

ON THE COARSENING RATES FOR ATTACHMENT-LIMITED KINETICS*

LUCA MUGNAI[†] AND CHRISTIAN SEIS[‡]

Abstract. We study the coarsening rates for attachment-limited kinetics which is modeled by volume-preserving mean-curvature flow. Attachment-limited kinetics is observed during solidification processes, in which the system is divided into two domains of the two pure phases, more precisely, islands of a solid phase surrounded by an undercooled liquid phase, and the relaxation process is due to material redistribution from high to low interfacial curvature regions. The interfacial area between the phases decreases in time while the volume of each phase is preserved. Consequently, the domain morphology coarsens. Experiments, heuristics, and numerics suggest that the typical domain size ℓ of the solid islands grows according to the power law $\ell \sim t^{1/2}$, when t denotes time. In this paper, we focus on the two-dimensional case. We prove a weak one-sided version of this coarsening rate, namely, we prove that $\ell \lesssim t^{1/2}$ in time average. The bound on the coarsening rate is uniform in the sense that we do not impose any explicit assumptions on the initial configuration. However, during the evolution, we have to suppose that collisions of different domains are rare events. In this regard, our result is relevant and new for “relatively sparse” configurations. Our analytical approach is based on a method introduced by Kohn and Otto [*Comm. Math. Phys.*, 229 (2002), pp. 375–395], which relies on the gradient flow structure of the dynamics.

Key words. coarsening, volume-preserving mean-curvature flow, attachment kinetics

AMS subject classifications. 35B36, 74N20, 80A22

DOI. 10.1137/120865197

1. Introduction. For more than a century, coarsening phenomena in physics and material science have been the object of extensive theoretical, experimental, and numerical research. Coarsening is observed in two-phase (or multiphase) systems far from equilibrium, where thermodynamics favors the separation of the different phases and thus drives the formation of microstructure. In this paper, we investigate a model for a coarsening process of a two-phase system that preserves the total volume of each phase, respectively, and which serves as a model problem for many physically relevant systems: the volume-preserving mean-curvature flow.

If the system is so far relaxed that it is essentially divided into domains of the pure phases, then the system energy is concentrated along the interface between these domains. During the evolution, the systems tends to minimize the interfacial area while the volume of each phase is preserved. Consequently, the domain morphology coarsens. The decrease of interfacial area is realized by mass transport from regions with “high” interfacial curvature to regions with “low” interfacial curvature. In some sense, the volume-preserving mean-curvature flow is the simplest volume-preserving evolution in a two-phase system that implements this geometrical idea. Mathematically, this flow relates the normal velocity V at any point of the interface to its mean curvature κ . More precisely, if $\Omega(t)$ denotes the volume that is occupied by one of the two phases at time t , the evolution of its boundary $\partial\Omega(t)$ can be expressed via

$$(1.1) \quad V = \langle \kappa \rangle - \kappa \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega(t),$$

*Received by the editors February 8, 2012; accepted for publication (in revised form) December 12, 2012; published electronically February 27, 2013.

<http://www.siam.org/journals/sima/45-1/86519.html>

[†]Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik in den Naturwissenschaften, 04103 Leipzig, Germany (mugnai@mis.mpg.de).

[‡]Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto M5S 2E4, ON, Canada (cseis@math.toronto.edu).

where $\langle \kappa \rangle$ denotes the average of the mean curvature over the interface, i.e., $\langle \kappa \rangle = \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega(t)|} \int_{\partial\Omega(t)} \kappa \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$. Notice that this flow is nonlocal due to the presence of the term $\langle \kappa \rangle$.

Volume-preserving mean-curvature flow is often used to model attachment-limited kinetics. This latter can be observed during the growth process of a solid phase that is surrounded by an undercooled liquid phase of the same substance, in which diffusion is so fast that the chemical potential can be considered as constant and excess mass of the solid in the substrate is negligible [31, 9, 30]. In this case, solid particles move with “infinite” velocity from regions with high interfacial curvature to regions with low interfacial curvature. More general solidification processes can be modeled by the Mullins–Sekerka equations, where the Gibbs–Thomson relation is modified by a kinetic drag term [21, 17]:

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta\mu &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega(t) \cup \Omega(t)^c, \\ -[\nabla\mu \cdot \nu] &= V && \text{on } \partial\Omega(t), \\ V &= \mu - \kappa && \text{on } \partial\Omega(t). \end{aligned}$$

Here, μ is the chemical potential, ν is the outward normal on $\partial\Omega(t)$, and the brackets $[\cdot]$ denote the jump of a quantity over the boundary. Furthermore, $\Omega(t)^c$ is the (open) complement set of $\Omega(t)$. This model allows for attachment-limited *and* bulk-diffusion-limited kinetics. It is observed that the early stages of the phase separation process are dominated by attachment-limited kinetics (cf. [11]) so that volume-preserving mean-curvature flow (1.1) can be considered as a singular limit of (1.2).

Moreover, volume-preserving mean-curvature flow can also be considered as a toy model for grain growth, where grain boundaries move according to mean-curvature flow with a nonlocal condition at the grain vertices; see, e.g., [26]. Besides applications in phase separation models, variants of volume-preserving mean-curvature flow have been applied to shape recovery in image processing [8].

In this paper, we focus on the coarsening behavior for attachment-limited kinetics as it is modeled by volume-preserving mean-curvature flow (1.1). Systems evolving by attachment kinetics are supposed to coarsen according to

$$(1.3) \quad \ell \sim t^{1/2},$$

where ℓ denotes the average size of the islands of the minority phase (i.e., the solid phase) and t denotes time. This coarsening rate was first predicted by Wagner [31] using a mean-field theory for the evolution of droplet radii (Lifshitz–Slyozov–Wagner theory). Real experiments, e.g., [3], and numerical simulations, e.g., [20], support Wagner’s predictions. Evidence for this growth law is given by scale invariance: As (1.1) is invariant under the scaling $t = \lambda^2 \hat{t}$, $x = \lambda \hat{x}$, dynamical analysis suggests that the only possible *universal* growth law for a characteristic length scale ℓ is (1.3).

Our main result is a time-averaged one-sided version of (1.3). More precisely, we prove an upper bound on the coarsening rate which is *universal* in the sense that it is uniform in the particular choice of the initial data. However, to carry on our analysis we have to impose a restriction on the evolution: We assume that *collisions of domains are rare events*, in a sense that we will make precise and discuss later. In particular, our results are relevant and new only for relatively sparse configurations as opposed to labyrinthine pattern. Our analysis follows a method proposed by Kohn and Otto in [19].

We also recall that volume-preserving mean-curvature flow has a phase field formulation: the so-called volume-preserving Allen–Cahn equation, by analogy with the

corresponding description of the regular mean-curvature flow by the Allen–Cahn equation. In this formulation, a smooth order parameter ϕ varies smoothly between the regions of the pure phases, e.g., $\{\phi = 1\}$ and $\{\phi = -1\}$, with a characteristic interfacial profile. It evolves in time by

$$(1.4) \quad \partial_t \phi - \Delta \phi - \phi(1 - \phi^2) + \int \phi(1 - \phi^2) dx = 0.$$

The integral in (1.4) is averaged over the system size, so that the volume fraction of each phase (more precisely, $\int \phi dx$) is preserved. The connections between volume-preserving mean-curvature flow (1.1) and the volume-preserving Allen–Cahn equation (1.4) are investigated in [28, 5, 10]. In particular, in [10] the authors prove that, in the so-called sharp-interface limit, solutions of (1.4) converge (in an appropriate sense) to solutions of (1.1), as long as a smooth solution of (1.1) exists.

