\beta(0, 1) \leq \varepsilon$ as well as $|\nu - \nu_0| \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$K \cap B(0, 1) \subset \{|x \cdot \nu| \leq 2\varepsilon\}. \quad (50)$$

so the points of $K \cap B(0, 1)$ are at distance $\leq 2\varepsilon$ from P . Then we use (49) to evaluate how far are the points of $P \cap B(0, 1/2)$ from K . For $x \in P \cap B(0, 1/2)$, we are going to prove that

$$\text{dist}(x, K) \leq \max \left(4\varepsilon, C \varepsilon^{-1/2} \omega_2(0, 1)^{1/(4m)} \right), \quad (51)$$

where $m = N - 1$. For this we consider a radius $t > 0$ such that $B(x, t) \cap K \neq \emptyset$. We want to bound t from above by the right-hand side of (51) and for this we can directly assume that $t > 4\varepsilon$. We see that $K \cap B(0, 1) \subset \{|x \cdot \nu| \leq t/2\}$ so it is not possible for $P \cap B(x, t/2)$ to contain a point of $\pi_P(K \cap B(0, 1))$ and therefore

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(0, 1/2) \cap B(x, t/2))^2 \leq C \varepsilon^{1-N} \omega_2(0, 1)^{1/2}.$$

On the other hand, since $0 \in K$ and $B(x, t) \cap K = \emptyset$, we have at most $t \leq 1/2$ so we can bound from below

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(P \cap B(0, 1/2) \cap B(x, t/2)) \geq C^{-1} t^{N-1}.$$

This proves our claim. In view of (50) and (51), we conclude that for all $\varepsilon \in (\beta(0, 1), 1/8)$, we have

$$\beta^{\text{bil}}(0, 1/2) \leq C \max \left(\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{-1/2} \omega_2(0, 1)^{1/(4m)} \right).$$

If $\beta(0, 1) \leq \omega^{1/(6m)}$, we take $\varepsilon = \omega^{1/(6m)}$ and otherwise we take $\varepsilon = \beta(0, 1)$. In both case, this shows that

$$\beta^{\text{bil}}(0, 1/2) \leq C \left(\beta(0, 1) + \omega_2(0, 1)^{1/(6m)} \right),$$

as desired. \square

Reciprocally, a blow-up type argument shows that the bilateral flatness controls the flatness and the normalized elastic energy.

Proposition 7.5. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ (depending on N , \mathbb{C} and ε) such that the following holds. Let (u, K) be a topological almost-minimizer with gauge h in an open set Ω . If $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ are such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and*

$$\beta^{\text{bil}}(x_0, r_0) + h(r_0) \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

then

$$\beta(x_0, \gamma r_0) + \omega(x_0, \gamma r_0) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. We let $C \geq 1$ denote a generic constant which depends only on N and \mathbb{C} . As usual, we assume that $B(x_0, r_0) = B(0, 1)$. We consider a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and we assume the statement does not hold for all choice of constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Therefore, we can find a sequence $(r_i)_i \in (0, 1)$ going to 0 and sequence of topological almost-minimizers $(u_i, K_i)_i$ with gauge h_i in $B(0, 1)$ such that for all i ,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \beta_{K_i}^{\text{bil}}(0, 1) + h_i(1) \leq r_i^2$$

but

$$\beta(0, r_i) + r_i^{1-N} \int_{B(0, r_i)} |e(u_i)|^2 dx \geq \varepsilon.$$

Note that by the scaling property of the flatness and the fact that $\beta_{K_i}(0, 1) \leq \beta_{K_i}^{\text{bil}}(0, 1) \leq r_i^2$, we have

$$\beta_{K_i}(0, r_i) \leq r_i^{-1} \beta_{K_i}(0, 1) \leq r_i.$$

We extract a subsequence such that for all i , $\beta(0, r_i) \leq \varepsilon/2$ and thus we have to contradict the fact that for all i , $\omega(0, r_i) \geq \varepsilon/2$. We also extract a subsequence such that for all i , $h_i(1) \leq \varepsilon_A$ and thus by (5), for all ball $B(x, r) \subset B(0, 1)$,

$$\sup_i \left(\int_{B(x, r)} |e(u_i)|^2 dx + \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K_i \cap B(x, r)) \right) \leq Cr^{N-1}. \quad (52)$$

