

# Large Deviation Principle for One Dimensional Vector Spin Models with Kac Potentials

Paolo Buttà, Pierre Picco

► **To cite this version:**

Paolo Buttà, Pierre Picco. Large Deviation Principle for One Dimensional Vector Spin Models with Kac Potentials. RR-3193, INRIA. 1997. <inria-00073496>

**HAL Id: inria-00073496**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00073496>**

Submitted on 24 May 2006

**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.

***Large deviation principle for one dimensional  
vector spin models with Kac potentials***

Paolo Butta Pierre Picco

**N° 3193**

19 Juin 1997

\_\_\_\_\_ THEME 4 \_\_\_\_\_



***Rapport  
de recherche***



# Large deviation principle for one dimensional vector spin models with Kac potentials

Paolo Buttà\*, Pierre Picco†

Thème 4 — Simulation et optimisation  
de systèmes complexes  
Projet SYSDYS

Rapport de recherche n3193 — 19 Juin 1997 — 58 pages

**Abstract:** We consider the one dimensional planar rotator and classical Heisenberg models with a ferromagnetic Kac potential. Below the Lebowitz–Penrose critical temperature the limit (mean field) theory exhibits a phase transition with a continuum of equilibrium states, indexed by the magnetization vectors. We prove a large deviation principle for the associated Gibbs measures. Then we study the system in a certain limit.

**Key-words:** Large deviations, Kac potentials, spin vector models — 1991  
*Mathematics Subject Classification:* 60F10, 60K35, 82B20.

(Résumé : *tsvp*)

This work was done during the stay of Paolo Buttà in the SYSDYS group.

\* INRIA/LATP — CMI, 39 Rue F. Joliot Curie, F-13453 Marseille Cedex 13, France.

† CPT-CNRS — Luminy, Case 907, F-13288 Marseille Cedex 9, France.

# Principe de grandes déviations pour des modèles de spin vectoriels avec potentiels de Kac

**Résumé :** On s'intéresse à un modèle de rotateur plan, et aux modèles classiques d'Heisenberg unidimensionnel avec potentiel ferromagnétique de Kac. En-dessous de la température critique de Lebowitz–Penrose la théorie limite (champ moyen) fait apparaître une transition de phase avec un continuum d'états d'équilibre, indexé par les vecteurs de magnétisation. On démontre un principe de grande déviation pour la mesure de Gibbs associée. On étudie alors les configurations typiques du système.

**Mots-clé :** Grandes déviations, potentiels de Kac, modèles de spin — *1991 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 60F10, 60K35, 82B20.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Notation and results</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	The model . . . . .	8
2.2	The Lebowitz-Penrose limit and the mean field theory . . . . .	9
2.3	Block spins and the continuum approximation . . . . .	12
2.4	Results . . . . .	13
<b>3</b>	<b>Large deviation principle</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1	Block spin approximation . . . . .	16
3.2	Analysis of the free energy functional . . . . .	22
3.3	Upper bound . . . . .	26
3.4	Lower bound . . . . .	35
<b>4</b>	<b>Typical behavior</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Estimates for the independent model</b>	<b>45</b>



## 1 Introduction

Mean field models are very important to explain in a simple way the general phenomenon of phase transitions. However they have some unphysical properties as the non convexity of the canonical free energy. In the lattice gas language, this non convexity produces the totally unphysical effect that in some region of the parameters the pressure is a decreasing function of the density. Exactly the same problem appears in the famous van der Waals equation of state that comes from a molecular theory of the vapor-liquid transition. To avoid this unphysical feature of the van der Waals equation of state, Maxwell, in the middle of the last century, invented his equal area modification of this equation. In term of thermodynamic potentials this corresponds to take the *convex* envelope of the mean field canonical free energy. In the end of the fifties, M. Kac, G. Uhlenbeck, & P.C. Hemmer, [30, 31, 32], found a microscopic model for the vapor-liquid transition that explains in a very clear way the Maxwell modification of the van der Waals theory. More precisely they derived the phase diagram of the van der Waals theory, comprehensive of the Maxwell rule, from the thermodynamics of a system with interaction  $\gamma J(\gamma r)$ ,  $J(r) = \exp[-|r|]$ , in the limit  $\gamma \downarrow 0$ . These results were extended by J. Lebowitz & O. Penrose, [34], to a larger class of potentials. There is a review by P. Hemmer & J. Lebowitz, [28], appeared in the middle of the seventies, where more complete references can be found.

As well known, mean field theories present some other unsatisfactory features, e.g. phase transitions occur independently on the dimension in the space. Then the behavior of a system with long but finite range (i.e. with  $\gamma$  small but positive) can be very different from the one of the corresponding mean field model. Therefore it is natural to wonder what kind of informations about the system before the limit we can extract from the mean field theory. Strangely enough such a basic question has not been investigated for a long time.

Only recently, after an important paper by M. Cassandro, E. Orlandi, & E. Presutti, [13], a new interest for Kac models came. In [13] the authors give a very complete description of the infinite volume one dimensional Ising-Kac model: they characterize the typical configurations of the (unique) Gibbs state and the interface between two phases. Part of these results were extended by



T. Bodineau, [3], to a system of bounded continuous spins, but the canonical free energy of the corresponding mean field model is still a double well one. Disordered one dimensional Kac models were studied recently, in particular by A. Bovier, V. Gaynard, & P. Picco, [8, 9], for the Kac-Hopfield model, and by T. Bodineau, [4], for a disordered ferromagnetic Kac model. After that, the study of Ising-Kac model in more than one dimension was done by various authors. The existence of a phase transition for the system before the Kac limit was proved by M. Cassandro & E. Presutti, [14], and A. Bovier & M. Zahradnik, [7]. Asymptotic from above of the critical temperature and decay of correlation functions were given by M. Cassandro, R. Marra, & E. Presutti, [12]. The surface tension was investigated by G. Alberti, G. Bellettini, M. Cassandro, & E. Presutti, [1], and by O. Benois, T. Bodineau, P. Buttà, & E. Presutti, [2], while a characterization of the translation invariant states was done by P. Buttà, I. Merola, & E. Presutti, [11]. The problem of considering the phase diagram of a perturbation à la Kac of an Ising model was studied by T. Bodineau & E. Presutti, [5]. Dynamical aspects of the Ising-Kac model can be found in the papers by A. De Masi, E. Orlandi, E. Presutti, & L. Triolo, see [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20] and references therein.

Beside the Ising model, vector spin models with an internal continuous symmetry are also very important. They exhibit radically different behaviors. A typical example is given by the classical  $SO(q)$  models, and, among these, the classical XY or “planar rotator” model ( $q = 2$ ), and the classical Heisenberg model ( $q = 3$ ). In one and two dimensions, if the interaction range decays at infinity fast enough, there is no breaking of the internal symmetry, this comes from the Mermin-Wegner argument and was proved by R. Dobrushin & S. Shlosman, [21], C. Pfister, [40], and J. Fröhlich & C. Pfister, [23]. For the classical XY-Edwards-Anderson model with long range random interaction this was proved by P. Picco, [38].

Upper bounds on the decay of correlations in one and two dimensions were given by various authors, O. Mc Bryan & T. Spencer, [35], for short range models and S. Shlosman, [43], C. Bonato, F. Perez, & A. Klein, [6], K. Ito, [29], and A. Messenger, S. Miracle, & J. Ruiz, [37], for models with long range interactions and P. Picco, [39], for the classical long range XY-Edwards-Anderson model.

For the ferromagnetic planar rotator model with short range interactions, the main feature is that there is uniqueness of the Gibbs state in one and two dimensions, as shown by J. Brémont, J. Fontaine, & J. Landau, [10], and A. Messager, S. Miracle, & C. Pfister, [36]. However in two dimensions, at least for the nearest neighbor interaction, there is the famous Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless transition, [33], where there is no spontaneous magnetization, no breakdown of the internal symmetry but the decay of two points correlation functions is exponential at high temperature and only polynomial at low temperature. The existence of this transition was proved rigorously by J. Fröhlich & T. Spencer, [26].

In three or more dimensions it was proved by J. Fröhlich, B. Simon, & T. Spencer, [25], that the ferromagnetic planar rotator and classical Heisenberg models exhibit spontaneous magnetization and symmetry breaking at sufficiently low temperature. A complete description of all extremal, translation invariant equilibrium states was done by J. Fröhlich & C. Pfister, [24], where it was also proved that the surface tension vanishes.

From what discussed above it seems quite natural to start an analysis of the Kac version of the classical XY or more generally classical  $SO(q)$  models, as done for the Ising-Kac one. Moreover, a general picture on the statistical mechanics of finite range  $SO(q)$  models is not well established as for the Ising model.

For what concern the Kac limit of the thermodynamic potentials for  $SO(q)$  models, C. Thompson & M. Silver, [44], proved the Lebowitz-Penrose theorem for the pressure. An analogous result for the canonical free energy is missing. The proof of such a result is standard if one has good large deviation estimates for the corresponding independent (i.e. non interacting) model. This is contained in our Theorem 2.2 (for  $q = 2, 3$ ) that we did not find in the literature and we believe interesting in its own.

The first step in the systematic study of Kac models is to consider the one dimensional case, where we can expect to have a rather complete description of typical configurations. That is, to extend to models with an  $SO(q)$ -symmetry the results of [13]. In this paper we consider the Kac version of the ferromagnetic classical XY and Heisenberg models ( $q = 2, 3$ ). We prove a large deviation principle for the associated (infinite volume) Gibbs states, by giving the explicit form of the large deviation rate functional. By going beyond the

large deviation behavior, we deduce also a lower bound on the scale where the typical configurations are rigid.

## 2 Notation and results

### 2.1 The model

To each site  $i$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$  is attached a spin variable  $\sigma_i$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $q = 2, 3$ . The a priori probability distribution  $\nu$  for the  $\sigma_i$ 's is assumed to be the normalized surface measure on  $S^{q-1}$ , the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ :  $\nu(d\sigma_i) \equiv |S^{q-1}|^{-1} \delta(|\sigma_i| - 1) d\sigma_i$ . We denote by  $\sigma$  the spin configuration  $\{\sigma_i; i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  and, for any region  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\sigma_\Lambda$  is the restriction of  $\sigma$  to  $\Lambda$ . Finally we call  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda$  the space of all the spin configurations on  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\Lambda$  respectively.

The energy of the configuration  $\sigma$  in a finite region  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$  and with free boundary conditions is

$$H_\gamma(\sigma_\Lambda) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i, j \in \Lambda \\ i \neq j}} J_\gamma(i - j) \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j \quad (1)$$

where “ $\cdot$ ” denotes the Euclidean scalar product in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ .  $J_\gamma(i)$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ , is a Kac potential:  $J_\gamma(i) = \gamma J(\gamma|i|)$  with  $J(s)$ ,  $s \geq 0$ , non negative and continuous in  $[0, 1]$ , strictly positive in  $(0, 1)$  and with support in  $[0, 1]$ . We assume also that  $J$  has bounded derivative in  $(0, 1)$  and that it is normalized so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dx J(|x|) = 1. \quad (2)$$

The typical choice is  $J(s) = \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}$ , the characteristic function of  $[0, 1]$ . For technical convenience, at some point in the paper, we will assume  $J$  of this particular form.