In contrast to the situation of the volume-preserving Allen–Cahn equation (1.4), for which well-posedness is relatively easy, the mathematical treatment of volume-preserving mean-curvature flow (1.1) is delicate. Local in time existence and uniqueness of a smooth solution of (1.1) follow from the results obtained in [16, 18, 14]. Moreover, existence and uniqueness of a global (in time) classical solution, as well as its asymptotic convergence to a sphere, have been proved for a smooth convex initial datum Ω_0 (see [16, 18]) and for an initial datum Ω_0 whose boundary $\partial\Omega_0$ is smooth and “nearly spherical” (see [14, 22]). For generic initial data, singularities occur in finite time due, for example, to topological changes of the domain morphology: small domains shrink and disappear; domains collide and merge; parts of domains are pinched off. A few notions of weak solutions have been proposed, e.g., level set solutions [27] and diffusion generated solutions [29]. However, to the best of our knowledge, no rigorous results are available in the literature concerning the global existence and the uniqueness of such weak solutions. Despite these analytical difficulties, in this paper we work with (1.1) under the assumption that piecewise smooth solutions exist and that the evolution of the perimeter of $\partial\Omega$ is decreasing for all times. Considering (1.1) instead of (1.4) has the advantage that geometric information on the domain morphology is directly accessible.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we recall the (formal) gradient flow structure of the dynamics and introduce the mathematical framework we apply for our studies: the Kohn–Otto method; in section 3 we present and discuss our main results, the proofs of which we collect in section 4. Finally, in the appendix, we state and prove a technical lemma that we need in the proof of Proposition 3.2.

2. Gradient flow structure and method. Our mathematical investigation follows a method introduced by Kohn and Otto [19] in order to study the coarsening rates for two variants of the Cahn–Hilliard equation modeling bulk and surface diffusion. The method is based on the gradient flow structure of the dynamics and analyzes the evolution of the configuration in the energy landscape. Before introducing the Kohn–Otto method, we first discuss the gradient flow structure of (1.1).

The volume-preserving mean-curvature flow has a formal gradient flow interpretation, that is, the dynamics follows the steepest descent in an energy landscape:

$$V = -\nabla E.$$

The energy E is the surface area functional, which we normalize by the total volume:

$$(2.1) \quad E(\Omega) := \frac{|\partial\Omega|}{|\Omega|}.$$

(Here and in the following, we will often write $|\cdot|$ both for the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure and the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure.) The energy gradient ∇E in (2.1) is defined implicitly via the Riesz representation theorem,

$$\text{diff}E(\Omega)[W] = g_{\Omega}(\nabla E(\Omega), W) \quad \text{for any } W \text{ such that (s.t.) } \int_{\partial\Omega} W \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = 0,$$

where the metric tensor g_{Ω} is the (normalized) L^2 scalar product on $\partial\Omega$,

$$g_{\Omega}(W_0, W_1) := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\partial\Omega} W_0 W_1 \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$$

$$\text{for any } W_0, W_1 \text{ s.t. } \int_{\partial\Omega} W_0 \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \int_{\partial\Omega} W_1 \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = 0.$$

With the help of the metric tensor g_{Ω} , the abstract formulation of a gradient flow becomes

$$g_{\Omega}(V(\Omega), W) + \text{diff}E(\Omega)[W] = 0 \quad \text{for any } W \text{ s.t. } \int_{\partial\Omega} W \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = 0,$$

and being

$$\text{diff}E(\Omega)[W] = \int_{\partial\Omega} \kappa W \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

this gives (1.1).

The constraints on the admissible normal velocity fields V and W ensure that the volume of Ω is preserved and cause thereby the nonlocal correction in (1.1). Indeed, if $\Omega(t)$ is evolving with normal velocity $V(t, y)$ for $y \in \partial\Omega(t)$, then

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt} |\Omega(t)| = \int_{\partial\Omega(t)} V(t, \cdot) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = 0.$$

Notice also the dissipative structure of the gradient flow, writing $E(t) := E(\Omega(t))$:

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{d}{dt} E(t) = g_{\Omega(t)}(V(t, \cdot), \nabla E(t)) = -g_{\Omega(t)}(\nabla E(t), \nabla E(t)) \leq 0.$$

We now come back to the description of the strategy we will adopt to prove our main result. The Kohn–Otto method translates information on the energy landscape, i.e., information on how fast the energy decreases as a function of the distance to some reference configuration, into information on the coarsening rates, more precisely, in a lower bound on how fast the energy decreases as a function of time. Since the energy (in the original paper by Kohn and Otto an appropriate Ginzburg–Landau regularization of surface energy normalized by system volume) scales like an inverse length,

$$E \sim \frac{1}{\text{length}},$$

assuming there is only one length scale present in the dynamics, lower bounds on the

energy decay rate can be interpreted as upper bounds on the coarsening rate. The bounds on the energy decay rate come in time averages.

The key idea of [19] is to compare the geometric length scale E to a second intrinsic quantity which is rather of physical origin: a distance L in configuration space to some reference configuration. In the simplest application, this distance is just the geodesic distance which is induced by the metric tensor in the gradient flow formulation of the dynamics. Since in a gradient flow formulation the metric tensor encodes the limiting dissipation mechanisms (cf. (2.3)), the induced distance measures the minimal amount of energy which is dissipated along trajectories between two points in configuration space. Kohn and Otto establish two basic relations between E and L : Both quantities are dual in the sense that they satisfy an isoperimetric (or interpolation) inequality

$$EL \gtrsim 1,$$

and the rate of change of L is controlled via a dissipation inequality

$$\frac{dL}{dt} \lesssim L^{1/2} \left(-\frac{dE}{dt} \right)^{1/2}.$$

(Notice that above, we present the dissipation inequality precisely in the version that we need in our analysis below.) If the induced distance function is not known explicitly, a proxy has to be introduced for L that satisfies both inequalities. Finally, the core of the Kohn–Otto-method is an abstract ODE argument that is based on these two relations and produces a time-averaged version of the coarsening rate

$$E \gtrsim \frac{1}{t^{1/2}}.$$

We also recall that the Kohn–Otto method does not provide pointwise bounds on the energy. A counterexample is stated in [19, Remark 4].

The method is quite robust and it has been applied to a variety of models; see [4, section 1.2] for a review. Within the Kohn–Otto method, the challenge is that of identifying a distance function L that satisfies the above inequalities. In contrast to the strategy of Kohn and Otto described above, in our setting it seems hopeless to look for a distance function L that can be considered as a proxy for the induced geodesic distance. In fact, it turns out that the distance induced by an L^2 metric tensor on the (suitably defined) manifold of *geometric curves* in the plane is degenerate, in that the distance between two well separated configurations on the manifold is zero (see [25]). This insight suggests that we need a more subtle choice of L .

Before discussing our choice of L , we comment on previous (partial) results on coarsening rates for volume-preserving mean-curvature flow.

- In [12], Dai and Pego consider a mean-field approximation of a Mullins–Sekerka model with kinetic undercooling (cf. (1.2)), which allows for attachment kinetics *and* bulk diffusion. The model comes as an evolution equation for the radii of a collection of spherical islands, i.e., $\Omega = \bigcup B_{R_i}(x_i)$ (Lifshitz–Slyozov–Wagner theory) and coincides in the regime of dominant attachment kinetics with volume-preserving mean-curvature flow under the assumption that each island remains spherical during the evolution. The authors derive an upper bound on the $t^{1/2}$ coarsening rate using the method from [19] with distance

$$L := \frac{\sum R_i^{d+1}}{\sum R_i^d}.$$

A simplified proof can be found in [11].