We define a pair (v_i, L_i) in $B(0, r_i^{-1})$ by

$$v_i(x) := r_i^{-1/2} u_i(r_i x) \quad \text{and} \quad L_i := r_i^{-1} K_i.$$

We observe that (v_i, L_i) is a topological almost-minimizer in $B(0, r_i^{-1})$ with gauge $\tilde{h}_i(t) = h_i(r_i t)$. We also observe that for all $R > 0$ and for i big enough such that $B(0, R) \subset B(0, r_i^{-1})$, we have by (52),

$$\int_{B(0, R)} |e(v_i)|^2 dx = r_i^{1-N} \int_{B(0, r_i R)} |e(u_i)|^2 dx \leq CR^{N-1}$$

which is bounded. It follows that we can extract a subsequence of $(v_i, L_i)_i$ which converges to a pair (v_∞, L_∞) in \mathbb{R}^N . As $h_i(1) \rightarrow 0$, we have $\tilde{h}_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and thus the limit gauge

h is identically zero. By application of Theorem 2.7, the pair (v_∞, L_∞) is a global minimizer in \mathbb{R}^N and we have for all $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B(0,R)} \mathbb{C}e(v_\infty) : e(v_\infty) \, dx = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} r_i^{1-N} \int_{B(0,r_i R)} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx. \quad (53)$$

We also observe that for all $R > 0$ and for all i big enough such that $B(0, R) \subset B(0, r_i^{-1})$,

$$\beta_{L_i}^{\text{bil}}(0, R) = \beta_{K_i}^{\text{bil}}(0, r_i R) \leq (r_i R)^{-1} \beta_{K_i}^{\text{bil}}(0, 1) \leq r_i R^{-1}$$

whence $\beta_{L_\infty}^{\text{bil}}(0, R) = 0$. This means that L_∞ coincides with an hyperplane in $B(0, R)$ and as R is arbitrarily large, we deduce that that L_∞ coincides with an hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^N . By testing the minimality condition of (v_∞, L_∞) with outer variations of the form $(v_\infty + \varepsilon\varphi, L_\infty)$, where $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^N)$, we see that v_∞ solves in a weak sense the elliptic PDE $\text{div}(\mathbb{C}e(v_\infty)) = 0$ in the complement of L_∞ with a Neumann boundary condition $\mathbb{C}e(v_\infty) \cdot e_N = 0$ on each side of L_∞ . By elliptic regularity, it follows that there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that for all $R > 1$,

$$\int_{B(0,1)} |e(v_\infty)|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{C}{R^N} \int_{B(0,R)} |e(v_\infty)|^2 \, dx.$$

But by (53), we have

$$\int_{B(0,R)} \mathbb{C}e(v_\infty) : e(v_\infty) \, dx = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} r_i^{1-N} \int_{B(0,r_i R)} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx \leq CR^{N-1}$$

so

$$\int_{B(0,1)} |e(v_\infty)|^2 \, dx \leq CR^{-1}$$

and since $R > 0$ is arbitrarily large, we arrive at $\int_{B(0,1)} |e(v_\infty)|^2 \, dx = 0$. Using (53) again, this gives

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} r_i^{1-N} \int_{B(0,r_i)} \mathbb{C}e(u_i) : e(u_i) \, dx = 0$$

and contradicts the assumption. \square

Corollary 7.6. *Let (u, K) be an almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge h . For all $x \in K$, x is a regular point of K if and only if*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta(x, r) + \omega(x, r) = 0. \quad (54)$$