The energy inclusive of the interaction with a boundary condition  $\sigma_{\Lambda^c} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda^c}$  is given by

$$H_\gamma(\sigma_\Lambda | \sigma_{\Lambda^c}) = H_\gamma(\sigma_\Lambda) - \sum_{\substack{i \in \Lambda \\ j \in \Lambda^c}} J_\gamma(i - j) \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j. \quad (3)$$

The Gibbs measure at the inverse temperature  $\beta > 0$ , in the finite region  $\Lambda$  and with free boundary conditions is the probability distribution on  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda$  defined as

$$\mu_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(d\sigma_\Lambda) = \frac{1}{Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda} \exp[-\beta H_\gamma(\sigma_\Lambda)] \prod_{i \in \Lambda} \nu(d\sigma_i) \quad (4)$$

where  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda$  is the partition function, i.e. the normalization factor that makes the r.h.s. of (4) a probability measure.

Analogously we define the Gibbs measure in  $\Lambda$  with boundary condition  $\sigma_{\Lambda^c}$  as the probability

$$\mu_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(d\sigma_\Lambda | \sigma_{\Lambda^c}) = \frac{1}{Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda, \sigma_{\Lambda^c}}} \exp[-\beta H_\gamma(\sigma_\Lambda | \sigma_{\Lambda^c})] \prod_{i \in \Lambda} \nu(d\sigma_i). \quad (5)$$

We denote by  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}$  the infinite volume Gibbs state, i.e. the (unique) probability distribution on  $\mathcal{S}$  that satisfies the DLR equations for the specifications (5):

$$\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(d\sigma_\Lambda | \sigma_{\Lambda^c}) = \mu_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(d\sigma_\Lambda | \sigma_{\Lambda^c}) \quad \mu_{\beta,\gamma}\text{-a.s.}, \quad \forall \Lambda \subset\subset \mathbb{Z},$$

$\mu_{\beta,\gamma}$  is a shift invariant measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  and can be obtained as the weak limit of the free boundary states:

$$\mu_{\beta,\gamma} = \text{w-}\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mu}_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda, \quad \Lambda = [-L, L], \quad L \in \mathbb{N} \quad (6)$$

where  $\tilde{\mu}_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda \subset\subset \mathbb{Z}$ , is the cylinder measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  defined by setting  $\tilde{\mu}_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \mu_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(\Gamma)$  if  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  is a cylinder in  $\mathcal{S}$  with basis  $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{S}_\Lambda$ .

## 2.2 The Lebowitz-Penrose limit and the mean field theory

We introduce the empirical magnetization in the finite region  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$  as

$$m_\Lambda(\sigma) = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i$$

and, for any  $m \in \mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $|m| \leq 1$ , the canonical partition function

$$Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda, \sigma_{\Lambda^c}}(m) = \int \prod_{i \in \Lambda} \nu(d\sigma_i) \exp[-\beta H_\gamma(\sigma_\Lambda | \sigma_{\Lambda^c})] \delta(m_\Lambda(\sigma) - m).$$

Then the quantity

$$F_\gamma(\beta, m) = \lim_{\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{Z}} -\frac{1}{\beta|\Lambda|} \log Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Lambda, \sigma_{\Lambda^c}}(m) \quad (7)$$

is well defined, it does not depend on the boundary condition  $\sigma_{\Lambda^c}$  and it has to be interpreted as the Gibbs free energy of the macroscopic system, see e.g. [27].

The Lebowitz-Penrose theorem relates the limit free energy as  $\gamma \downarrow 0$  to the corresponding one predicted by the van der Waals (mean field) theory of phase transition, comprehensive of the Maxwell rule. In our context:

**Theorem 2.1** *Let  $F_\gamma(\beta, m)$  be as in (7). Then*

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} F_\gamma(\beta, m) = \text{CE}(f_\beta(m)) \quad (8)$$

where  $\text{CE}(f)$  denotes the convex envelope of the function  $f$ , while  $f_\beta(m)$  is the free energy of the corresponding “mean field” model, i.e.

$$f_\beta(m) = -\frac{|m|^2}{2} + \beta^{-1} I(m) \quad (9)$$

where  $I(m)$  denotes the entropy function of the a priori measure  $\nu$ .

The entropy function  $I(m)$  for our model can be computed as follows. We introduce the moment generating function

$$\varphi(h) \equiv \int \nu(dv) e^{h \cdot v}, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}^q \quad (10)$$

and we define

$$I(m) \equiv \sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^q} \{h \cdot m - \log \varphi(h)\}, \quad m \in \mathbb{R}^q. \quad (11)$$

By symmetry  $\varphi(h)$  is a function of  $|h|$  only and, by using polar coordinates, one easily computes

$$\varphi(h) = \hat{\varphi}(|h|) \equiv \begin{cases} \mathcal{J}_0(i|h|) & \text{if } q = 2, \\ |h|^{-1} \sinh(|h|) & \text{if } q = 3, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_0(\cdot)$  is the Bessel function of order 0, [45]. Clearly also the entropy function (11) depends only on the norm of its argument:

$$I(m) = \hat{I}(|m|) \equiv \sup_{t \geq 0} \{t|m| - \log \hat{\varphi}(t)\}. \quad (13)$$

We note that  $\hat{\varphi}(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , is a real smooth, even, strictly convex function with

$$\hat{\varphi}(0) = 1, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-t} \hat{\varphi}(t) = 1$$

so that  $\log \hat{\varphi}(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , is a non negative, even, strictly convex function with

$$\log \hat{\varphi}(0) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} t^{-1} \log \hat{\varphi}(t) = 1.$$

Then

$$I(m) = \begin{cases} h^* \cdot m - \log \varphi(h^*) & \text{if } |m| < 1, \\ +\infty & \text{if } |m| > 1, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

with  $h^* = h^*(m) = (t^*/|m|)m$ ,  $|m| < 1$ , where  $t^* = t^*(|m|)$  is the (unique) positive number for which

$$\hat{I}(|m|) = t^*|m| - \log \hat{\varphi}(t^*) \quad (15)$$

(clearly  $h^* = 0$  when  $m = 0$ ). Finally, for any  $m \in S^{q-1}$ ,  $I(m)$  is finite but the supremum is not achieved in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ .

The result stated in Theorem 2.1 does not depend on the lattice dimension (we have considered the case  $d = 1$  to simplify notation) and it exhibits a phase transition of mean field type. In fact for any  $\beta > 1$  there is a positive solution  $m_\beta$  of the equation

$$\beta m_\beta = \hat{I}'(m_\beta) \quad (16)$$

and any magnetization  $m$  on the sphere of radius  $m_\beta$  minimizes the free energy function  $f_\beta(m)$ . The inverse (mean field) critical temperature is thus  $\beta_c^{\text{mf}} = 1$  (this value comes from our normalization choice (2) for the interaction).

To our knowledge there is no proof of Theorem 2.1 in the literature. Thompson et al, [44], by working with the grand canonical partition function, prove the analogous statement for the thermodynamic pressure  $p_\gamma(\beta, h)$ , by showing

that it converges to the Legendre transform of the r.h.s. of (8). As already discussed in the Introduction, to prove the “canonical” version (8) of the Lebowitz-Penrose theorem one needs large deviation estimates for the product of the a priori measures  $\nu$ . We did not find such a result in the literature and also we will need in the sequel more refined estimates. These are the content of the following theorem that we will prove in Section 5.

**Theorem 2.2** *Let  $\sigma = \{\sigma_i; i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with values in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $q = 2, 3$ , and probability distribution*

$$\nu(d\sigma_i) \equiv |S^{q-1}|^{-1} \delta(|\sigma_i| - 1) d\sigma_i.$$

*Let  $\nu_N$  be the probability distribution in  $\mathbb{R}^q$  of the empirical average  $m_N(\sigma) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i$ . Then, for any  $N \geq 2$ ,  $\nu_N$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^q$  and its density is identically 0 for  $|m| > 1$ . Moreover, when  $|m| < 1$ , the function*

$$\varepsilon(m, N) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \log \frac{d\nu_N}{dm}(m) + I(m) \tag{17}$$

*has the following property. For any  $r \in (0, 1)$  there is  $c(r) > 0$  such that*

$$|\varepsilon(m, N)| \leq c(r) \frac{\log N}{N} \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{R}^q : |m| \leq r. \tag{18}$$

*Finally, there is a constant  $b > 0$  such that, for any  $r \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\nu_N(|m| > r) \leq (b(1 - r))^{N/12}. \tag{19}$$

With this result the proof of Theorem 2.1 is quite standard, [34], then we omit it to make shorter the paper.

### 2.3 Block spins and the continuum approximation

The phase transition described above is due to a mean field effect and, as already noticed, it occurs also in lattice dimension 1 and 2, when the system has an unique infinite volume state at any  $\gamma > 0$ . Here we consider the one

dimensional case and we analyze the typical behavior of the system in the limit  $\gamma \downarrow 0$ . Since the relevant scale of the system is the interaction range  $\gamma^{-1}$  that diverges as  $\gamma \downarrow 0$ , to see a non trivial structure we have to look at the collective behavior of the system. This suggests that the relevant quantities are appropriate empirical averages of spins. Moreover, following [13], it is convenient to scale distances by  $\gamma$  and to work directly on the continuum. With this in mind we introduce the following definitions.

We denote by  $\mathcal{M}$  the space of all measurable functions  $m : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$  such that  $|m(x)| \leq 1$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is equipped with the weak  $L_2$ -loc topology with respect to which it is compact and convex. For any  $\delta > 0$  we denote by  $\mathcal{D}^{(\delta)}$  the partition of  $\mathbb{R}$  into intervals  $[n\delta, (n+1)\delta)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The ‘‘coarse graining transformation’’  $m \mapsto m^{(\delta)}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  into itself is defined by setting

$$m^{(\delta)}(x) = \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{n\delta}^{(n+1)\delta} dy m(y) \quad \text{when } x \in [n\delta, (n+1)\delta). \quad (20)$$

For each  $\gamma > 0$  we define the continuous injective map  $\sigma \mapsto \sigma_\gamma$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $\mathcal{M}$  by setting

$$\sigma_\gamma(x) = \sigma_i \quad \text{when } x \in [i\gamma, (i+1)\gamma). \quad (21)$$

Clearly  $\sigma_\gamma$  is a  $\mathcal{D}^{(\gamma)}$ -measurable function and we call ‘‘block spin transformation’’ of size  $\delta > \gamma$  the map  $\sigma \mapsto \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta)}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $\mathcal{M}$ . In the sequel, to simplify notations, we assume that the Kac parameter  $\gamma$  and any coarse graining parameter  $\delta$  we introduce belong to the set  $\{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .

With an abuse of notation, we denote by the same symbol  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}$  the image of the Gibbs measure  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  via the map (21). That is, for any measurable set  $A$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we shorthand  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(A) = \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(\{\sigma \in \mathcal{S} : \sigma_\gamma \in A\})$ .

## 2.4 Results

We will restrict ourself to the case  $\beta > 1$  since this is the more interesting one. When  $\beta \leq 1$  the picture is quite trivial, since one can prove that for any  $\delta > 0$  the marginal of  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}$  on the block spins  $\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta)}$  gives full measure to the profile  $m^{(\delta)} \equiv 0$  as  $\gamma \downarrow 0$ .