- In [13], Dai considers volume-preserving mean-curvature flow in two space dimensions assuming that Ω is a finite collection of convex domains Ω_i . Using the Kohn–Otto method with distance

$$L := \frac{\sum |\Omega_i|^{3/2}}{\sum |\Omega_i|},$$

the author obtains, as desired, a $t^{1/2}$ bound on the energy decay. However, this bound is not universal in the sense that the coarsening rate depends on the geometry of the initial data. More precisely, the bound becomes trivial if the isoperimetric ratio of the initial data becomes large.

Our choice of L is, in a way, geometrically motivated and generalizes the one of [12] and its interpretation as a *volume-weighted average of radii* [12, p. 5]; cf. (3.1) below.

Let us also remark that in order to apply the Kohn–Otto method, besides the gradient flow structure, in the proof of the dissipation inequality we need to use some characteristic properties of volume-preserving mean-curvature flow.

3. Main results. We are now in a position to state our main results. We limit ourselves to the two-dimensional setting, but we comment on the higher-dimensional case in Remark 1 below. By $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ we denote an open, bounded subset of finite topological genus, that is,

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \Omega_i \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^M \omega_j \right),$$

where Ω_i, ω_j are open, simply connected subsets and $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$. We suppose that Ω evolves according to volume-preserving mean-curvature flow (1.1). (As we consider the two-dimensional setting, we should rather speak of *area-preserving* mean-curvature flow, but we maintain the same terminology for convenience.) More precisely, we consider a time-parametrized family of subsets $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ verifying

$$V(t, x) = \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle - \kappa(t, x) \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega(t) \text{ and } t \in [0, T] \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T},$$

where $V(t, x), \kappa(t, x)$ denote respectively the (outward) normal velocity and the curvature of $\partial\Omega(t)$ at $x \in \partial\Omega(t)$ (with the sign convention that the curvature is nonnegative at x if $\Omega(t)$ is locally convex around x) and the brackets $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denote the average over the boundary of $\Omega(t)$. We suppose that $\partial\Omega(t)$ is smooth on the time interval $[0, T)$ except for at most finitely many times Sing_{Ω_T} , corresponding to possible topological changes of $\Omega(t)$ (collisions, pinch-offs, shrinkage). Finally, we suppose that the perimeter of $\Omega(t)$ decreases in the whole time interval $[0, T]$. For a more detailed description of solutions to the volume-preserving mean-curvature flow (1.1), we refer to Definitions 4.1 and 4.2.

As generalized average domain radius, we consider

$$(3.1) \quad L(\Omega) := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i) dx,$$

where $\widehat{\Omega}_i$ denotes the convex hull of Ω_i . Notice that this quantity is closely related to the distance function introduced in the studies of mean-curvature flow independently

by Almgren, Taylor, and Wang [1] and Luckhaus and Sturzenhecker [23]. However, while the distance function considered by these authors measures the change of the average radius during the evolution, the function $L(\Omega)$ in (3.1) compares the average radius to infinitesimally small radii. From now on, given a solution of the volume-preserving mean-curvature flow $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$, with a small abuse of notation, we will write $L(t)$ in place of $L(\Omega(t))$. Notice that we consider the convex hulls componentwise. In particular, the convex hulls of two (or more) distinct domains may overlap. Moreover, the function $L(t)$ “follows” the evolution of the sets $\Omega(t)$, so that two different initial conditions having the same convex hull (componentwise) eventually give rise to different functions $L(t)$. Furthermore, due to the discontinuous evolution of the convex hulls, L has a positive jump when two domains collide, while in general, L develops a negative jump in case a domain pinches off. We measure the height of the jumps of L via the total variation of L in the time interval $[0, t)$. Let $\text{Sing}_{\Omega_t} = \{t_1, \dots, t_K\}$. We define

$$\text{TV}^{1/2}(L, t) := \sum_{k=1}^K \left(L(t_k+)^{1/2} - L(t_k-)^{1/2} \right).$$

As we claimed above, our result applies to a restricted class of solutions of the volume-preserving mean-curvature flow satisfying the two following assumptions, in addition to the one on the finiteness of the singular times. The first assumption states that *collisions of different domains are rare events*. More precisely, we suppose that

$$(3.2) \quad L(t)^{1/2} \geq 4 \text{TV}^{1/2}(L, t) \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

When domains only either shrink to a point or pinch off, L is either continuous or has negative jumps. Hence, in these cases assumption (3.2) does not represent a restriction on the evolution. However, it does in the case of collisions. Condition (3.2) rules out series of many collisions all happening in short time intervals and collisions of large domains, i.e., domains of sizes comparable to the system size. We notice that in the case where the typical length scale is small compared to the system size, that is, in the case of a large number of domains, the height of the jump of L at the time two domains collide is relatively small compared to L . Therefore, in generic relatively sparse configurations, i.e., large-size, low-volume fraction, when the domains are well separated from each other and collisions do indeed happen only rarely, we expect condition (3.2) to be generically satisfied. In this case we expect that $L(t) \sim t^{1/2}$ (which is still unproven), since $L(t)$ scales like length. Moreover, we expect $0 < \text{TV}^{1/2}(L, t) \ll L(t)^{1/2}$ and the actual value of $\text{TV}^{1/2}(L, t)$ depends on the sparseness of the initial configuration. However, we should mention that we can construct configurations for which L jumps arbitrarily, like two colliding elongated domains with orthogonal major axes, whose convex hull forms a triangle. While L can be arbitrarily small before the collision, it can be arbitrarily large after it. In this case, $\text{TV}^{1/2}(L, t) \approx L(t)^{1/2}$ in the moment after the collision, and thus (3.2) is certainly violated.

The second assumption we make is that *the set $\Omega(t)$ evolves continuously, while the perimeter of $\Omega(t)$ decreases* in the whole time interval. This second restriction on the admissible flows is very mild, in the sense that any (reasonable) notion of weak solution should satisfy it. Notice that, in particular, we allow the energy to have a finite number of jump-discontinuities in time. Already in two space dimensions, it is possible to construct “exceptional” smooth initial data such that a strong solution

$\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ of the volume-preserving mean-curvature flow exists up to a first singular time at which the energy jumps down. More precisely, when approaching the singular time the volume of a connected component $\Omega_i(t)$ (or $\Omega_i(t) \setminus \omega_j(t)$) of $\Omega(t)$ continuously decreases to zero, while its perimeter converges to a positive constant. As a result, we expect that the energy jumps in correspondence of this singular time, while the volume is continuous across it. Due to the lack of results on weak solutions, it is not clear if, in some cases, the energy may perform a jump also at more general singular times corresponding to topological changes, due to a collision or a pinch-off, though numerical simulations suggest that this behavior is not “generic”; see [20, Figure 6]. As it turns out in the proof of the abstract Kohn–Otto ODE argument, Proposition 3.3 below, discontinuities of the energy do not represent any mathematical difficulties. Whether this surprising feature is related to the particular definition (3.1) of or assumption (3.2) on L is not clear to the authors. This question may be related to the question whether the assumption (3.2) can eventually be removed, i.e., whether Proposition 3.2 below holds for all times.

Under these hypotheses we prove the following.

THEOREM 3.1. *Suppose that $L(t)^{1/2} \geq 4 \text{TV}^{1/2}(L, t)$ for all $t > 0$. Then, for any $1 < \sigma < 2$, we have*

$$\int_0^T E^\sigma dt \gtrsim \int_0^T \left(\frac{1}{t^{1/2}} \right)^\sigma dt,$$

provided that $T \gg L(0)^2$.