Proof. Let $x \in K$ be a regular point, i.e., there exists a sequence $(r_i)_i$ going to 0 such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta^{\text{bil}}(x, r_i) = 0$. For all $k \geq 0$, Proposition (7.5) shows that there exist $\varepsilon_k > 0$ and $c_k \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $r > 0$ with $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$, if $\beta^{\text{bil}}(x, r) + h(r) \leq \varepsilon_k$, then $\beta(x, c_k r) + \omega(x, c_k r) \leq 2^{-k}$. But for all $k \geq 0$, we always have $\beta^{\text{bil}}(x, r_i) + h(r_i) \leq \varepsilon_k$ for i big enough and thus $\beta(x, c_k r_i) + \omega(c_k r_i) \leq 2^{-k}$ for i big enough. We deduce that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta(x, r) + \omega(x, r) \leq 2^{-k},$$

but since k is arbitrarily large, $\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta(x, r) + \omega(x, r) = 0$. Reciprocally, it directly follows from Proposition 7.4 that the condition (54) implies $\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta^{\text{bil}}(x, r) = 0$. \square

7.3. Dimension of the singular part. We finally show that when $e(u)$ is integrable with an exponent $p > 2$, the dimension of the singular part is controlled by $\max(N - 2, N - p/2)$. This result is minor adaptation of [1, Corollary 5.7] to the Griffith setting, with our definition of $\Sigma(K)$ and to the presence of a gauge. The existence of such an exponent $p > 2$ has been established in [44, Theorem 2.4] for Griffith minimizers in the plane, following the method of [30]. Similarly as in the scalar case, we can conjecture that $e(u) \in L^{4,\infty}$.

Proposition 7.7. *Let (u, K) be an almost-minimizer in Ω with gauge h . If there exists $p > 2$ such that $e(u) \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$, then*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\Sigma(K)) \leq \max(N - 2, N - p/2).$$

Proof. Step 1. We show that

$$\text{the set } \{x \in K \mid \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega(x, r) > 0\} \text{ has a dimension } \leq N - p/2,$$

where in the case $N - p/2 < 0$, this means that the set is empty. We start with a general fact about locally integrable function which is that if $v \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ for some $p \geq 1$, then for all real number $s < N$, we have for $\mathcal{H}^{N-p(N-s)}$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-s} \int_{B(x,r)} v \, dy = 0,$$

where in the case $N - p(N - s) < 0$, this means that the limit holds everywhere. Applying this in particular to $v = |e(u)|^2 \in L^{p/2}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ and $s = N - 1$, we see that for $\mathcal{H}^{N-p/2}$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{1-N} \int_{B(x,r)} |e(u)|^2 \, dx = 0.$$

This proves step 1.

Step 2. We show that

$$\text{the set } \{x \in \Sigma(K) \mid \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega(x, r) = 0\} \text{ has a dimension } \leq N - 2.$$

Since

$$\Sigma(K) = \{x \in K \mid \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta_K(x, r) + \omega(x, r) > 0\},$$

we see that

$$\{x \in \Sigma(K) \mid \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega(x, r) = 0\} = \{x \in K \mid \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta_K(x, r) > 0, \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega(x, r) = 0\}$$

and it can be decomposed as a countable union of sets of the form

$$\Sigma' = \{x \in K \mid B(0, R_0) \subset \Omega, \forall r \in (0, R_0), \beta_K(x, r) > \varepsilon_0 \text{ and } \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega(x, r) = 0\},$$

where $R_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. So let us show that such a set Σ' has a dimension $\leq N - 2$. We let $s \in (N - 2, N - 1)$ and we proceed by contradiction by assuming that $\mathcal{H}^s(\Sigma') > 0$. By [48, Lemma 4.6], we have $\mathcal{H}^s_{\infty}(\Sigma') = 0$ and by [51, Theorem 3.6 (2)], we have

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-s} \mathcal{H}^s_{\infty}(\Sigma' \cap B(x, r)) > C^{-1} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^s\text{-a.e. } x \in \Sigma', \quad (55)$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$ which depends only on N .