Our first result describes the effect of the Lebowitz-Penrose phase transition in the structure of  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}$  for  $\gamma \downarrow 0$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $|m| < 1$ , we denote by  $\nu_m^{\mathcal{S}}$



the product measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  such that, for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\nu_m^{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma_i) = \varphi(h^*)^{-1} \exp[h^* \cdot \sigma_i] \nu(d\sigma_i)$  where  $h^* \in \mathbb{R}^q$  is chosen such that  $\nu_m(\sigma_i) = m$  (see also Section 5, formula (163)). Then

**Theorem 2.3** *Let  $\beta > \beta_c^{\text{mf}} = 1$  and  $m_\beta$  as in (16). Then, for any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\zeta \in (0, m_\beta)$  and  $p > 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \mu_{\beta, \gamma} \left( \{ |m^{(\delta)}(x)| - m_\beta \leq \zeta \text{ for any } |x| \leq \gamma^{-p} \} \right) = 1. \quad (22)$$

Moreover

$$\text{w-}\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \mu_{\beta, \gamma} = \int \nu(ds) \nu_{m_\beta s}^{\mathcal{S}}. \quad (23)$$

Theorem 2.3 shows that the block spins  $\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta)}$  are close to the mean field spontaneous magnetizations  $\{m_\beta s; s \in S^{q-1}\}$ .

In fact we can prove a stronger result where we allow the parameters  $\delta \equiv \delta(\gamma) \downarrow 0$ ,  $\zeta \equiv \zeta(\gamma) \downarrow 0$  as  $\gamma \downarrow 0$  and get a localization in the sphere of radius  $m_\beta$  for a length which is exponential in a power of  $\gamma^{-1}$ .

**Theorem 2.4** *Let  $\beta > \beta_c^{\text{mf}} = 1$  and  $m_\beta$  as in (16). Then there exists an absolute constants  $c > 0$  such that if  $\delta'' = \delta''(\gamma)$  and  $\zeta'' = \zeta''(\gamma)$  satisfy  $\delta''(\zeta'')^3 \geq 3c\gamma^\alpha$  with  $\alpha < (2(6+q))^{-1} < 1$  then, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\mu_{\beta, \gamma} \left( \{ |m^{(\delta'')}(x)| - m_\beta \leq \zeta'' \text{ for any } |x| \leq e^{c\gamma^{-1+\alpha(1-\varepsilon)}} \} \right) \geq 1 - e^{-\varepsilon c\gamma^{-1+\alpha}}. \quad (24)$$

The next question concerns the distribution of the  $\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta)}$ 's on the sphere of radius  $m_\beta$ , i.e. the change of phase along the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}$ . We prove that on a *macroscopic* scale which is diverging when  $\gamma \downarrow 0$ , typically the profiles are rigid. This gives a lower bound on the rigidity length.

**Theorem 2.5** *Let  $\beta > \beta_c^{\text{mf}} = 1$  and  $m_\beta$  as in (16). For any given  $0 < \rho < 1$  and  $\Theta > 0$ , let*

$$\mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho) \equiv \{ m \in \mathcal{M} : |m^{(\rho)}(x) - m^{(\rho)}(y)| \leq \Theta \ \forall x, y \in [-L, +L] \} \quad (25)$$

*then for any  $\lambda > 0$  small enough, for any  $L \leq \gamma^{-\lambda}$ , we have*

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \mu_{\beta, \gamma}(\mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)) = 1. \quad (26)$$

**Remark 2.6** *It follows from the proof of this theorem that  $\lambda$  has to be smaller than  $(6(6+q))^{-1}$ . A priori, we can expect that as a function of  $q$  the rigidity length, which can be defined as the largest  $L$  such that (26) is true, has to be a decreasing function of  $q$  since there are more possibilities to be non rigid when  $q$  increases. Our bound have this property but we do not believe that it is optimal.*

The key ingredient to prove the above theorems is a large deviation principle for the Gibbs measures  $\{\mu_{\beta,\gamma}; \gamma > 0\}$ . To state this we need some definitions.

We introduce the “excess free energy functional”  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  as

$$\mathcal{F}(m) = \int dx (f_{\beta}(m(x)) - f_{\beta}(m_{\beta})) + U(m) \quad (27)$$

where

$$U(m) = \frac{1}{4} \int dx \int dy J(|x-y|) |m(x) - m(y)|^2 \quad (28)$$

and  $f_{\beta}(m)$  is defined in (9). In (28) and in the rest of the paper we shorthand  $f_{\beta}(m_{\beta}s) = f_{\beta}(m_{\beta})$  for any  $s \in S^{q-1}$  (recall that  $f_{\beta}(m)$  depends only on  $|m|$ ). We introduce the subset of  $\mathcal{M}$

$$\mathcal{M}^0 = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : \exists x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1} \text{ s. t. } m - m_{\beta}s \in L_2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^q), U(s) < +\infty\} \quad (29)$$

Then

**Theorem 2.7** *The functional  $\mathcal{F}$  is lower semicontinuous on  $\mathcal{M}$  and bounded on  $\mathcal{M}^0$ . Moreover, the family  $\{\mu_{\beta,\gamma}; \gamma > 0\}$  satisfies the large deviation principle with rate function  $\beta\mathcal{F}$ . That is, for any closed set  $F \subset \mathcal{M}$  and any open set  $A \subset \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\limsup_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(F) \leq - \inf_{m \in F} \beta\mathcal{F}(m), \quad (30)$$

$$\liminf_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(A) \geq - \inf_{m \in A} \beta\mathcal{F}(m). \quad (31)$$

### 3 Large deviation principle

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.7. Since we work in the infinite volume, if we merely perform the continuum approximation everywhere, we cannot control the errors. Then, as in [13], we “localize the transition to the continuum” by using the strategy proposed by Ruelle to study superstable interactions, [41, 42]. We have here new difficulties with respect to [13], coming from the vector valued nature of the single spin state space. A key ingredient is Theorem 2.2 which allows us to control the entropy contribution coming from the block spin transformation. Moreover, because of the continuous symmetry of the system, we need some extra work when proving the lower semicontinuity property of the free energy functional  $\mathcal{F}$ . Also a more attention is required when computing the cost in  $\mathcal{F}$  of “non equilibrium” configurations.

The section is divided into four subsections. In the first one we prove a preliminary lemma on the block spin approximation. The second one is devoted to the proof of the required properties of the free energy functional  $\mathcal{F}$ . Finally, in the third and fourth subsections we prove the upper and the lower bounds (30) and (31).

#### 3.1 Block spin approximation

We start with some definitions. Let  $T = [t_1, t_2]$  be a finite interval of  $\mathbb{R}$ . For any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  we denote by  $m_T$  its restriction on  $T$ . A cylinder set in  $\mathcal{M}$  with basis in  $T$  is any subset  $\Gamma$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  with the following property: for any  $m \in \Gamma$  and  $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $m_T(x) = \tilde{m}_T(x)$  almost surely (in  $T$ ), implies  $\tilde{m} \in \Gamma$ . Therefore the set  $\{\sigma : \sigma_\gamma \in \Gamma\}$  is a cylinder in  $\mathcal{S}$  with basis in  $\Delta_T \equiv \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : [\gamma^{-1}t_1] \leq i < [\gamma^{-1}t_2]\}$ . For any finite subset  $\Delta$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$  containing  $\Delta_T$  and any spin configuration  $\sigma_{\Delta^c} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta^c}$  we define

$$Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma_{\Delta^c}}(\Gamma) \equiv \int \prod_{i \in \Delta} \nu(d\sigma_i) \exp[-\beta H_\gamma(\sigma_\Delta | \sigma_{\Delta^c})] \mathbf{1}_\Gamma(\sigma) \quad (32)$$

where we shorthand with  $\mathbf{1}_\Gamma$  the characteristic function of the set  $\{\sigma \in \mathcal{S} : (\sigma_\gamma)_T = m \text{ a.s. for some } m \in \Gamma\}$ . We introduce the continuum version of the

Hamiltonian (3),

$$\begin{aligned} E(m_T|m_{T^c}) &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_T dy J(|x-y|) m(x) \cdot m(y) \\ &\quad - \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) m(x) \cdot m(y). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Recalling the definition (9) and using the normalization assumption (2) one easily checks that

$$\begin{aligned} E(m_T|m_{T^c}) + \beta^{-1} \int_T dx I(m(x)) \\ = \mathcal{F}_T(m_T) + W_T(m_T|m_{T^c}) + U_{T^c}(m_{T^c}) + f_\beta(m_\beta)|T| \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_T(m_T) &= \int_T dx (f_\beta(m(x)) - f_\beta(m_\beta)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \int_T dx \int_T dy J(|x-y|) |m(x) - m(y)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$W_T(m_T|m_{T^c}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m(x) - m(y)|^2, \quad (36)$$

$$U_{T^c}(m_{T^c}) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m(y)|^2. \quad (37)$$

Notice that, since  $J$  is supported on  $[0, 1]$ ,  $W_T(\cdot|m_{T^c})$  and  $U_{T^c}(m_{T^c})$  depend only on  $m(y)$  for  $y \in T^c$  such that  $\text{dist}(y, T) \leq 1$ .

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $T = [t_1, t_2]$ ,  $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\Delta = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : t_1 \leq i\gamma < t_2\}$ . Then*

- (i) *There are constants  $b_1, b_2 > 0$  such that for any  $\gamma, \delta^* \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $\gamma < \delta^*$ , any measurable cylinder set  $\Gamma$  with basis  $T$  and any boundary condition  $\sigma_{\Delta^c} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta^c}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma_{\Delta^c}}(\Gamma) \\ \leq \left(1 + 4\pi(\delta^* \gamma^{-1})^{b_2}\right)^{|T|/\delta^*} \exp[\beta b_1 \delta^* \gamma^{-1} |T|] \\ \times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \left( U_{T^c}((\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + f_\beta(m_\beta) |T| \right) \right] \\ \times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \inf_{m \in \Gamma} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) + W_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

(ii) For any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\|m_T\|_\infty < 1$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1 - \|m_T\|_\infty)$ ,  $\delta^* \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  define

$$V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m) = \{\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{M} : \|\tilde{m}_T^{(\delta^*)} - m_T^{(\delta^*)}\|_\infty < \rho\}. \quad (39)$$

Then, for any  $\gamma \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $\gamma < \delta^*$ , and any boundary condition  $\sigma_{\Delta^c} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta^c}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma_{\Delta^c}}(V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)) \\ & \geq \left( \frac{4\pi\rho^3}{3} (\delta^* \gamma^{-1})^{-c(\|m_T\|_\infty + \rho)} \right)^{|T|/\delta^*} \exp[-\beta b_1 \delta^* \gamma^{-1} |T|] \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \left( U_{T^c}((\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + f_\beta(m_\beta) |T| \right) \right] \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \sup_{\tilde{m} \in V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_T(\tilde{m}_T^{(\delta^*)}) + W_T(\tilde{m}_T^{(\delta^*)}) |(\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}| \right\} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where  $b_1$  is the same constant as in (38) while  $c(\cdot)$  is the function that appears in (18).