We have to comment on our sloppy notation. The result has to be read as follows: For every given $\sigma \in (1, 2)$, if T is sufficiently large compared to $L(0)^2$, then the constant in the statement can be chosen *uniformly* (only dependent on σ).

Notice that the above result is in agreement with the coarsening rate (1.3). Indeed, as we already remarked, since the energy scales like an inverse length, assuming that there is only one length scale present in the dynamics, a lower bound on the energy decay rate translates into an upper bound on the coarsening rate.

We also recall that proving upper bounds on coarsening rates is substantially different from proving lower bounds. While upper bounds can be universally true, lower bounds depend strongly on the initial data: There are (infinitely many) configurations that do not coarsen at all, e.g., a collection of spheres with the same radii. Therefore, lower bounds can only be “generically” true.

For proving Theorem 3.1, we use the method proposed by Kohn and Otto in [19] and recalled in the previous section. As a first step, we derive the isoperimetric inequality.

PROPOSITION 3.1.

$$EL \gtrsim 1.$$

Our main contribution is the dissipation inequality.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *For all but finite times Sing_{Ω_T} we have*

$$\frac{dL}{dt} \lesssim L^{1/2} \left(-\frac{dE}{dt} \right)^{1/2}.$$

The core of the Kohn–Otto method is the ODE argument that in our context has the following form.

PROPOSITION 3.3 (see [19, 12]). *Let E and L be absolutely continuous on $[0, T) \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}$. Suppose that (3.2) holds and*

$$EL \gtrsim 1 \quad \text{in } [0, T)$$

and

$$\frac{dL}{dt} \lesssim L^{1/2} \left(-\frac{dE}{dt} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{in } [0, T) \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}.$$

Then, for any $1 < \sigma < 2$ we have

$$\int_0^T E^\sigma dt \gtrsim \int_0^T \left(\frac{1}{t^{1/2}} \right)^\sigma dt,$$

provided that $T \gg L(0)^2$.

Remark 1. Let us also mention that our main result can be easily generalized to any dimension $d \geq 2$, under the additional assumption that the initial datum is given by a finite collection of convex domains and that the domains remain convex during the evolution. In fact, since in this situation, apart from the gradient flow structure, no additional information on the flow is needed, the techniques developed in Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 above can be used to generalize the results from [12] (and from [11] for the evolution (1.2)) to collections of convex domains.

In order to generalize the result in three or higher dimensions to nonconvex configurations in the spirit of the present article, one would first have to find an appropriate notion of a convex hull that does not decrease the volume, that does not increase the perimeter, and whose normal velocity under (1.1) can be (easily) computed. A natural choice of a hull that satisfies the first two properties seems to be the *mean-convex* hull. However, we could not tackle some technical problems related to its evolution.

Before turning to the proofs of our results, we motivate our choice of L . A natural generalization of the length scale used by Dai and Pego in [12] to configurations with nonspherical islands leads to the choice $\tilde{L} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) dx$. Indeed, this quantity measures the average diameter of the configuration and reduces to the average radius in the case of spherical islands. The reason for our modification (i.e., to consider the convex hull of the connected components of Ω) is the following. On the one hand, infinitesimally small “holes” ω_j inside the components may decrease the average distance to $\partial\Omega$ while keeping the perimeter of Ω constant. In particular, \tilde{L} can become arbitrarily small and the interpolation/isoperimetric inequality stated in Proposition 3.1 may fail. Therefore it is convenient to “fill these holes.” On the other hand, small negative-curvature regions on the outer boundaries $\partial\Omega_i$ result in a steep ascend of \tilde{L} during the evolution, which might not be controlled by the energy dissipation. More precisely, we do not know whether the estimate (4.8) in the proof of Proposition 3.2 below holds for arbitrary nonconvex configurations if we replace L by \tilde{L} . In order to circumvent this problem, we convexify the connected components—with the drawback that L jumps up when two (or more) components collide.

4. Proofs. Before presenting the proof of our main result we introduce some notation. In particular we give a rigorous definition of what we mean by open set with smooth boundary and of the admissible initial data and solutions of (1.1) to which our results apply.

DEFINITION 4.1 (smooth domains). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open. We say that Ω has (piecewise) smooth boundary if for all (but a finite number of points) $x \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a radius $r(x) > 0$ such that up to rigid motions, $\Omega \cap B_r(x)$ can be written as the subgraph of a C^∞ function.

DEFINITION 4.2 (admissible flows). Let $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ be a time-parametrized family of open subsets. We say that $\Omega(t)$ is an admissible flow with initial condition $\Omega(0)$ if the following hold:

- For every $t \in [0, T]$ but possibly a finite set J of times the set $\Omega(t)$ is open, bounded, with smooth boundary and of finite topological genus. That is, for every $t \in [0, T] \setminus J$ the set $\Omega(t)$ has smooth boundary, and we have

$$(4.1) \quad \Omega(t) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N(t)} \Omega_i(t) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{M(t)} \omega_j(t) \right),$$

where $\Omega_i(t), \omega_j(t)$ are open, simply connected subsets with smooth boundary, $N(t), M(t) \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, for $t \in J$ we require that $\Omega(t)$ has piecewise smooth boundary and that (4.1) still holds, but now $\Omega_i(t), \omega_j(t)$ are only piecewise smooth.

- For every $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the function

$$t \mapsto \int_{\Omega(t)} \psi(x) dx$$

is continuous in $[0, T]$. Moreover $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a smooth solution of (1.1) up to a finite set of singular times $\text{Sing}_{\Omega_T} = \{0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_K < T\} \supseteq J$ with $K \in \mathbb{N}$. That is, letting $t_0 = 0$ and $t_{K+1} = T$, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ the functions $M(t), N(t)$ are constant for every $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1})$, and

$$V(t, x) = \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle - \kappa(t, x) \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Omega(t),$$

where $V(t, x)$ and $\kappa(t, x)$ respectively denote the velocity of the boundary at x in direction of the outer normal to $\partial\Omega(t)$ and the curvature of $\partial\Omega(t)$ at x , with the sign convention that $\kappa(t, x)$ is nonnegative if $\Omega(t)$ is locally convex around x . Finally we suppose that

$$t \mapsto |\partial\Omega(t)|$$

is a decreasing function on $[0, T]$.

In our definition above, the set J consists of the times at which different domains collide or pinch off, while Sing_{Ω_T} additionally contains the times at which connected components shrink and disappear and/or the energy is discontinuous.

We notice that if $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is an admissible flow, the function $L(t)$, defined in (3.1), is smooth on $[0, T] \setminus J$ and Lipschitz continuous on $[0, T] \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}$. Moreover we have $L \in L^\infty(0, T) \cap BV(0, T)$ and

$$\text{TV}^{1/2}(L, T) = \sum_{k=1}^K \left(L(t_k+)^{1/2} - L(t_k-)^{1/2} \right) < \infty.$$

Hence the singular part of the distributional derivative of L can only concentrate on the (possibly not empty) set J .

Finally we also remark that assuming that $|\partial\Omega(t)|$ is decreasing on $[0, T]$, together with the assumption that $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a smooth solution of the volume-preserving mean-curvature flow on $[0, T] \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}$, ensures that $E \in C^\infty([0, T] \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}) \cap L^\infty(0, T)$.