Let us now fix a point $x_0 \in \Sigma'$ such that (55) holds and let $(r_i)_i \rightarrow 0$ be a sequence such $(r_i)_i \rightarrow 0$ and that for all i ,

$$r_i^{-s} \mathcal{H}^s_{\infty}(\Sigma' \cap B(x_0, r_i)) \geq C^{-1}.$$

We consider the blow-up sequence $(u_i, K_i)_i$ given by

$$u_i(x) = r_i^{-1/2} u_i(x_0 + r_i x) \quad \text{and} \quad K_i = r_i^{-1}(K - x_0).$$

Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} h(r) = 0$, we can extract a subsequence (not relabelled) such that $(u_i, K_i)_i$ converges to a global minimiser (u_∞, K_∞) in \mathbb{R}^N , see Section 7.1. Moreover,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{1-N} \int_{B(x,r)} |e(u)|^2 dx = 0$$

so K_∞ is a minimal set in \mathbb{R}^N . Now, we introduce $\Sigma(K_\infty)$, the singular part of K_∞ , i.e., the set of points $x \in K_\infty$ such that $\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta_{K_\infty}(x, r) > 0$. By Allard ε -regularity theorem, there exists a universal ε_1 such that for all $x \in K_\infty$, for all $r > 0$, if $\beta_K(x, r) \leq \varepsilon_1$, then K_∞ is a C^1 surface in the neighborhood of x . This shows that at all points $x \in K_\infty \setminus \Sigma(K_\infty)$, the set K is C^1 in a neighborhood of x and thus, $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \beta_{K_\infty}(x, r) = 0$. We also note that according to the regularity theory of minimal sets [1, Theorem 4.3], we have

$$\dim(\Sigma(K_\infty)) \leq N - 2$$

and thus, since $s > N - 2$,

$$\mathcal{H}^s(\Sigma(K_\infty)) = 0. \quad (56)$$

Next, for all i , we set $\Sigma'_i := r_i^{-1}(\Sigma' - x_0) \subset K_i$. As the flatness is invariant under rescaling, let us note that from the definition of Σ' we have

$$\text{for all } x \in \Sigma'_i, \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_i^{-1}R_0), \text{ we have } \beta_{K_i}(x, r) \geq \varepsilon_0. \quad (57)$$

We then check that Σ'_i converges to $\Sigma(K)$ in the sense that for all open set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ containing $\Sigma(K_\infty) \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)$, we have

$$\Sigma'_i \cap \overline{B}(0, 1) \subset V \quad \text{for } i \text{ big enough.} \quad (58)$$

If (58) does not hold true, we can find a sequence of points $x_i \in \Sigma'_i \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)$ such that for all i , $x_i \notin V$. By extracting a subsequence again, we can assume that $(x_i)_i$ converges to some point $x \in \overline{B}(0, 1) \setminus V$, which also necessarily belongs to K_∞ by convergence of $(K_i)_i$ to K_∞ . Since $x \in K_\infty \cap \overline{B}(0, 1) \setminus V \subset K_\infty \setminus \Sigma(K_\infty)$ is a regular point of K_∞ , there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\beta_{K_\infty}(x, 2\rho) < \varepsilon_0/8$. By convergence of $(K_i)_i$ to K and $(x_i)_i$ to x , one can deduce that for i big enough,

$$\beta_{K_i}(x_i, \rho) \leq \varepsilon_0/2,$$

which contradicts (57). This proves (58).

Using the fact that

$$C^{-1} \leq r_i^{-s} \mathcal{H}_\infty^s(\Sigma' \cap B(x_0, r_i)) = \mathcal{H}_\infty^s(\Sigma'_i \cap B(0, 1))$$

and (58), we see that for all open set V containing $\Sigma(K_\infty) \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)$, we have $\mathcal{H}_\infty^s(V) \geq C^{-1}$. From the definition of \mathcal{H}_∞^s , one can deduce that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^s(\Sigma(K_\infty) \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)) \geq C^{-1}.$$

We finally arrive at

$$\mathcal{H}^s(\Sigma(K_\infty) \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)) \geq \mathcal{H}_\infty^s(\Sigma(K_\infty) \cap \overline{B}(0, 1)) \geq C^{-1},$$

which contradicts (56). We conclude that for all $s \in (N - 2, N - 1)$, we have $\mathcal{H}^s(\Sigma') = 0$ and thus $\dim(\Sigma') \leq N - 2$. \square

Appendices

A. AUXILIARY LEMMAS ABOUT AFFINE MAPS

This section is devoted to justifying a few elementary properties of affine maps. Our first result controls the L^∞ norm of an affine map on $B(0, R)$ by its average value on a subset $E \subset B(0, R)$. Similar and more general estimates of this kind are also proved in [39, Lemma 3.4], [37], [38].