*Proof.* For any  $\delta^* \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  we introduce the set  $\mathcal{N} = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : t_1 \leq \delta^* n < t_2\}$ . By exploiting the smoothness properties of the interaction  $J$  one easily gets, for any  $\sigma \in (S^{q-1})^{\mathbb{Z}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| E((\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_T | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n\delta^*, n'\delta^* \in T} \delta^* J_{\delta^*}(n, n') \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*) \cdot \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n'\delta^*) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{n\delta^* \in T \\ n'\delta^* \in T^c}} \delta^* J_{\delta^*}(n, n') \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*) \cdot \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n'\delta^*) \right| \leq b'_1 \delta^* |T| \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

and, for  $\gamma < \delta^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| H_\gamma(\sigma_\Lambda | \sigma_{\Lambda^c}) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{-1} \sum_{n\delta^*, n'\delta^* \in T} \delta^* J_{\delta^*}(n, n') \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*) \cdot \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n'\delta^*) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \gamma^{-1} \sum_{\substack{n\delta^* \in T \\ n'\delta^* \in T^c}} \delta^* J_{\delta^*}(n, n') \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*) \cdot \sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(n'\delta^*) \right| \leq b''_1 \delta^* |\Delta| \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where  $b'_1$  and  $b''_1$  are suitable positive numbers depending only on  $J$ . Calling  $b_1 = b'_1 + b''_1$  and observing that  $|\Delta| = \gamma^{-1}|T|$  we get, for any measurable set  $\Gamma$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\exp[-\beta b_1 \delta^* \gamma^{-1} |T|] Z_{\mathcal{N}}(\Gamma) \leq Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma^{\Delta^c}}(\Gamma) \leq \exp[\beta b_1 \delta^* \gamma^{-1} |T|] Z_{\mathcal{N}}(\Gamma) \quad (43)$$

where

$$Z_{\mathcal{N}}(\Gamma) \equiv \int \prod_{i \in \Delta} \nu(d\sigma_i) \exp[-\beta \gamma^{-1} E((\sigma_{\gamma}^{(\delta^*)})_T | (\sigma_{\gamma}^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c})] \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma}(\sigma). \quad (44)$$

If  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathcal{D}^{(\delta^*)}$ -measurable, the integrand in the r.h.s. of (44) depends only on the block spins  $\sigma_{\gamma}^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*)$ ,  $n \in \mathcal{N}$ . Then we can integrate first on the spin configurations in each block  $\Delta_n = \{i \in \Delta : n\delta^* \leq i\gamma < (n+1)\delta^*\}$  for fixed value of  $\sigma_{\gamma}^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*) = |\Delta_n|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \Delta_n} \sigma_i$ . We obtain so

$$Z_{\mathcal{N}}(\Gamma) = \int \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}(d\xi_n) \exp[-\beta \gamma^{-1} E(\xi^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_{\gamma}^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c})] \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma}(\xi) \quad (45)$$

where  $\nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}$ , as in Theorem 2.2, is the law of the empirical average of  $\delta^* \gamma^{-1}$  i.i.d. variables with distribution  $\nu$ ,  $\xi^{(\delta^*)} : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$  is defined by setting  $\xi^{(\delta^*)}(x) = \xi_n$  if  $x \in [n\delta^*, (n+1)\delta^*)$ . Now we prove separately (38) and (40).

(i) By (43) we need an upper bound for  $Z_{\mathcal{N}}(\Gamma)$ . We can assume that  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathcal{D}^{(\delta^*)}$ -measurable. In fact, if this is not the case, we get an upper bound by replacing  $\Gamma$  with the bigger  $\mathcal{D}^{(\delta^*)}$ -measurable set

$$\Gamma^{(\delta^*)} = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : \exists \hat{m} \in \Gamma \text{ such that } \hat{m}^{(\delta^*)} = m^{(\delta^*)}\}$$

and the r.h.s. of (38) does not change.

Since the integration in (45) is over all the possible values of  $\xi = \{\xi_n; n \in \mathcal{N}\}$ , we insert a partition to apply separately (17), (18) and the super-exponential estimate (19). Let  $r \in (0, 1)$  be a parameter to be fixed later. We expand

$$Z_{\mathcal{N}}(\Gamma) = \sum_{X \subseteq \mathcal{N}} Z_X^{(r)}(\Gamma) \quad (46)$$

where the sum is over all the subsets of  $\mathcal{N}$ ,

$$Z_X^{(r)}(\Gamma) = \int \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}(d\xi_n) \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} E(\xi^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) \right] \mathbf{1}_\Gamma(\xi) \mathbf{1}_{C_X^{(r)}}(\xi) \mathbf{1}_{B_X^{(r)}}(\xi) \quad (47)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_X^{(r)} &= \{ \xi : |\xi_n| > r \text{ for any } n \in X \}, \\ B_X^{(r)} &= \{ \xi : |\xi_n| \leq r \text{ for any } n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus X \}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

By (17)

$$\begin{aligned} Z_X^{(r)}(\Gamma) &= \int \prod_{n \in X} \nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}(d\xi_n) \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus X} d\xi_n \mathbf{1}_\Gamma(\xi) \mathbf{1}_{C_X^{(r)}}(\xi) \mathbf{1}_{B_X^{(r)}}(\xi) \\ &\quad \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} E(\xi^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \delta^* \gamma^{-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus X} (I(\xi_n) + \varepsilon(\xi_n, \delta^* \gamma^{-1})) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

By (18), for any  $\xi \in B_X^{(r)}$ ,

$$\delta^* \gamma^{-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus X} \varepsilon(\xi_n, \delta^* \gamma^{-1}) \leq c(r) \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1}) |\mathcal{N} \setminus X|. \quad (50)$$

On the other hand,  $\hat{I}(|m|)$ , see (13), is an increasing and continuous function for  $|m| \in [0, 1]$ , so that, since  $\nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}$  is supported on the unit closed ball in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ ,

$$I(\xi_n) \leq \hat{I}(1) \quad \nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}\text{-a.s.} \quad (51)$$

From (49), (50) and (51) we get

$$\begin{aligned} Z_X^{(r)}(\Gamma) &\leq \exp \left[ c(r) \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1}) |\mathcal{N} \setminus X| + \hat{I}(1) \delta^* \gamma^{-1} |X| \right] \\ &\quad \times \int \prod_{n \in X} \nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}(d\xi_n) \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus X} d\xi_n \mathbf{1}_\Gamma(\xi) \mathbf{1}_{C_X^{(r)}}(\xi) \mathbf{1}_{B_X^{(r)}}(\xi) \\ &\quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \left( E(\xi^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + \beta^{-1} \int_T dx I(\xi^{(\delta^*)}(x)) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_X^{(r)}(\Gamma) &\leq \exp \left[ c(r) \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1}) |\mathcal{N} \setminus X| + \hat{I}(1) \delta^* \gamma^{-1} |X| \right] \\
&\quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \inf_{m \in \Gamma} \left\{ E(m_T^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + \beta^{-1} \int_T dx I(m^{(\delta^*)}(x)) \right\} \right] \\
&\quad \times \left( \int d\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_1| \leq r} \right)^{|\mathcal{N} \setminus X|} \left( \nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}(|\xi_1| > r) \right)^{|X|}. \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

We notice that, for  $q = 2, 3$  and any  $r \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\int d\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_1| \leq r} \leq 4\pi$ , while by (19),  $\nu_{\delta^* \gamma^{-1}}(|\xi_1| > r) \leq \exp[-|\log(b(1-r))| \delta^* \gamma^{-1} / 12]$ . We fix then  $r$  so close to 1 that  $\hat{I}(1) \leq |\log(b(1-r))| / 12$ . Observing that  $|\mathcal{N}| = (\delta^*)^{-1} |T|$  and recalling (34) we obtain (38) with  $b_2 = c(r)$  from (43), (46) and (52).

(ii) By (43) we need a lower bound for  $Z_{\mathcal{N}}(\Gamma)$  with  $\Gamma = V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)$ . Since  $V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)$  is  $\mathcal{D}^{(\delta^*)}$ -measurable,  $Z_{\mathcal{N}}(V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m))$  can be written as in (45) with, see (39),

$$\mathbf{1}_{V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)}(\xi) = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_n - m^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*)| < \rho}. \tag{53}$$

But from the hypothesis on  $m$  and  $\rho$ , if  $\xi \in V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)$  then  $|\xi_n| \leq \|m_T\|_\infty + \rho < 1$  for any  $n \in \mathcal{N}$ , so that we can apply (17) and (18) getting

$$\begin{aligned}
&Z_{\mathcal{N}}(V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)) \\
&\geq \exp \left[ -c(\|m_T\|_\infty + \rho) \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1}) |\mathcal{N}| \right] \\
&\quad \times \int \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} d\xi_n \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_n - m^{(\delta^*)}(n\delta^*)| < \rho} \\
&\quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \left( E(\xi^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + \beta^{-1} \int_T dx I(\xi^{(\delta^*)}(x)) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
&Z_{\mathcal{N}}(V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)) \geq \tag{54} \\
&\exp \left[ -c(\|m_T\|_\infty + \rho) \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1}) |\mathcal{N}| \right] \left( \int d\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_1| < \rho} \right)^{|\mathcal{N}|} \\
&\times \exp \left[ -\beta \gamma^{-1} \sup_{\tilde{m} \in V_{\delta^*, \rho, T}(m)} \left\{ E(\tilde{m}_T^{(\delta^*)} | (\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + \beta^{-1} \int_T dx I(\tilde{m}^{(\delta^*)}(x)) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$



By noticing that, for  $q = 2, 3$ ,  $\int d\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_1| < \rho} \geq 4\pi\rho^3/3$  and recalling (34), we get (40) from (43) and (54).  $\square$

### 3.2 Analysis of the free energy functional

In this subsection we prove the properties of the free energy functional stated in Theorem 2.7. Let  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $U$  be as in (27), (28) respectively and define, for any set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$  and any measurable function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $q = 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$\|f\|_\Omega = \sqrt{\int_\Omega dx |f(x)|^2} \quad (55)$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ . Also we shorthand  $\|f\|_\mathbb{R} = \|f\|$ . Then

**Lemma 3.2** *There is  $c > 0$  depending only on  $\beta$  and  $J$  so that the following holds.*

- (i) *For any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}(m) < +\infty$  there is a measurable map  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$  such that*

$$\|m - m_\beta s\|^2 + U(s) \leq c\mathcal{F}(m). \quad (56)$$

- (ii) *For any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  and any measurable map  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{F}(m) \leq c (\|m - m_\beta s\|^2 + U(s)). \quad (57)$$

*Proof.* Since  $f_\beta(m) - f_\beta(m_\beta)$ , as a function of  $|m|$ , has an absolute quadratic minima at  $|m| = m_\beta$ , there is  $c_1 > 0$  such that, for any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$c_1^{-1} \|(|m| - m_\beta)\|^2 + U(m) \leq \mathcal{F}(m) \leq c_1 \|(|m| - m_\beta)\|^2 + U(m). \quad (58)$$

Then

(i) Let  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}(m) < +\infty$ . Define the set

$$X = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \||m(x)| - m_\beta| > m_\beta/2\} \quad (59)$$

and let  $x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$  be any measurable map such that  $s(x) = \frac{1}{|m(x)|}m(x)$  for any  $x \in X^c$ . By (58)  $\||m| - m_\beta\|^2 \leq c_1 \mathcal{F}(m) < +\infty$  so that  $X$  has finite Lebesgue measure. Moreover, from the definition of  $X$ ,

$$\|m - m_\beta s\|_X^2 \leq (1 + m_\beta)^2 |X| \leq 4 \left( \frac{1 + m_\beta}{m_\beta} \right)^2 \||m| - m_\beta\|_X^2.$$

On the other hand, from the definition of  $s(x)$ ,

$$\|m - m_\beta s\|_{X^c}^2 = \||m| - m_\beta\|_{X^c}^2$$

so that

$$\|m - m_\beta s\|^2 \leq c_1 \left( 1 + \left( \frac{1 + m_\beta}{m_\beta} \right)^2 \right) \mathcal{F}(m). \quad (60)$$

Finally, recalling (2) and using the convexity of  $|\cdot|^2$ ,

$$U(s) \leq \frac{3}{2} \|m - m_\beta s\|^2 + 3\mathcal{F}(m). \quad (61)$$

From (60) and (61) the bound (56) for a suitable  $c > 0$  follows.