The L^1 -continuity assumption on $\Omega(t)$ in the definition of admissible flows ensures that the volume of $\Omega(t)$ is preserved during the evolution; cf. (2.2). Hence, by rescaling length, we may w.l.o.g. from here on assume that

$$|\Omega(t)| = |\Omega(0)| = 1.$$

We then have

$$E(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} |\partial\Omega_i(t)| + \sum_{j=1}^{M(t)} |\partial\omega_j(t)|$$

and

$$L(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \, dx.$$

We are now in the position to prove Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We first observe that by an elementary property of convex hulls, we have

$$(4.2) \quad E(t) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} |\partial\Omega_i(t)| \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} |\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)|,$$

$$(4.3) \quad 1 = |\Omega(t)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} |\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)|.$$

We split each set $\widehat{\Omega}_i$ into a boundary and a bulk part. More precisely, for $\ell \geq 0$ we have

$$|\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)| = \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \cap \{\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \leq \ell\}} dx + \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \cap \{\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) > \ell\}} dx.$$

The bulk term is easily estimated:

$$\int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \cap \{\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) > \ell\}} dx \leq \frac{1}{\ell} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \, dx.$$

For the boundary term, we apply the coarea formula [15, Theorem 1.3.4.2] and find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \cap \{\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \leq \ell\}} dx &\leq \int_0^\ell \mathcal{H}^1 \left(\widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \cap \{\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) = s\} \right) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^\ell \mathcal{H}^1 \left(\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \right) ds \\ &= \ell |\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)|, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds because $\widehat{\Omega}_i$ is simply connected.

Combining the estimates for the boundary and the bulk part with (4.2) and (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\stackrel{(4.3)}{\leq} \ell \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} |\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)| + \frac{1}{\ell} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) dx \\ &\stackrel{(4.2)}{\leq} \ell E(t) + \frac{1}{\ell} L(t). \end{aligned}$$

We optimize in $\ell > 0$ by choosing $\ell \sim E(t)^{-1/2} L(t)^{1/2}$ and obtain

$$1 \lesssim E(t) L(t). \quad \square$$

Before proceeding with the proof of Proposition 3.2, we collect some easy consequence of basic properties of convex hulls and of the definition of admissible flows in a technical lemma we will need later on.

LEMMA 1. Suppose $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is an admissible flow with initial condition $\Omega(0) = (\cup_{i=1}^{N(0)} \Omega_i(0)) \setminus (\cup_{j=1}^{M(0)} \omega_j(0))$. Let $\text{Sing}_{\Omega_T} = \{t_1 < \dots < t_K\}$, $t_0 = 0$, $t_{K+1} = T$, and $\ell \in \{0, \dots, K\}$. For every $t \in [t_l, t_{l+1})$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, N(t_l)\}$ we define the following subsets of $\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$:

$$\Sigma_i^-(t) := \partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \cap \{x : \text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega_i(t)) > 0\}, \quad \Sigma_i^+(t) := \partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^-(t).$$

The following properties hold for every $t \in [t_l, t_{l+1})$:

- (i) $\Sigma_i^+(t) = \partial \Omega_i(t) \cap \partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$, and for every $y \in \Sigma_i^+(t)$ we have $\kappa(t, y) \geq 0$.
- (ii) $\Sigma_i^-(t) = \cup_{k \in I(t)} \alpha_{k,t}$, where for every $t \in [t_l, t_{l+1})$ the index set $I(t)$ is at most countable; for every $k \in I(t)$ and $t \in [t_l, t_{l+1})$ every $\alpha_{k,t}$ is an open, connected flat segment of finite length whose extremes are points of $\Sigma_i^+(t)$. That is, for every $y \in \Sigma_i^-(t)$ we can find $p_1(t, y), p_2(t, y) \in \Sigma_i^+(t)$ and $s \in (0, 1)$, such that $y = s p_1(t, y) + (1 - s) p_2(t, y)$.
- (iii) The (outer) normal velocity \widehat{V} of $\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$ is given by

$$\widehat{V}(t, y) = \begin{cases} V(t, y) & \text{if } y \in \Sigma_i^+(t), \\ s V(t, p_1(t, y)) + (1 - s) V(t, p_2(t, y)) & \text{if } y \in \Sigma_i^-(t). \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma 1. Property (ii) follows from the fact that $\Sigma_i^-(t)$ is an open subset of $\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$ and basic properties of convex hulls. Property (i) follows from the fact that $\Sigma_i^+(t)$ is a closed subset of $\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$, the smoothness of $\partial \Omega_i(t)$, and again basic properties of convex hulls. Eventually (iii) is a consequence of (i), (ii), and the definition of admissible flow. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Let $t \in (0, T) \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}$. Then $M(t + h)$, $N(t + h)$ are constant for $|h| \ll 1$. Moreover, for every $1 \leq i \leq N(t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) dx \\ &= \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \partial_t \text{dist}(x, \partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) dx + \int_{\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \widehat{V}(t, y) \text{dist}(x, \partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\ &= \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \widehat{V}(t, \pi_{\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)}(x)) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_{\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)}(x)$ denotes the projection of x onto $\partial \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$.

Let

$$R(t, y) := \sup\{s \geq 0 : [y, y + s\nu_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)}(y)] \subset \widehat{\Omega}(t) \setminus \mathcal{S}(t)\},$$

where $\mathcal{S}(t) := \{x \in \widehat{\Omega}(t) : \pi_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)}(x) \text{ is not a singleton}\}$, $\nu_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)}$ is the outer normal vector on $\partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)$, and $[y, y + s\nu_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)}(y)] := \{z = \lambda y + (1 - \lambda)s\nu_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)}(y) : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$ (see also Lemma 2). Since $\partial\Omega_i(t)$ is smooth, we have that $\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$ is of class $C^{1,1}$ and thus the change of variable formula proved in Lemma 2 in the appendix yields at every fixed time t

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \, dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \widehat{V}(t, y) \left(\int_0^{R(t, y)} |1 - s\widehat{\kappa}(t, y)| \, ds \right) d\mathcal{H}^1(y), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\kappa}(t, y)$ is the curvature at $y \in \partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)$, which is well defined \mathcal{H}^1 -a.e. since $\partial\widehat{\Omega}(t)$ is of class $C^{1,1}$. By the convexity of $\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$ we can conclude that

$$(4.4) \quad 0 \leq \widehat{\kappa}(t, y) \leq \frac{1}{R(t, y)} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^1 - \text{a.e. } y \in \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t).$$

Moreover, by Lemma 1(i) and (ii),

$$(4.5) \quad \widehat{\kappa}(t, y) = \begin{cases} \kappa(t, y) & \text{for } y \in \Sigma_i^+(t), \\ 0 & \text{for } y \in \Sigma_i^-(t), \end{cases}$$

so that

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \, dx \\ & \stackrel{(4.4) \& (4.5)}{=} \int_{\Sigma_i^+(t)} \widehat{V}(t, y) \left(\int_0^{R(t, y)} (1 - s\kappa(t, y)) \, ds \right) d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.7) \quad + \int_{\Sigma_i^-(t)} \widehat{V}(t, y) R(t, y) \, d\mathcal{H}^1(y).$$

We first observe that

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} R(t, y)^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \lesssim \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \, dx.$$

Indeed, again by Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \, dx \\
 &= \int_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \int_0^{R(t,y)} s|1 - s\widehat{\kappa}(t, y)| \, ds d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\
 &\stackrel{(4.4) \& (4.5)}{=} \int_{\Sigma_i^+(t)} \int_0^{R(t,y)} s(1 - s\widehat{\kappa}(t, y)) \, ds d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\
 &\quad + \int_{\Sigma_i^-(t)} \int_0^{R(t,y)} s \, ds d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\
 &= \int_{\Sigma_i^+(t)} \left(\frac{1}{2} R(t, y)^2 - \frac{1}{3} R(t, y)^3 \widehat{\kappa}(t, y) \right) d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\
 &\quad + \int_{\Sigma_i^-(t)} \frac{1}{2} R(t, y)^2 \, ds d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\
 &\stackrel{(4.4)}{\geq} \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Sigma_i^+(t)} R(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_i^-(t)} R(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\
 &\gtrsim \int_{\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} R(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y).
 \end{aligned}$$