Lemma A.1. *For all real number $p \geq 1$, for all constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^N$, for all radius $R > 0$ and for all Borel set $E \subset B(0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$\int_E |c + v \cdot x|^p dx \geq C^{-1} (|c|^p + R^p |v|^p) \left(\frac{|E|}{R^N} \right)^p,$$

where $C \geq 1$ depends on N and p .

Proof. In view of the homogeneity of the inequality, we can assume $R = 1$ without loss of generality. We start by proving a simpler inequality, namely, that there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ (depending on N and p) such that

$$\int_E |c + v \cdot x|^p dx \geq C^{-1} |v|^p |E|^{p+1}. \quad (59)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $v \neq 0$. For $\delta > 0$, the inequality $|c + v \cdot x| \leq \delta$ defines a $\delta|v|^{-1}$ -neighborhood of some affine hyperplane so there exists a constant $C > 0$ (depending on N) such that for all $\delta > 0$

$$|B(0, 1) \cap \{|c + v \cdot x| \leq \delta\}| \leq C|v|^{-1}\delta.$$

Therefore we can estimate for $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |E| &\leq |E \cap \{|c + v \cdot x| \leq \delta\}| + |E \cap \{|c + v \cdot x| \geq \delta\}| \\ &\leq C|v|^{-1}\delta + |E \cap \{|c + v \cdot x| \geq \delta\}|. \end{aligned}$$

We choose $\delta := (2C)^{-1}|v||E|$ so that

$$|E \cap \{|c + v \cdot x| \geq \delta\}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|E|.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |c + v \cdot x|^p dx &\geq \int_{E \cap \{|c + v \cdot x| \geq \delta\}} |c + v \cdot x|^p dx \\ &\geq 2^{-1}\delta^p |E| \\ &\geq 2^{-p-1} C^{-p} |v|^p |E|^{p+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves our claim. Now, we pass to the proof of the general inequality. If $c \geq 2|v|$, then for all $x \in E \subset B(0, 1)$, we have $|c + v \cdot x| \geq c/2$ so

$$\int_E |c + v \cdot x|^p dx \geq 2^{-p} c^p |E| \geq 2^{-p} \left(\frac{c^p + |v|^p}{1 + 2^{-p}} \right) |E|.$$

Note that we can also bound from below $|E| \geq |B(0, 1)|^{-p} |E|^{p+1}$ since $E \subset B(0, 1)$. If $c \leq 2|v|$, we use (59), which gives

$$\int_E |c + v \cdot x|^p dx \geq C^{-1} |v|^p |E|^{p+1} \geq C^{-1} \left(\frac{|c|^p + |v|^p}{1 + 2^p} \right) |E|^{p+1}.$$

□

We shall need an analogue inequality on the unit sphere.

Lemma A.2. *For all real number $p \geq 1$, for all Borel set $E \subset \partial B(0, 1)$, for all vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, we have*

$$\int_E |b \cdot x|^p + |Ax|^p d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(x) \geq C^{-1} (|b|^p + |A|^p) \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E)^p,$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$ which depends on N and p .

Proof. In the case $A = 0$, the proof is exactly like Lemma A.1 with $B(0, 1)$ replaced by $\partial B(0, 1)$. We then pass to the case $b = 0$. For $i = 1, \dots, N$, we let A_i denote the i -th column of A^T . From the definition of the Frobenius norm, we see that $|A| \leq C \max_i |A_i|$. We can thus fix an index k such that $|A_k| \geq C^{-1}|A|$. We observe that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$

$$|Ax| = \sqrt{\sum_i (A_i \cdot x)^2} \geq |A_k \cdot x| = |A_k| |b \cdot x|,$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is a unit vector, so an application of the first step concludes that

$$\int_E |Ax|^p d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \geq C^{-1} |A|^p \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E)^p.$$

□

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

C. Labourie was funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR) under grant ANR-21-CE40-0013-01 (project GeMfaceT).