(ii) Let  $m, s \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $|s(x)| = 1$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . By (58) and arguing analogously as to get (61), we have

$$\mathcal{F}(m) \leq c_1 \||m| - m_\beta\|^2 + \frac{3}{2} \|m - m_\beta s\|^2 + 3U(s). \quad (62)$$

Observing that  $\||m| - m_\beta\| \leq \|m - m_\beta s\|$ , (57) follows from (62).  $\square$

Clearly Lemma 3.2 implies that  $\mathcal{F}(m)$  is finite iff  $m \in \mathcal{M}^0$ , see definition (29). We are left with the proof of the lower semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We have to show that, if  $\{m_n\}$  is a sequence in  $\mathcal{M}$  converging in the weak  $L_2$ -loc topology to some  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ , then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(m_n) \geq \mathcal{F}(m). \quad (63)$$

Clearly if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(m_n) = +\infty$  (63) holds, so we can assume

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(m_n) = \alpha < +\infty. \quad (64)$$

Then there is a subsequence  $\{m'_n\}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}(m'_n) \leq \alpha + 1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By item (i) of Lemma 3.2, there is a sequence  $\{s_n\}$  of measurable maps  $x \mapsto s_n(x) \in S^{q-1}$  such that

$$\|m'_n - m_\beta s_n\|^2 + U(s_n) \leq c(\alpha + 1) \quad (65)$$

Since the bounded sets in  $L_2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^q)$  are compact in the weak topology, we can extract a subsequence  $\{m''_n - m_\beta s'_n\}$  converging in the weak  $L_2$  topology to some element  $f \in L_2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^q)$ . Since  $m_n \rightarrow m$  weakly in  $L_2$ -loc, we conclude that the subsequence  $\{s'_n\}$  converges in the weak  $L_2$ -loc topology to  $\tilde{m} \equiv m_\beta^{-1}(m - f) \in \mathcal{M}$ . We point out that in general  $\tilde{m}(x) \notin S^{q-1}$  although  $s_n(x) \in S^{q-1}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . But using the bound (65) for  $U(s_n)$  we will prove that there is  $x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$  such that  $\tilde{m} - s \in L_2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^{q-1})$ . We introduce the functionals on  $\mathcal{M}$ :

$$U_N(m) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-N}^N dx (|m(x)|^2 - m(x) \cdot J \star m(x)), \quad (66)$$

$$U_N^{(1)}(m) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-N}^N dx (1 - m(x) \cdot J \star m(x)), \quad (67)$$

where  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and “ $\star$ ” denotes the convolution. By the assumptions on the interaction  $J$ , for any compact set  $K$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ , the map  $i_J : L_2(K; \mathbb{R}^q) \rightarrow C(K; \mathbb{R}^q) : i_J(m) \equiv J \star m$  is compact. Then  $U_N$  is lower semicontinuous (notice that  $|\cdot|^2$  is a convex function) while  $U_N^{(1)}$  is positive and continuous. Moreover, for any  $x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$ ,  $U_N^{(1)}(s) = U_N(s) \leq U(s)$ , so that, from (65), since  $s'_n \rightarrow \tilde{m}$ ,

$$U_N(\tilde{m}) \leq c(\alpha + 1), \quad U_N^{(1)}(\tilde{m}) \leq c(\alpha + 1) \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (68)$$

Observing that  $|J \star m(x)| \leq 1$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , from (68) we get, for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 4c(\alpha + 1) &\geq \int_{-N}^N dx (|\tilde{m}(x)|^2 - |\tilde{m}(x)|) + \int_{-N}^N dx (1 - |\tilde{m}(x)|) \\ &= \|(1 - |\tilde{m}|\|_{[-N, N]}^2 \end{aligned}$$

so that  $1 - |\tilde{m}| \in L_2(\mathbb{R})$ . Moreover, by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$U(\tilde{m}) = \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{4} \int_{-N}^N dx \int dy J(|x-y|) |\tilde{m}(x) - \tilde{m}(y)|^2$$

and, by (2), since  $|\tilde{m}(x)| \leq 1$ ,

$$\left| U_N(\tilde{m}) - \frac{1}{4} \int_{-N}^N dx \int dy J(|x-y|) |\tilde{m}(x) - \tilde{m}(y)|^2 \right| \leq 1$$

so that  $U(\tilde{m}) \leq 1 + c(\alpha + 1) < +\infty$ . Arguing analogously to the proof of item (i) of Lemma 3.2, there is  $x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$  such that  $\tilde{m} - s \in L_2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^q)$  and  $U(s) < +\infty$ . Recalling that  $m - m_\beta \tilde{m} = f \in L_2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^q)$ , we get also  $m - m_\beta s \in L_2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^q)$ , and then  $\mathcal{F}(m) < +\infty$ .

Now the proof goes on very similar to the analogous one in [13], but we report it for the sake of completeness. For any finite interval  $T$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ , we decompose

$$\mathcal{F}(m) = \mathcal{F}_{T^c}(m_{T^c}) + \mathcal{F}_T^0(m) + \frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m(y)|^2 \quad (69)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_T^0(m) \equiv E(m_T | m_{T^c}) + \beta^{-1} \int_T dx I(m(x)) - f_\beta(m_\beta) |T| \quad (70)$$

(see (33), (35) for notation). Since  $I(\cdot)$  is a convex function and  $E(\cdot|\cdot)$  is continuous, the functional  $\mathcal{F}_T^0$  is lower semicontinuous.

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $\|m_n'' - m_\beta s_n'\|^2 \leq c(\alpha + 1)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  (see (65)), there are a subsequence  $\{n_k; k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and an interval  $T_\varepsilon$  such that

$$\|m_{n_k}'' - m_\beta s_{n_k}'\|_{T_\varepsilon^c}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3m_\beta} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (71)$$

Since  $\|m - m_\beta s\|^2 < +\infty$  and  $\mathcal{F}(m) < +\infty$  there is also  $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon$  such that

$$\|m - m_\beta s\|_{\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^c}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3m_\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}_\varepsilon}(m_{\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^c}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (72)$$

Let  $T = T_\varepsilon \cup \tilde{T}_\varepsilon$ ; from (69) for  $\mathcal{F}(m''_{n_k})$  and the lower semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{F}_T^0(m)$ , recalling (64), we get

$$\alpha \geq \mathcal{F}_T^0(m) + \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m''_{n_k}(y)|^2. \quad (73)$$

Using (69) and the second inequality in (72), from (73) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\geq \mathcal{F}(m) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3} - \frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m(y)|^2 \\ &\quad + \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m''_{n_k}(y)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

But, by (2) and convexity,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m(y)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) m_\beta^2 + m_\beta \|m - m_\beta s\|_{T^c}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

and analogously

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) |m''_{n_k}(y)|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_T dx \int_{T^c} dy J(|x-y|) m_\beta^2 - m_\beta \|m''_{n_k} - m_\beta s'_{n_k}\|_{T^c}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Collecting together (74), (75), (76), using (71) and the first inequality in (72) we finally get  $\alpha \geq \mathcal{F}(m) - \varepsilon$  and then, by the arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\alpha \geq \mathcal{F}(m)$ . That is  $\mathcal{F}$  is lower semicontinuous.

### 3.3 Upper bound

Following [13] we prove a crucial estimate for the probability of cylinder sets in  $\mathcal{M}$  with basis a finite interval, Proposition 3.3 below, from which the upper bound follows by using the properties of  $\mathcal{F}$ . The basic idea is to perform the block spin transformation in the (random) interval  $T$  containing the origin and

defined by the condition: the right and the left unit intervals adjacent to  $T$  are the first ones where the spin configuration is at “local equilibrium”, in a suitable sense to be precised. Then the system in  $T$  looks finite and, on the other hand, we can prove that the probability of having local equilibrium not far away from the origin is large enough.

First of all we give a precise notion of local equilibrium. It is reasonable to consider a spin configuration at equilibrium in a given (macroscopic) interval  $I$  and with some accuracy  $\zeta > 0$  if all the block spins on  $I$  are in a  $\zeta$ -neighbor of an equilibrium magnetization. With respect to the case of Ising systems we have here a continuum of possible equilibrium magnetizations, indexed by the vectors  $m_\beta s$ ,  $s \in S^{q-1}$ . Therefore it is necessary to discretize the number of possible magnetizations. But we cannot introduce simply a partition of  $S^{q-1}$  and define the local equilibrium accordingly. In fact, due again to the continuum of the equilibrium states, the energy cost of some non equilibrium configurations can be very small, independently on the accuracy  $\zeta$ . Then the probability of finding local equilibrium is not large and the strategy of the proof cannot be applied. To overcome this problem we introduce a weaker definition of equilibrium, obtained by introducing a finer discretization of  $S^{q-1}$ , so that the  $\zeta$ -neighbors of two close magnetizations are overlapping.

For any  $\zeta > 0$  we choose  $\ell^* \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $s_1, \dots, s_{\ell^*} \in S^{q-1}$  such that, for any  $s \in S^{q-1}$  there is  $s_\ell$  with  $|s - s_\ell| \leq (1 + m_\beta)^{-1}\zeta/4$  (the precise value  $(1 + m_\beta)^{-1}/4$  comes out for technical reasons, see the proof of Lemma 3.4 below). Notice that we can assume  $\ell^* \sim \zeta^{1-q}$ . Given  $\delta, \zeta > 0$  we say that in an interval  $[k, k+1) \in \mathcal{D}^{(1)}$  there is equilibrium with accuracy  $\zeta$  and coarse grain  $\delta$  if, for any  $x \in [k, k+1)$ ,  $|\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta)}(x) - m_\beta s_\ell| < \zeta$  for some  $s_\ell$ . To summarize this we introduce the variable  $\eta_{\delta, \zeta}(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, \ell^*\}$  defined as follows. Consider the random subsets of  $\{1, \dots, \ell^*\}$ ,

$$L(k, m) = \{\ell : |m^{(\delta)}(x) - m_\beta s_\ell| \leq \zeta \text{ for any } x \in [k, k+1)\}. \quad (77)$$

Then

$$\eta_{\delta, \zeta}(k, m) = \begin{cases} \min L(k, m) & \text{if } L(k, m) \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

so that  $\eta_{\delta, \zeta}(k, \sigma_\gamma) \neq 0$  means that there is equilibrium in  $[k, k+1)$  in the sense stated above. When useful we will consider  $\eta_{\delta, \zeta}(\cdot, \cdot)$  a function on  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{S}$  by setting, with an abuse of notation,  $\eta_{\delta, \zeta}(k, \sigma) = \eta_{\delta, \zeta}(k, \sigma_\gamma)$ .