We turn to the estimate of (4.6). In view of Lemma 1(iii) and the definition of $\Sigma_i^+(t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Sigma_i^+(t)} \widehat{V}(t, y) \left(\int_0^{R(t,y)} (1 - s\widehat{\kappa}(t, y)) \, ds \right) d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\
 &\stackrel{(4.4)}{\leq} \left(\int_{\Sigma_i^+(t)} V(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\Sigma_i^+(t)} R(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \right)^{1/2} \\
 (4.9) \quad &\stackrel{(4.8)}{\lesssim} \left(\int_{\partial\Omega_i(t)} V(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) \, dx \right)^{1/2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the term (4.7), we use the fact that $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ evolves by volume-preserving mean-curvature flow (1.1). Let $y \in \Sigma_i^-(t)$. By Lemma 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{V}(t, y) &= s V(t, p_1(t, y)) + (1 - s) V(t, p_2(t, y)) \\
 &\stackrel{(1.1)}{=} \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle - (s \kappa(t, p_1(t, y)) + (1 - s) \kappa(t, p_2(t, y))) \\
 &\stackrel{(4.4) \& (4.5)}{\leq} \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle,
 \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\widehat{V}(t, y) \leq \max\{0, \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle\} \quad \text{for all } y \in \Sigma_i^-(t).$$

It is enough to consider the situation where $\langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle \geq 0$. In this case, we conclude

that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma_i^-(t)} \widehat{V}(t, y) R(t, y) d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\ & \leq (|\Sigma_i^-(t)| \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle^2)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\Sigma_i^-(t)} R(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \stackrel{(4.8)}{\lesssim} (|\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)| \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle^2)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) dx \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we used that $|\Sigma_i^-(t)| \leq |\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)|$, as convexification reduces the length of the boundary. However, since $\partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)$ is of class $C^{1,1}$, the oriented tangents at the two endpoints of each connected component of $\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)$ are parallel and therefore we have

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)} \kappa(t, y) d\mathcal{H}^1(y) = 0,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)| \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle^2 & \leq \int_{\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)} \langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle^2 + \kappa(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\ & = \int_{\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)} (\langle \kappa(t, \cdot) \rangle - \kappa(t, y))^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\ & = \int_{\partial\Omega_i(t) \setminus \Sigma_i^+(t)} V(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma_i^-(t)} \widehat{V}(t, y) R(t, y) d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\ (4.10) \quad & \leq \left(\int_{\partial\Omega_i(t)} V(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) dx \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting together (4.6), (4.7), (4.9), and (4.10), for every $t \in [0, T) \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) dx \\ & \lesssim \left(\int_{\partial\Omega_i(t)} V(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)} \text{dist}(x, \partial\widehat{\Omega}_i(t)) dx \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all i , using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality in ℓ^2 , and since

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = - \int_{\partial\Omega(t)} V(t, y)^2 d\mathcal{H}^1(y)$$

(cf. (2.3)), the above inequality turns into

$$\frac{d}{dt} L(t) \lesssim L(t)^{1/2} \left(-\frac{d}{dt} E(t) \right)^{1/2}$$

for every $t \in (0, T) \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}$. \square

Finally, in order to complete the proof of our main result, we prove Proposition 3.3.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. The proof of this proposition closely follows the one of [19, Lemma 3] (see also [12, Lemma 4.2]). Our modifications are due to the fact that in our case $E(t)$ and $L(t)$ may jump at times $t \in \text{Sing}_{\Omega_T}$.

For $\tau > 0$, let $\text{Sing}_{\Omega_\tau} = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}$ denote the singular set in the time interval $[0, \tau)$. We consider separately the two possible cases $L(\tau) \geq 4L(0)$ and $L(\tau) < 4L(0)$. Let us begin supposing that $L(\tau) \geq 4L(0)$. By the dissipation inequality we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}L(t)^{1/2} \lesssim \left(-\frac{d}{dt}E(t)\right)^{1/2} \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \tau) \setminus \text{Sing}_{\Omega_\tau}$$

and thus, after integration,

$$L(\tau_k-)^{1/2} - L(\tau_{k-1}+)^{1/2} \lesssim \int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} \left(-\frac{d}{dt}E(t)\right)^{1/2} dt$$

for any $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$, where $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\tau_{K+1} = \tau$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} \left(-\frac{d}{dt}E(t)\right)^{1/2} dt \\ & \lesssim \left(\int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} \left(-\frac{d}{dt}E(t)\right) E(t)^{-\sigma} dt\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} E(t)^\sigma dt\right)^{1/2} \\ & \sim (E(\tau_k-)^{1-\sigma} - E(\tau_{k-1}+)^{1-\sigma})^{1/2} \left(\int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} E(t)^\sigma dt\right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use the fact that $\sigma > 1$. Since the energy is non-increasing, it is $E(\tau_k+) \leq E(\tau_k-)$, and thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & L(\tau_k-)^{1/2} - L(\tau_{k-1}+)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim (E(\tau_k-)^{1-\sigma} - E(\tau_{k-1}-)^{1-\sigma})^{1/2} \left(\int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} E(t)^\sigma dt\right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, summing over all k yields

$$\begin{aligned} & L(\tau)^{1/2} - L(0)^{1/2} - \text{TV}^{1/2}(L, \tau) \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \left(L(\tau_k-)^{1/2} - L(\tau_{k-1}+)^{1/2}\right) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} (E(\tau_k-)^{1-\sigma} - E(\tau_{k-1}-)^{1-\sigma})^{1/2} \left(\int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} E(t)^\sigma dt\right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K+1} (E(\tau_k-)^{1-\sigma} - E(\tau_{k-1}-)^{1-\sigma})\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \int_{\tau_{k-1}}^{\tau_k} E(t)^\sigma dt\right)^{1/2} \\ & = (E(\tau)^{1-\sigma} - E(0)^{1-\sigma})^{1/2} \left(\int_0^\tau E(t)^\sigma dt\right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption $L(\tau) \geq 4L(0)$ and (3.2) we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{4}L(\tau)^{1/2} \leq L(\tau)^{1/2} - L(0)^{1/2} - \mathrm{TV}^{1/2}(L, \tau)$$

and thus

$$L(\tau)^{1/2} \lesssim (E(\tau)^{1-\sigma})^{1/2} \left(\int_0^\tau E(t)^\sigma dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Taking the square on both sides and using the isoperimetric inequality $EL \gtrsim 1$, we obtain

$$(E(\tau)^{-\sigma})^{\frac{2-\sigma}{\sigma}} \lesssim E(\tau)^{\sigma-1} L(\tau) \lesssim \int_0^\tau E(t)^\sigma dt,$$

and using $\sigma < 2$

$$1 \lesssim E(\tau)^\sigma \left(\int_0^\tau E(t)^\sigma dt \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{2-\sigma}}.$$

Setting $h(\tau) := \int_0^\tau E(t)^\sigma dt$ we have that the function $h(\tau)$ is Lipschitz and the last inequality reads

$$(4.11) \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} \left(h(\tau)^{\frac{2}{2-\sigma}} \right) \gtrsim 1 \quad \text{for a.e. } \tau, \text{ provided } L(\tau) \geq 4L(0).$$