REFERENCES

- [1] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and John E. Hutchinson. Higher integrability of the gradient and dimension of the singular set for minimisers of the Mumford-Shah functional. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 16(2):187–215, 2003.
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [3] Jean-François Babadjian, Antonin Chambolle, and Antoine Lemenant. Energy release rate for non-smooth cracks in planar elasticity. *J. Éc. polytech. Math.*, 2:117–152, 2015.
- [4] Jean-François Babadjian, Flaviana Iurlano, and Antoine Lemenant. Partial regularity for the crack set minimizing the two-dimensional Griffith energy. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(7):2443–2492, 2022.
- [5] Alexis Bonnet. On the regularity of edges in image segmentation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 13(4):485–528, 1996.
- [6] Alexis Bonnet and Guy David. Cracktip is a global Mumford-Shah minimizer. *Astérisque*, (274):vi+259, 2001.
- [7] Kenneth A. Brakke. Minimal cones on hypercubes. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 1(4):329–338, 1991.
- [8] A. Chambolle, G. A. Francfort, and J.-J. Marigo. When and how do cracks propagate? *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 57(9):1614–1622, 2009.
- [9] Antonin Chambolle. A density result in two-dimensional linearized elasticity, and applications. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 167(3):211–233, 2003.
- [10] Antonin Chambolle, Sergio Conti, and Gilles Francfort. Korn-Poincaré inequalities for functions with a small jump set. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 65(4):1373–1399, 2016.
- [11] Antonin Chambolle, Sergio Conti, and Flaviana Iurlano. Approximation of functions with small jump sets and existence of strong minimizers of Griffith’s energy. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 128:119–139, 2019.
- [12] Antonin Chambolle and Vito Crismale. Existence of strong solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the Griffith energy. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 58(4):Paper No. 136, 27, 2019.

- [13] Antonin Chambolle and Vito Crismale. Compactness and lower semicontinuity in *GSBD*. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 23(3):701–719, 2021.
- [14] Antonin Chambolle, Alessandro Giacomini, and Marcello Ponsiglione. Crack initiation in brittle materials. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 188(2):309–349, 2008.
- [15] Sergio Conti, Matteo Focardi, and Flaviana Iurlano. Existence of strong minimizers for the Griffith static fracture model in dimension two. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 36(2):455–474, 2019.
- [16] Sergio Conti, Matteo Focardi, and Flaviana Iurlano. A note on the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set of solutions to elasticity type systems. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 21(6):1950026, 58, 2019.
- [17] G. Dal Maso, J.-M. Morel, and S. Solimini. A variational method in image segmentation: existence and approximation results. *Acta Math.*, 168(1-2):89–151, 1992.
- [18] Gianni Dal Maso. Generalised functions of bounded deformation. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 15(5):1943–1997, 2013.
- [19] Gianni Dal Maso, Gilles A. Francfort, and Rodica Toader. Quasistatic crack growth in nonlinear elasticity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 176(2):165–225, 2005.
- [20] Gianni Dal Maso and Giuliano Lazzaroni. Quasistatic crack growth in finite elasticity with non-interpenetration. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 27(1):257–290, 2010.
- [21] G. David and S. Semmes. On the singular sets of minimizers of the Mumford-Shah functional. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 75(4):299–342, 1996.
- [22] Guy David. *Singular sets of minimizers for the Mumford-Shah functional*, volume 233 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
- [23] Guy David. Hölder regularity of two-dimensional almost-minimal sets in \mathbb{R}^n . *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 18(1):65–246, 2009.
- [24] Guy David and Stephen Semmes. Uniform rectifiability and singular sets. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 13(4):383–443, 1996.
- [25] C. De Lellis and M. Focardi. Higher integrability of the gradient for minimizers of the 2d Mumford-Shah energy. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 100(3):391–409, 2013.
- [26] C. De Lellis, F. Ghiraldin, and F. Maggi. A direct approach to Plateau’s problem. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 19(8):2219–2240, 2017.
- [27] Camillo De Lellis, Antonio De Rosa, and Francesco Ghiraldin. A direct approach to the anisotropic Plateau problem. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 12(2):211–223, 2019.
- [28] G. De Philippis, A. De Rosa, and F. Ghiraldin. A direct approach to Plateau’s problem in any codimension. *Adv. Math.*, 288:59–80, 2016.
- [29] Guido De Philippis, Antonio De Rosa, and Francesco Ghiraldin. Existence results for minimizers of parametric elliptic functionals. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 30(2):1450–1465, 2020.
- [30] Guido De Philippis and Alessio Figalli. Higher integrability for minimizers of the Mumford-Shah functional. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 213(2):491–502, 2014.
- [31] Françoise Dibos and Georges Koepfler. Propriété de régularité des contours d’une image segmentée. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 313(9):573–578, 1991.
- [32] James Dugundji. *Topology*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Mass., 1966.
- [33] Yangqin Fang. *Minimal sets, existence and regularity*. PhD thesis, Université Paris Sud XI, Orsay, 2015.
- [34] Yangqin Fang. Existence of minimizers for the Reifenberg plateau problem. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 16(3):817–844, 2016.
- [35] I. Fonseca, N. Fusco, G. Leoni, and M. Morini. Equilibrium configurations of epitaxially strained crystalline films: existence and regularity results. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 186(3):477–537, 2007.
- [36] Manuel Friedrich. On a decomposition of regular domains into John domains with uniform constants. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 24(4):1541–1583, 2018.
- [37] Manuel Friedrich. A piecewise Korn inequality in *SBD* and applications to embedding and density results. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 50(4):3842–3918, 2018.
- [38] Manuel Friedrich and Francesco Solombrino. Quasistatic crack growth in 2d-linearized elasticity. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 35(1):27–64, 2018.
- [39] Manuel Friedrich and Francesco Solombrino. Functionals defined on piecewise rigid functions: integral representation and Γ -convergence. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 236(3):1325–1387, 2020.
- [40] Camille Labourie. Weak limits of quasiminimizing sequences. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 31(10):10024–10135, 2021.
- [41] Camille Labourie and Antoine Lemenant. Epsilon-regularity for griffith almost-minimizers in any dimension under a separating condition. *preprint*, 2022.