For any pair of unit vectors  $s, s' \in S^{q-1}$  we define the function

$$\chi_{ss'}(x) = \begin{cases} m_\beta s & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ m_\beta s' & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases} \quad (79)$$

and, for any finite interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  we introduce the subset of  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_I = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : \exists \ell_+, \ell_- \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\} \\ \text{such that } m(x) - \chi_{\ell_+ \ell_-}(x) = 0 \text{ when } x \in I^c\} \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where we shorthand  $\chi_{s_{\ell_+} s_{\ell_-}} = \chi_{\ell_+ \ell_-}$ . We also write  $\mathcal{M}_r$  for  $\mathcal{M}_{[-r, r]}$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then:

**Proposition 3.3** *For any interval  $I = [-a, a]$  with  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ , any cylinder set  $F$  with basis  $I$ , any  $\zeta > 0$ , any  $\delta, \delta^* \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and any integer  $R > a$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta, \gamma}(F) \\ \leq - \inf_{m \in F \cap \mathcal{M}_R} \beta \mathcal{F}(m^{(\delta^*)}) + c_1 R \delta^* + c_2 (\zeta + \delta) + \vartheta(\zeta, \delta, R - a) \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

where  $c_1, c_2$  and  $\vartheta(\zeta, \delta, R)$  are positive and independent on  $I$  and  $F$ , and  $\vartheta(\zeta, \delta, R) \rightarrow 0$  as  $R \rightarrow +\infty$  for any  $\zeta$  and  $\delta$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\zeta, \delta > 0$  and  $R > a$ . Let  $\tau_\pm : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be the functions

$$\begin{cases} \tau_+(m) = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : k \geq a, \eta_{\delta, \zeta}(k, m) \neq 0\} \\ \tau_-(m) = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : k \geq a, \eta_{\delta, \zeta}(-k - 1, m) \neq 0\} \end{cases} \quad (82)$$

( $\tau_\pm(m) = +\infty$  if the infimum is not achieved). For any  $k_+, k_- \geq a$  and  $\ell_+, \ell_- = 1, \dots, \ell^*$  we introduce the set

$$G_{k_\pm, \ell_\pm}^{(\delta, \zeta)} = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : \tau_\pm = k_\pm, \eta_{\delta, \zeta}(k_+, m) = \ell_+, \eta_{\delta, \zeta}(-k_- - 1, m) = \ell_-\} \quad (83)$$

and we partition  $\mathcal{M}$  as the union of

$$D = \bigcup_{k_+=a}^R \bigcup_{k_-=a}^R \bigcup_{\ell_+=1}^{\ell^*} \bigcup_{\ell_-=1}^{\ell^*} G_{k_\pm, \ell_\pm}^{(\delta, \zeta)} \quad (84)$$

and its complementary set  $D^c$ . Recalling (6) we introduce the set  $\Lambda = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : |i| \leq L\}$ ,  $L$  an integer greater than  $\gamma^{-1}R$  that will go to  $+\infty$ , and we look for an upper bound of  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(F)$ , defined as in (32) with free boundary conditions. We estimate

$$Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(F) \leq (R-a)^2(\ell^*)^2 \max_{\substack{k_\pm=a,\dots,R \\ \ell_\pm=1,\dots,\ell^*}} Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda \left( F \cap G_{k_\pm,\ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)} \right) + Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(D^c) \quad (85)$$

and we bound first  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda \left( F \cap G_{k_\pm,\ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)} \right)$  and then  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda(D^c)$ .

Fix  $k_\pm, \ell_\pm$  and decompose  $\Lambda = \Lambda_+ \cup \Delta \cup \Lambda_-$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : -k_- \leq i\gamma < k_+\}, \\ \Lambda_+ &= (\Lambda \setminus \Delta) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, \\ \Lambda_- &= (\Lambda \setminus \Delta) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{<0}. \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\beta,\gamma}^\Lambda \left( F \cap G_{k_\pm,\ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)} \right) &\leq \max_{\sigma \in G_{k_\pm,\ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)}} Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Delta,\sigma\Delta^c}(F) Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_-}(\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(-k_- - 1, \cdot) = \ell_-) \\ &\quad \times Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_+}(\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(k_+, \cdot) = \ell_+). \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

We notice that  $\sigma \in G_{k_\pm,\ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)}$  implies  $|\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)}(x) - \chi_{\ell_+\ell_-}(x)| \leq \zeta$  for any  $x \in [-k_- - 1, -k_-] \cup [k_+, k_+ + 1]$ . Then, calling  $T = [-k_-, k_+]$ , for some  $b_3 > 0$  depending only on  $J$  and for any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| U_{T^c}((\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c}) + W_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) |(\sigma_\gamma^{(\delta^*)})_{T^c} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - U_{T^c}((\chi_{\ell_+\ell_-})_{T^c}) - W_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) |(\chi_{\ell_+\ell_-})_{T^c} \right| \mathbf{1}_{G_{k_\pm,\ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)}}(\sigma) \leq b_3(\zeta + \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Now we apply Lemma 3.1 to bound  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Delta,\sigma\Delta^c}(F)$ . From (38) and (88) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{\sigma \in G_{k_\pm,\ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)}} Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Delta,\sigma\Delta^c}(F) \\ &\leq \exp[\beta\gamma^{-1}(b_1\delta^*|T| + b_3(\zeta + \delta))] \left(1 + 4\pi(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{b_2}\right)^{|T|/\delta^*} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left[-\beta\gamma^{-1}\left(U_{T^c}((\chi_{\ell_+\ell_-})_{T^c}) + f_\beta(m_\beta)|T|\right)\right] \\ &\quad \times \exp\left[-\beta\gamma^{-1}\inf_{m \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) + W_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) |(\chi_{\ell_+\ell_-})_{T^c} \right\}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$



We are left with the bound on the product of the partition functions in (87) coming from the integration over the spin configurations  $\sigma_{\Lambda_+}$  and  $\sigma_{\Lambda_-}$ . As in [13] we follow Ruelle's strategy, [41, 42], and we reconstruct the full partition function on  $\Lambda$ . First of all we use the symmetry of the interaction with respect to global spin rotations to claim that

$$Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_-}(\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(-k_- - 1, \cdot) = \ell_-) = Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_-}(\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(-k_- - 1, \cdot) = \ell_+). \quad (90)$$

Let now  $V_{\delta^*,\rho,T}(m_\beta s_{\ell_+})$  be as in (39). From the explicit form of the functional, see also the proof of Lemma 3.4, one easily checks that, for some constant  $b_4 > 0$ ,

$$0 \leq \sup_{m \in V_{\delta^*,\rho,T}(m_\beta s_{\ell_+})} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) + W_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)} | (m_\beta s_{\ell_+})_{T^c}) \right\} \leq b_4 \rho^2 |T|. \quad (91)$$

We choose  $\rho$  so small that  $b_4 \rho^2 \leq b_1 \delta^*$ . Then from (40), (88) and (91), for any  $\sigma$  such that  $\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(-k_- - 1, \sigma) = \eta_{\delta,\zeta}(k_+, \sigma) = \ell_+$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma_{\Lambda \setminus \Delta}} \\ & \geq \exp[-\beta\gamma^{-1}(2b_1\delta^*|T| + b_3(\zeta + \delta))] \left( \frac{4\pi\rho^3}{3} (\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{-c(m_\beta + \rho)} \right)^{|T|/\delta^*} \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} \left( U_{T^c}((m_\beta s_{\ell_+})_{T^c}) + f_\beta(m_\beta)|T| \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Now we come back to the r.h.s. of (87). We first use (90) and then (92) to reinsert the integration over the  $\sigma_\Delta$ 's in order to reconstruct  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda}(\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(-k_- - 1, \cdot) = \eta_{\delta,\zeta}(k_+, \cdot) = \ell_+)$  that can be bounded with the full partition function. From (89), recalling the definitions (35), (36), (37), (80) and that  $|T| \leq 2R$ , we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda} \left( F \cap G_{k_\pm, \ell_\pm}^{(\delta,\zeta)} \right) \\ & \leq \exp[\beta\gamma^{-1}(6b_1\delta^*R + 2b_3(\zeta + \delta))] \\ & \quad \times \left( \frac{3}{4\pi\rho^3} (\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{c(m_\beta + \rho)} \left( 1 + 4\pi(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{b_2} \right) \right)^{2R/\delta^*} \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} \inf_{m \in F \cap \mathcal{M}_R} \{ \mathcal{F}(m^{(\delta^*)}) \} \right] Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

To bound  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda}(D^c)$  we need a lower bound for the cost in free energy of a row of non equilibrium configurations which is the content of the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4** *Let  $T = [t_1, t_2]$ ,  $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For any  $\delta \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $\zeta \in (0, m_\beta)$ , let  $\eta_{\delta, \zeta}(\cdot, \cdot)$  be as in (78) and define the cylinder set*

$$\Gamma^{(\delta, \zeta)} = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : \eta_{\delta, \zeta}(k, m) = 0 \text{ for any } k = t_1, \dots, t_2 - 1\}. \quad (94)$$

*Then there are positive functions  $p(\delta, \zeta)$  and  $p^*(\delta, \zeta)$  such that, for any  $\delta^* \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $\delta^* \leq p^*(\delta, \zeta)$ ,*

$$\inf_{m \in \Gamma^{(\delta, \zeta)}} \mathcal{F}_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) \geq p(\delta, \zeta)|T| \quad (95)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_T$  is defined in (35).

We postpone the proof of the above lemma at the end of the subsection and we complete the proof of Proposition 3.3. As before we take  $T = [-k_-, k_+]$  with now  $k_\pm = \min\{R; \tau_\pm\}$ . Since there is not equilibrium at the border of  $T$ , an estimate as (88) is not still true. We then use that the interactions  $W_T$  and  $U_{T^c}$  can be uniformly bounded by some constant  $C > 0$  and we simply estimate

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\beta, \gamma}^\Lambda(D^c) &\leq \exp[\beta\gamma^{-1}(6b_1\delta^*R + 2C)] \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{3}{4\pi\rho^3}(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{c(m_\beta + \rho)} \left(1 + 4\pi(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{b_2}\right) \right)^{2R/\delta^*} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left[-\beta\gamma^{-1} \inf_{m \in D^c} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)}) \right\}\right] Z_{\beta, \gamma}^\Lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

But, from the definition (84),  $\min\{k_-; k_+\} = R$ , therefore  $D^c$  is contained into a set  $\Gamma^{(\delta, \zeta)}$  as defined in (94) with  $t_2 - t_1 \geq (R - a)$ . From (85), (93), (96) and using Lemma 3.4 we finally get, uniformly in  $\Lambda$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\beta, \gamma}^\Lambda(F) &\leq (R - a)^2(\ell^*)^2 \exp[\beta\gamma^{-1}(6b_1\delta^*R + 2b_3(\zeta + \delta))] \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{3}{4\pi\rho^3}(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{c(m_\beta + \rho)} \left(1 + 4\pi(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})^{b_2}\right) \right)^{2R/\delta^*} \\ &\quad \times \max \left\{ \exp\left[-\beta\gamma^{-1} \inf_{m \in F \cap \mathcal{M}_R} \left\{ \mathcal{F}(m^{(\delta^*)}) \right\}\right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \exp\left[-\beta\gamma^{-1}(p(\delta, \zeta)(R - a) - 2C)\right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

from which the Proposition follows immediately.  $\square$

With Proposition 3.3 and the lower semicontinuity of the functional  $\mathcal{F}$ , the proof of (30) is exactly the same as in [13], then we omit the proof.