Now we consider the case $L(\tau) < 4L(0)$. Under this assumption, the isoperimetric inequality yields

$$1 \lesssim E(\tau)^\sigma L(0)^\sigma,$$

which in terms of $h(\tau)$ reads

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} (h(\tau)L(0)^\sigma) \gtrsim 1 \quad \text{for a.e. } \tau, \text{ provided } 4L(0) > L(\tau).$$

Combining (4.11) and (4.12) we get

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \left(h(\tau)^{\frac{2}{2-\sigma}} + h(\tau)L(0)^\sigma \right) \gtrsim 1 \quad \text{for a.e. } \tau.$$

Integrating in τ over the interval $[0, T)$ and using Young's inequality we then have

$$T \lesssim h(T)^{\frac{2}{2-\sigma}} + h(T)L(0)^\sigma \lesssim h(T)^{\frac{2}{2-\sigma}} + L(0)^2.$$

Finally, since $T \gg L(0)^2$, we conclude that

$$h(T) \gtrsim T^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \sim \int_0^T t^{-\sigma/2} dt. \quad \square$$

5. Appendix. In the present section we state and prove a technical lemma needed in the proof of Proposition 3.2.

LEMMA 2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open, bounded, connected, and with $C^{1,1}$ -smooth boundary. Let \mathcal{S} denote the singular set of the distance function, that is,*

$$\mathcal{S} := \{x \in \Omega : \pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) \text{ is not a singleton}\},$$

and define

$$R : \partial\Omega \rightarrow [0, +\infty), \quad y \mapsto \sup\{s \geq 0 : [y, y + s\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y)] \subset \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}\},$$

where $[y, y + s\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y)] := \{z = \lambda y + (1 - \lambda)s\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y) : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$. For every $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ we have

$$(5.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} f(x) dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_0^{R(y)} f(y + s\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y)) |1 - s\kappa_{\partial\Omega}(y)| ds d\mathcal{H}^1(y).$$

Remark 2. The proof of (5.1) in the case that Ω has C^2 -boundary is straightforward. In fact, in this case the closure of the singular set $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ has zero Lebesgue measure (see [7, 6]), and the function $R(y)$ defined above coincides with the continuous function $\tau(y) := \min\{s \geq 0 : y + s\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y) \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}\}$. However, as shown in [24], there exist open (convex) subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 with $C^{1,1}$ -smooth boundary such that $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ has positive Lebesgue measure. In this case the function $R(\cdot)$ is only upper semicontinuous, it verifies $R(y) > \tau(y)$, and the proof of (5.1) requires a bit more work.

Finally we remark that up to minor changes, the proof of Lemma 2 works also when Ω is a $C^{1,1}$ open, bounded, connected subset of \mathbb{R}^d , ($d \geq 2$). In this case (5.1) reads

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x) dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_0^{R(y)} f(y + s\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y)) \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} |1 - s\kappa_{\partial\Omega}^{(i)}(y)| ds d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y),$$

where $\kappa_{\partial\Omega}^{(1)}(y), \dots, \kappa_{\partial\Omega}^{(d-1)}(y)$ denote the principal curvatures of $\partial\Omega$ at $y \in \partial\Omega$.

Proof of Lemma 2. As Ω has $C^{1,1}$ -smooth boundary by [24, Proposition 4.2, Remark 4.3] we obtain $\inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} R(y) > 0$. Moreover by [7, Proposition 2.2] (see also [2, Theorem 5.9, Remark 5.10]) we have that for every $x \in \Omega$ and $y \in \pi_{\partial\Omega}(x)$ the function $\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\Omega)$ is differentiable in every point z belonging to the open segment $]y, x[:= \{z = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y : \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$, and $\nabla \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) = (x - y)/|x - y|$. As a consequence,

$$(5.2) \quad]y, x[\cap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset \quad \text{for every } x \in \Omega, \text{ and } y \in \pi_{\partial\Omega}(x).$$

Hence $y + R(y)\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y) \in \Omega$. Moreover, again due to the $C^{1,1}$ -regularity hypothesis on $\partial\Omega$, the curvature $\kappa_{\partial\Omega}$ is well defined \mathcal{H}^1 -a.e. on $\partial\Omega$, and it verifies $1 > R(y)\kappa_{\partial\Omega}(y)$ for \mathcal{H}^1 -a.e. $y \in \partial\Omega$.

We claim that the function R is a bounded upper semicontinuous function (and hence measurable). To prove that, we argue by contradiction. Suppose that we can find a sequence $\{y_n\}_n \subset \partial\Omega$ such that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $y_n \rightarrow y \in \partial\Omega$ and $R(y_n) \rightarrow R^* > R(y)$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $R(y) + \delta < R^*$. By the definition of $R(y)$ we can find an $\bar{s} \in [R(y), R(y) + \delta)$ such that $y + \bar{s}\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y) \in \mathcal{S}$. Furthermore, fixed $\tilde{s} \in (R(y) + \delta, R^*)$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough we have $\tilde{s} < R(y_n)$, so that $z_n := y_n + \tilde{s}\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y_n) \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}$, and $\pi_{\partial\Omega}(z_n) = \{y_n\}$ and $\text{dist}(z_n, \partial\Omega) = \tilde{s}$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = y + \tilde{s}\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y) =: z$ and,

by the continuity of the distance function, we have $\text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) = \tilde{s}$, we conclude that $y \in \pi_{\partial\Omega}(z)$. However, as $\bar{s} < \tilde{s}$, we also have that

$$y + \bar{s}\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y) \in \mathcal{S} \cap]y, z[,$$

which is in contradiction with (5.2).

Since Ω is bounded, connected, and with $C^{1,1}$ -boundary, we have

$$\Omega = \Omega_0 \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^M \omega_j \right),$$

where $\Omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_M$ are open, simply connected subsets with $C^{1,1}$ -boundary. We fix $I_k = [a_k, b_k]$ ($k = 0, \dots, M$) such that $\cap_{k=0}^M I_k = \emptyset$; $|b_0 - a_0| = \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega_0)$ and $|b_k - a_k| = \mathcal{H}^1(\omega_k)$ for $k = 1, \dots, M$. We then consider $\gamma_0 \in C^{1,1}([a_0, b_0], \mathbb{R}^2)$ (respectively, $\gamma_j \in C^{1,1}([a_j, b_j], \mathbb{R}^2)$ for every $j = 0, 1, \dots, M$) as the arc length parametrization of $\partial\Omega_0$ (respectively, of $\partial\omega_j$) such that the vector $\dot{\gamma}_0^\perp(\sigma)$, obtained rotating counterclockwise (respectively, clockwise) by $\pi/2$ the tangent vector $\dot{\gamma}_0(\sigma)$ (respectively, $\dot{\gamma}_j(\sigma)$), verifies $\dot{\gamma}_0^\perp(\sigma) = -\nu_{\partial\Omega}(\gamma_0(\sigma))$ (respectively, $\dot{\gamma}_j^\perp(\sigma) = -\nu_{\partial\Omega}(\gamma_j(\sigma))$). We consider the map

$$\Psi : \left(\bigcup_{k=0}^M I_k \right) \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (\sigma, s) \in I_k \times [0, +\infty) \mapsto \gamma_k(\sigma) + s\dot{\gamma}_k^\perp(\sigma).$$

By the regularity assumptions on Ω , we can conclude that the map Ψ is locally Lipschitz on $(\cup_{k=0}^M I_k) \times [0, +\infty)$ and uniformly Lipschitz on every subset of the form $(\cup_{k=0}^M I_k) \times [0, M)$ with a Lipschitz constant that depends on M and the Lipschitz constant of $\nu_{\partial\Omega} \in C^{0,1}(\partial\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$.