- [42] Camille Labourie and Antoine Lemenant. Regularity improvement for the minimizers of the two-dimensional Griffith energy. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.*, 34(2):337–357, 2023.
- [43] Gary Lawlor and Frank Morgan. Paired calibrations applied to soap films, immiscible fluids, and surfaces or networks minimizing other norms. *Pacific J. Math.*, 166(1):55–83, 1994.
- [44] C. Labourie M. Friedrich and K. Stinson. On regularity for griffith almost-minimizers in the plane. *preprint*, 2023.
- [45] C. Labourie M. Friedrich and K. Stinson. Strong existence for free discontinuity problems in linear elasticity. *preprint*, 2023.
- [46] Francesco Maddalena and Sergio Solimini. Blow-up techniques and regularity near the boundary for free discontinuity problems. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 1(2):1–41, 2001.
- [47] Francesco Maddalena and Sergio Solimini. Concentration and flatness properties of the singular set of bisected balls. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 30(3-4):623–659, 2001.
- [48] Pertti Mattila. *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces*, volume 44 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Fractals and rectifiability.
- [49] Jean-Michel Morel and Sergio Solimini. *Variational methods in image segmentation*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 14. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1995. With seven image processing experiments.
- [50] Séverine Rigot. Big pieces of $C^{1,\alpha}$ -graphs for minimizers of the Mumford-Shah functional. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 29(2):329–349, 2000.
- [51] Leon Simon. *Lectures on geometric measure theory*, volume 3 of *Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University*. Australian National University, Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983.
- [52] Sergio Solimini. Simplified excision techniques for free discontinuity problems in several variables. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 151(1):1–34, 1997.
- [53] Jean E. Taylor. The structure of singularities in soap-bubble-like and soap-film-like minimal surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 103(3):489–539, 1976.

(C. Labourie) UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SACLAY, CNRS, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES D’ORSAY, 91405, ORSAY, FRANCE.

Email address: `camille.labourie@universite-paris-saclay.fr`

(A. Lemenant) INSTITUT UNIVERSITAIRE DE FRANCE AND UNIVERSITÉ DE LORRAINE – CNRS, UMR 7502 IECL, BP 70239 54506 VANDOEUVRE-LÈS-NANCY, FRANCE

Email address: `antoine.lemenant@univ-lorraine.fr`