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* Let

$$\mathcal{N}_k = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : k \leq n\delta < k + 1\}, \quad \mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{k=t_1}^{t_2-1} \mathcal{N}_k.$$

From the definition (78),

$$\Gamma^{(\delta, \zeta)} = \bigcap_{k=t_1}^{t_2-1} \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{\ell^*} \bigcup_{n \in \mathcal{N}_k} \Gamma_{n, \ell}^{(\delta, \zeta)} \quad (98)$$

where, for any  $\delta \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $\zeta \in (0, m_\beta)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, \ell^*$ ,

$$\Gamma_{n, \ell}^{(\delta, \zeta)} = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : |m^{(\delta)}(n\delta) - m_\beta s_\ell| > \zeta\}. \quad (99)$$

Now let  $\delta^* \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $\delta^* < \delta$ , and define, for any  $n \in \mathcal{N}$ ,

$$\mathcal{U}_n = \{u \in \mathbb{Z} : n\delta \leq u\delta^* < (n+1)\delta\}, \quad \mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{U}_n.$$

Given  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ , let  $B_{n, \ell}(m) = \{u \in \mathcal{U}_n : |m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*) - m_\beta s_\ell| > \zeta/2\}$ . Clearly, for any  $m \in \Gamma_{n, \ell}^{(\delta, \zeta)}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &< |m^{(\delta)}(n\delta) - m_\beta s_\ell| \leq \frac{\delta^*}{\delta} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}_n} |m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*) - m_\beta s_\ell| \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\delta^*}{\delta} |B_{n, \ell}(m)| + \frac{\zeta \delta^*}{2\delta} \left( \frac{\delta}{\delta^*} - |B_{n, \ell}(m)| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

so that  $|B_{n, \ell}(m)| > \zeta\delta/(4\delta^*)$ . Then

$$\Gamma_{n, \ell}^{(\delta, \zeta)} \subseteq \bigcup_{\substack{U \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n \\ |U| > \zeta\delta/(4\delta^*)}} \bigcap_{u \in U} \Gamma_{u, \ell}^{(\delta^*, \zeta/2)}. \quad (101)$$

Let  $\zeta' = (1 + m_\beta)^{-1}\zeta/2$  and  $\zeta'' = m_\beta\zeta'/8$ . For any  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  define

$$\begin{aligned} A_\ell^{(\delta^*, \zeta')}(u) &= \left\{ m \in \mathcal{M} : m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*) \neq 0, \left| \frac{m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*)}{|m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*)|} - s_\ell \right| \leq \zeta' \right\}, \\ B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u) &= \left\{ m \in \mathcal{M} : \left| |m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*)| - m_\beta \right| \leq \zeta'' \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By triangular inequality and since  $\zeta \in (0, m_\beta)$  we have

$$A_\ell^{(\delta^*, \zeta')}(u) \cap B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u) \subseteq \left( \Gamma_{u, \ell}^{(\delta^*, \zeta/2)} \right)^c. \quad (102)$$

Then, setting

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k) &= \bigcup_{n \in \mathcal{N}_k} \bigcup_{\substack{U \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n \\ |U| > \zeta\delta/(4\delta^*)}} \bigcap_{u \in U} B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u)^c, \\ \tilde{D}^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k) &= \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{\ell^*} \bigcup_{n \in \mathcal{N}_k} \bigcup_{\substack{U \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n \\ |U| > \zeta\delta/(4\delta^*)}} \bigcap_{u \in U} A_\ell^{(\delta^*, \zeta')}(u)^c \cap B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u), \end{aligned}$$

from (98) and (102) we obtain

$$\Gamma^{(\delta, \zeta)} \subseteq \bigcap_{k=t_1}^{t_2-1} R^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k) \cup \tilde{D}^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k). \quad (103)$$

Let now  $m \in \tilde{D}^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k)$ . Then there are  $n_1 \in \mathcal{N}_k$  and  $U \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{n_1}$ ,  $|U| > \zeta\delta/(4\delta^*)$ , such that

$$m \in \bigcap_{u \in U} B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u). \quad (104)$$

In particular the unit vectors  $m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*)/|m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*)| \neq 0$  are well defined for any  $u \in U$ . But from the definition of  $\{s_\ell; \ell = 1, \dots, \ell^*\}$ , for any  $s \in S^{q-1}$ , there is  $s_\ell$  such that  $|s - s_\ell| < \zeta'/2$ . Then we can apply the ‘‘pigeon holes principle’’ to conclude that there must be at least an index  $\ell_1$  and a set  $U_1 \subseteq U$  such that  $|U_1| > \zeta\delta/(4\ell^*\delta^*)$  and

$$m \in \bigcap_{u \in U_1} A_{\ell_1}^{(\delta^*, \zeta'/2)}(u) \cap B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u). \quad (105)$$

Since  $m \in \tilde{D}^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k)$  it follows also that there are  $n_2 \in \mathcal{N}_k$  and  $U_2 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{n_2}$ ,  $|U_2| > \zeta\delta/(4\delta^*)$  such that

$$m \in \bigcap_{u \in U_2} A_{\ell_1}^{(\delta^*, \zeta')}(u)^c \cap B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u). \quad (106)$$

From (105) and (106), for any  $u_1 \in U_1$  and  $u_2 \in U_2$ ,

$$\left| \frac{m^{(\delta^*)}(u_1\delta^*)}{|m^{(\delta^*)}(u_1\delta^*)|} - \frac{m^{(\delta^*)}(u_2\delta^*)}{|m^{(\delta^*)}(u_2\delta^*)|} \right| > \zeta' - \frac{\zeta'}{2} = \frac{\zeta'}{2}. \quad (107)$$

Since  $m \in B^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u)$  for any  $u \in U_1 \cup U_2$ , see (105) and (106), from (107) and recalling that  $\zeta'' = m_\beta \zeta'/8$ , we get

$$|m^{(\delta^*)}(u_1\delta^*) - m^{(\delta^*)}(u_2\delta^*)| > m_\beta \frac{\zeta'}{2} - 2\zeta'' = 2\zeta''.$$

So we found

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k) &\subseteq D^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k) \\ &= \bigcup_{n_1, n_2 \in \mathcal{N}_k} \bigcup_{\substack{U_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{n_1} \\ |U_1| > \zeta\delta/(4\ell^*\delta^*)}} \bigcup_{\substack{U_2 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{n_2} \\ |U_2| > \zeta\delta/(4\delta^*)}} \bigcap_{\substack{u_1 \in U_1 \\ u_2 \in U_2}} C^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u_1, u_2) \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

where

$$C^{(\delta^*, \zeta'')}(u_1, u_2) = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : |m^{(\delta^*)}(u_1\delta^*) - m^{(\delta^*)}(u_2\delta^*)| > 2\zeta''\}. \quad (109)$$

From (103) and (108) we finally obtain

$$\Gamma^{(\delta, \zeta)} \subseteq \bigcap_{k=t_1}^{t_2-1} R^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k) \cup D^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k). \quad (110)$$

Now it is easy to get a lower bound for  $\mathcal{F}_T(m_T^{(\delta^*)})$  on the set in the r.h.s. of (110) (and so also in  $\Gamma^{(\delta, \zeta)}$ ). Recalling (35),

$$\mathcal{F}_T(m_T) \geq \sum_{k=t_1}^{t_2-1} \left( \mathcal{F}_k^{(R)}(m^{(\delta^*)}) + \mathcal{F}_k^{(D)}(m^{(\delta^*)}) \right) \quad (111)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_k^{(R)}(m^{(\delta^*)}) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_k} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}_n} \delta^* \left( f_\beta(m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*)) - f_\beta(m_\beta) \right)$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_k^{(D)}(m^{(\delta^*)}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n_1, n_2 \in \mathcal{N}_k} \sum_{\substack{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{n_1} \\ u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{n_2}}} \delta^* J_{\delta^*}(u_1, u_2) |m^{(\delta^*)}(u_1\delta^*) - m^{(\delta^*)}(u_2\delta^*)|^2.$$

Using the fact that  $m_\beta$  is a quadratic absolute minima of  $f_\beta$  and assuming  $J = \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}$ , for a suitable positive constants  $c'$ ,

$$\inf_{m \in R^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k)} \mathcal{F}_k^{(R)}(m^{(\delta^*)}) > c' \delta \zeta^3, \quad \inf_{m \in D^{(\delta^*, \zeta)}(k)} \mathcal{F}_k^{(D)}(m^{(\delta^*)}) > c' \delta^2 \zeta^{q+3} \quad (112)$$

(for the second one we used also that  $\ell^* \sim \zeta^{-q+1}$ ). In the general case, since  $J > 0$  in  $(0, 1)$ , the term  $c' \delta^2 \zeta^{q+3}$  is replaced by some function  $g_J(\delta, \zeta)$  which is strictly positive for  $\delta, \zeta > 0$ . The Lemma follows immediately.  $\square$

### 3.4 Lower bound

As in [13] we introduce the basis of neighborhoods  $\{V_{\delta, \zeta, R}; \delta > 0, \zeta > 0, R \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ , for the weak  $L_2$ -loc topology where  $V_{\delta, \zeta, R}(m)$  is defined as in (39) when  $T = [-R, R]$  and  $(\delta^*, \rho) = (\delta, \zeta)$ . First we prove a probability estimate, Proposition 3.5 below, for neighborhoods of  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\|m\|_\infty < 1$ . Next, by exploiting the properties of the free energy functional  $\mathcal{F}$  and of the set  $\mathcal{M}^0$ , see (29), we deduce (31).

**Proposition 3.5** *Let  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\|m\|_\infty < 1$ . Suppose there are  $R \in \mathbb{N}$  and two unit vectors  $s_+, s_- \in S^{q-1}$  so that  $m(x) - \chi_{s_+ s_-}(x) = 0$  if  $|x| \geq R$ , see definition (79). Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are  $\zeta > 0$  and  $\delta \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  such that*

$$\liminf_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta, \gamma}(V_{\delta, \zeta, R}(m)) \geq -\beta \mathcal{F}(m) - \varepsilon. \quad (113)$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of Proposition 3.3, we use (6) and we work in finite volume. Let  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  larger than  $\gamma^{-1}R$  and  $\Lambda = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : |i| \leq L\}$ . For any

$k \in \mathbb{Z}$  we define the events

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\pm}^{(\delta, \zeta)}(k) &= \{m \in \mathcal{M} : |m^{(\delta)}(x) - m_{\beta} s_{\pm}| < \zeta \quad \forall x \in [k, k+1)\}, \\ G^{(\delta, \zeta)} &= G_{+}^{(\delta, \zeta)}(R) \cup G_{-}^{(\delta, \zeta)}(-R-1) \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

and we introduce the sets  $\Delta$ ,  $\Lambda_{\pm}$  as in (86) with here  $k_{\pm} = R$ . Then we bound

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Lambda}(V_{\delta, \zeta, R}(m)) &\geq Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Lambda}(V_{\delta, \zeta, R}(m) \cap G^{(\delta, \zeta)}) \\ &\geq \min_{\sigma_{\Delta^c} \in G^{(\delta, \zeta)}} Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma_{\Delta^c}}(V_{\delta, \zeta, R}(m)) Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Lambda_{+}}(G_{+}^{(\delta, \zeta)}(R)) \\ &\quad \times Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Lambda_{-}}(G_{-}^{(\delta, \zeta)}(-R-1)). \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

Now we can apply item (ii) of Lemma 3.1 to  $Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma_{\Delta^c}}(V_{\delta, \zeta, R}(m))$  with  $T = [-R, R]$  and  $(\delta^*, \rho) = (\delta, \zeta)$ . Using the smoothness properties of the functions  $J(\cdot)$  and  $I(\cdot)$  and since  $\sigma_{\Delta^c} \in G^{(\delta, \zeta)}$ , for some constant  $b_5 > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sup_{\tilde{m} \in V_{\delta, \rho, T}(m)} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_T(\tilde{m}_T^{(\delta)}) + W_T(\tilde{m}_T^{(\delta)} | (\sigma_{\gamma}^{(\delta)})_{T^c}) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + U_{T^c}((\sigma_{\gamma}^{(\delta)})_{T^c}) - \mathcal{F}_T(m_T^{(\delta)}) - W_T(m_T^{(\delta)} | m_{T^c}) - U_{T^c}(m_{T^c}) \right| \\ &\leq b_5(\zeta + \delta)|T| \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