We define

$$U := \left\{ (\sigma, s) : \sigma \in \bigcup_{k=0}^M I_k, 0 < s < R(\gamma(\sigma)) \right\}$$

and notice that by the upper semicontinuity of $R(\cdot)$, U is a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^2 ; by construction $\Psi(U) \subset \Omega$, and for every $x \in \Psi(U)$ we have that $\Psi^{-1}(x) \cap U$ is a singleton. Thus applying the area formula (see [15, Theorem 3.3.3.2]) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial\Omega} \int_0^{R(y)} f(y + s\nu_{\partial\Omega}(y)) |1 - s\kappa_{\partial\Omega}(y)| \, ds d\mathcal{H}^1(y) \\ &= \int_0^{\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega)} \int_0^{R(y)} f(\Psi(\sigma, s)) |\det J\Psi(\sigma, s)| \, ds d\sigma \\ &= \int_{\Psi(U)} \left[\sum_{(\sigma, s) \in \Psi^{-1}(x) \cap U} f(\Psi(\sigma, s)) \right] dx = \int_{\Psi(U)} f(x) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since, by (5.2), for every $x \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}$ we have $]\pi_{\partial\Omega}(x), x[\subset \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}$, we then have $|\pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) - x| < R(\pi_{\partial\Omega}(x))$ and hence $x = \pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) + |\pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) - x|\nu_{\partial\Omega}(x) \in \Psi(U)$. Therefore $\Psi(U) \supset (\Omega \setminus \mathcal{S})$. Since by [24] \mathcal{S} has null Lebesgue measure, we can conclude that (5.1) holds. \square

Acknowledgments. The authors acknowledge Selim Esedoğlu, Felix Otto, Dejan Slepčev, and Emanuele Spadaro for several interesting discussions. This paper was completed when the second author was a Ph.D. student at the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik in den Naturwissenschaften, Leipzig, Germany.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. ALMGREN, J. E. TAYLOR, AND L. WANG, *Curvature-driven flows: A variational approach*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 31 (1993), pp. 387–438.
- [2] M. BARDI AND I. CAPUZZO-DOLCETTA, *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*, in Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1997.
- [3] N. C. BARTELT, W. THEIS, AND R. M. TROMP, *Ostwald ripening of two-dimensional islands on Si(001)*, Phys. Rev. B, 54 (1996), pp. 11741–11751.
- [4] Y. BRENIER, F. OTTO, AND C. SEIS, *Upper bounds on coarsening rates in demixing binary viscous liquids*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 43 (2011), pp. 114–134.
- [5] L. BRONSARD AND B. STOTH, *Volume-preserving mean curvature flow as a limit of a nonlocal Ginzburg-Landau equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 28 (1997), pp. 769–807.
- [6] P. CANNARSA, P. CARDALIAGUET, AND C. SINISTRARI, *On a differential model for growing sandpiles with non-regular sources*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 34 (2009), pp. 656–675.
- [7] P. CANNARSA AND P. CARDALIAGUET, *Representation of equilibrium solutions to the table problem for growing sandpiles*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 6 (2004), pp. 435–464.
- [8] I. CAPUZZO DOLCETTA, S. FINZI VITA, AND R. MARCH, *Area-preserving curve-shortening flows: From phase separation to image processing*, Interfaces Free Bound., 4 (2002), pp. 325–343.
- [9] W. CARTER, A. ROOSEN, J. CAHN, AND J. TAYLOR, *Shape evolution by surface diffusion and surface attachment limited kinetics on completely faceted surfaces*, Acta Metallurgica et Materialia, 43 (1995), pp. 4309–4323.
- [10] X. CHEN, D. HILHORST, AND E. LOGAK, *Mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation and volume preserving mean curvature flow*, Interfaces Free Bound., 12 (2010), pp. 527–549.
- [11] S. DAI, B. NIETHAMMER, AND R. L. PEGO, *Crossover in coarsening rates for the monopole approximation of the Mullins Sekerka model with kinetic drag*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, 140 (2010), pp. 553–571.
- [12] S. DAI AND R. L. PEGO, *Universal bounds on coarsening rates for mean-field models of phase transitions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 37 (2005), pp. 347–371.
- [13] S. DAI, *On the shortening rate of collections of plane convex curves by the area-preserving mean curvature flow*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 42 (2010), pp. 323–333.
- [14] J. ESCHER AND G. SIMONETT, *The volume preserving mean curvature flow near spheres*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 126 (1998), pp. 2789–2796.
- [15] L. C. EVANS AND R. F. GARIEPY, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, Stud. Adv. Math., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992.
- [16] M. GAGE, *On an area-preserving evolution equation for plane curves*, in Nonlinear Problems in Geometry (Mobile, Ala., 1985), Contemp. Math. 51, AMS, Providence, RI, 1986, pp. 51–62.
- [17] M. E. GURTIN, *Thermomechanics of Evolving Phase Boundaries in the Plane*, Oxford Math. Monogr., Oxford University Press, New York, 1993.
- [18] G. HUISKEN, *The volume preserving mean curvature flow*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 382 (1987), pp. 35–48.
- [19] R. V. KOHN AND F. OTTO, *Upper bounds on coarsening rates*, Comm. Math. Phys., 229 (2002), pp. 375–395.
- [20] C. KUBLIK, S. ESEDOĞLU, AND J. A. FESSLER, *Algorithms for area preserving flows*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 33 (2011), pp. 2382–2401.
- [21] J. S. LANGER, *Instabilities and pattern formation in crystal growth*, Rev. Mod. Phys., 52 (1980), pp. 1–28.
- [22] H. LI, *The volume-preserving mean curvature flow in Euclidean space*, Pacific J. Math., 243 (2009), pp. 331–355.
- [23] S. LUCKHAUS AND T. STURZENHECKER, *Implicit time discretization for the mean curvature flow equation*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 3 (1995), pp. 253–271.
- [24] C. MANTEGAZZA AND A. C. MENNUCCI, *Hamilton-Jacobi equations and distance functions on Riemannian manifolds*, Appl. Math. Optim., 47 (2003), pp. 1–25.
- [25] P. W. MICHOR AND D. MUMFORD, *Riemannian geometries on spaces of plane curves*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 8 (2006), pp. 1–48.

- [26] W. W. MULLINS, *Two-dimensional motion of idealized grain boundaries*, J. Appl. Phys., 27 (1956), pp. 900–904.
- [27] D. PENG, B. MERRIMAN, S. OSHER, H. ZHAO, AND M. KANG, *A PDE-based fast local level set method*, J. Comput. Phys., 155 (1999), pp. 410–438.
- [28] J. RUBINSTEIN AND P. STERNBERG, *Nonlocal reaction-diffusion equations and nucleation*, IMA J. Appl. Math., 48 (1992), pp. 249–264.
- [29] S. J. RUUTH AND B. T. R. WETTON, *A simple scheme for volume-preserving motion by mean curvature*, J. Sci. Comput., 19 (2003), pp. 373–384.
- [30] L. A. TARSHIS, J. L. WALKER, AND M. F. X. GIGLIOTTI, *Solidification*, Ann. Rev. Materials Sci., 2 (1972), pp. 181–216.
- [31] C. WAGNER, *Theorie der Alterung von Niederschlägen durch Umlösen (Ostwald-Reifung)*, Zeitschrift für Elektrochemie, Berichte der Bunsengesellschaft für physikalische Chemie, 65 (1961), pp. 581–591.