(we used that  $m_{T^c}^{(\delta)} = m_{T^c} = (\chi_{s_{+} s_{-}})_{T^c}$ ). We need to replace the coarse grain  $m_T^{(\delta)}$  with  $m_T$ . This can be done in the energy terms  $E(\cdot|\cdot)$  and  $W_T(\cdot|\cdot)$  with an error of order  $\delta$ . Conversely, we have not such an estimate for the (local) entropy term in  $\mathcal{F}_T$  because the difference  $m(x) - m^{(\delta)}(x)$  is not small in general. But, since the entropy is a convex function,

$$\delta I(m^{(\delta)}(x)) \geq \int_{n\delta}^{(n+1)\delta} dy I(m(y)) \quad \forall x \in [n\delta, (n+1)\delta). \quad (117)$$

From (116), (117) and item (ii) of Lemma 3.1, there is a constant  $b_6 > 0$  such that, for any  $\zeta$  small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\sigma_{\Delta^c} \in G^{(\delta, \zeta)}} Z_{\beta, \gamma}^{\Delta, \sigma_{\Delta^c}}(V_{\delta, \zeta, R}(m)) \\ &\geq \left( \frac{4\pi\zeta^3}{3} (\delta\gamma^{-1})^{-c(\|m_T\|_{\infty} + \zeta)} \right)^{2R/\delta} \exp[-\beta b_6(\delta + \zeta)\gamma^{-1}R] \\ &\quad \times \exp[-\beta\gamma^{-1}(\mathcal{F}(m) + 2Rf_{\beta}(m_{\beta}))] \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

(we used that  $\mathcal{F}_{T^c}(m_{T^c}) = 0$ ).

Next, analogously to what done when proving Proposition 3.3, we reconstruct the full partition function to bound the other terms in the r.h.s. of (115). First we use the rotational symmetry to replace  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_-}(G_-^{(\delta,\zeta)}(-R-1))$  by  $Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_-}(G_+^{(\delta,\zeta)}(-R-1))$ . Then we use item (i) of Lemma 3.1 with  $\Gamma = V_{\delta,\zeta,R}(m_\beta s_{\ell_+})$  and  $\sigma_{\Delta^c} \in G_+^{(\delta,\zeta)}(R) \cap G_+^{(\delta,\zeta)}(-R-1)$  to reintroduce the sum over the  $\sigma_\Delta$ 's. After some simple estimates we get, for some constant  $b_7 > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_+}(G_+^{(\delta,\zeta)}(R)) Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda_-}(G_-^{(\delta,\zeta)}(-R-1)) \\ & \geq \left(1 + 4\pi(\delta\gamma^{-1})^{b_2}\right)^{-2R/\delta} \exp[-\beta b_7(\delta + \zeta)\gamma^{-1}R] \\ & \quad \times \exp[\beta\gamma^{-1}2Rf_\beta(m_\beta)] Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Lambda} \left( \bigcap_{k=-R-1}^R G_+^{(\delta,\zeta)}(k) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

From (118) and (119), taking first the limit  $L \rightarrow +\infty$  and after  $\gamma \downarrow 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(V_{\delta,\zeta,R}(m)) \\ & \geq -\beta\mathcal{F}(m) - \beta(b_6 + b_7)(\delta + \zeta)R \\ & \quad + \liminf_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \bigcap_{k=-R-1}^R G_+^{(\delta,\zeta)}(k) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

We are going to prove that the  $\liminf$  in the r.h.s. of (120) is 0, so the Proposition is proved. For any  $s \in S^{q-1}$  let

$$G_s = \{m \in \mathcal{M} : |m^{(\delta)}(x) - m_\beta s| < \zeta \quad \forall x \in [-R-1, R]\}. \quad (121)$$

Clearly  $G_{s_+}$  is the set in the r.h.s. of (120) and, by symmetry,  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(G_s)$  does not depend on  $s$ . Fix  $n = n(\zeta)$  unit vectors uniformly distributed on  $S^{q-1}$  such that the balls  $B_{s_i} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^q : |v - m_\beta s_i| < \zeta\}$  are disjoint and  $\text{dist}(m_\beta s, \cup B_{s_i}) < \zeta$  for any  $s \in S^{q-1}$ . Then,

$$n\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(G_s) = \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^n G_{s_i} \right) = 1 - \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^n G_{s_i}^c \right). \quad (122)$$

With an appropriate rotation of the  $s_i$ 's we can find  $n$  new vectors  $s'_i$  such that, for any  $s \in S^{q-1}$ ,  $\text{dist}(m_\beta s, \cap_i B_{s_i}^c \cap B_{s'_i}^c) > c\zeta$  for a suitable constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $q$  and  $\beta$ . Since

$$\mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^n G_{s_i}^c \right) \leq n\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(G_s) + \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^n G_{s_i}^c \cap G_{s'_i}^c \right)$$



from (122) we get

$$\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(G_s) \geq \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{2n} \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^n G_{s_i}^c \cap G_{s'_i}^c \right). \quad (123)$$

Recalling the definition (121), from the construction of the vectors  $s_i$  and  $s'_i$ , one checks that there is  $c' > 0$  such that the set in the r.h.s. of (123) is contained in the union of the events:  $\{\exists x \in [-R-1, R) : ||m^{(\delta)}(x)| - m_\beta| > c'\zeta\}$  and  $\{\exists x, y \in [-R-1, R) : |m^{(\delta)}(x) - m^{(\delta)}(y)| > c'\zeta\}$ . The latter one is clearly contained in the bigger one:  $\{\exists x \in [-R-1, R) : |m^{(\delta)}(x) - m^{(\delta)}(x+\delta)| > c'\delta\zeta/(2R)\}$ . We can use then the same arguments that lead to Lemma 3.4 to prove that the infimum of  $\mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]}(m^{(\delta^*)})$  over the above union of events is bounded from below by  $c(\delta, \delta\zeta/R)$  for some  $c(\cdot, \cdot) > 0$  and any  $\delta^* \in \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then, from Proposition 3.3 (with parameters  $(\delta, \zeta)$  smaller than the above one's!), we obtain  $\liminf \gamma \log \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(G_s) = 0$ .  $\square$

To use the above result to prove (31) we need a preliminary lemma.

**Lemma 3.6** *Let  $m \in \mathcal{M}^0$ , so that there exists a map  $x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$  s.t.  $\|m - m_\beta s\| < +\infty$  and  $U(s) < +\infty$ . Then there is  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for any  $z \in \mathbb{Z}, |z| \geq N_0$ , the unit vector*

$$s_z \equiv \left| \int_z^{z+1} dx s(x) \right|^{-1} \int_z^{z+1} dx s(x) \quad (124)$$

is well defined and

$$\lim_{|z| \rightarrow +\infty} \|m - m_\beta s_z\|_{[z, z+1]} = 0 \quad (125)$$

(recall definition (55)).

*Proof.* We first observe that, since  $|s(x)| = 1$  and  $J$  is positive and satisfies the normalization condition (2),

$$1 - \left| \int_z^{z+1} dx s(x) \right| \leq \int_z^{z+1} dx (1 - s(x) \cdot J \star s(x)) \quad (126)$$

and the integral in the r.h.s. of (126) goes to 0 as  $|z| \rightarrow +\infty$  since  $U(s) < +\infty$ . Then  $s_z$  is well defined for  $|z|$  large. Now we bound

$$\|m - m_\beta s_z\|_{[z, z+1]}^2 \leq 2\|m - m_\beta s\|_{[z, z+1]}^2 + 2m_\beta^2 \|s - s_z\|_{[z, z+1]}^2. \quad (127)$$

The first norm in the r.h.s. of (127) goes to 0 as  $|z| \rightarrow +\infty$  since  $\|m - m_\beta s\| < +\infty$ , while

$$\|s - s_z\|_{[z, z+1]}^2 = 2 \left( 1 - \left| \int_z^{z+1} dx s(x) \right| \right)$$

goes to 0 as  $|z| \rightarrow +\infty$  because of (126). □

Now we prove (31). Let  $A$  be an open set in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $A \cap \mathcal{M}^0 = \emptyset$ , (31) holds trivially, therefore we assume  $A \cap \mathcal{M}^0 \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $m \in A \cap \mathcal{M}^0$ , then there is  $x \mapsto s(x) \in S^{q-1}$  such that  $\|m - m_\beta s\| < +\infty$  and  $U(s) < +\infty$ . Let  $\rho \in (0, 1 - m_\beta)$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $N \geq N_0$  and  $s_N, s_{-N-1} \in S^{q-1}$  ( $N_0, z \mapsto s_z$  as in Lemma 3.6). We define the set

$$X_\rho = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |m(x)| > 1 - \rho\}.$$

Clearly  $|X_\rho| < +\infty$  and  $X_\rho \subseteq X_{\rho'}$  if  $\rho \leq \rho'$ . Moreover, recalling the proof of Lemma 3.2, we can assume  $s(x) = |m(x)|^{-1}m(x)$  for any  $x \in X_\rho$ . Setting  $T_N = [-N, N]$  we define

$$m_{\rho, N}(x) \equiv \begin{cases} m(x) & \text{if } x \in T_N \setminus X_\rho, \\ (1 - \rho)s(x) & \text{if } x \in T_N \cap X_\rho, \\ m_\beta s_N & \text{if } x > N, \\ m_\beta s_{-N-1} & \text{if } x < -N. \end{cases} \quad (128)$$

By the dominated convergence theorem,  $m_{\rho, N}$  converges to  $m$  weakly in  $L_2$ -loc as  $\rho \downarrow 0$  and  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then, since  $A$  is an open set,  $m_{\rho, N} \in A$  for any  $\rho$  sufficiently small and  $N$  large enough. Recalling the definitions (35) and (36) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(m) - \mathcal{F}(m_{\rho, N}) &= \mathcal{F}_{T_N}(m_{T_N}) - \mathcal{F}_{T_N}((m_{\rho, N})_{T_N}) + \mathcal{F}_{T_N^c}(m_{T_N^c}) \\ &\quad + W_{T_N}(m_{T_N} | m_{T_N^c}) - W_{T_N}((m_{\rho, N})_{T_N} | (m_{\rho, N})_{T_N^c}). \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

Since  $f_\beta(m)$ , as a function of  $|m|$ , is left continuous in  $|m| = 1$ , using the definition of  $m_{\rho,N}$  in  $T_N$ , one easily checks that the difference  $\mathcal{F}_{T_N}(m_{T_N}) - \mathcal{F}_{T_N}((m_{\rho,N})_{T_N}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \downarrow 0$  uniformly in  $N$ . On the other hand, using (2) and the support properties of  $J$ , after some simple computation one easily gets,

$$\begin{aligned} & |W_{T_N}(m_{T_N}|m_{T_N^c}) - W_{T_N}((m_{\rho,N})_{T_N}|(m_{\rho,N})_{T_N^c})| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{T_N} dx \left| |m(x)|^2 - |m_{\rho,N}(x)|^2 \right| + \frac{1}{2} \int_{T_{N+1} \setminus T_N} dy \left| |m(y)|^2 - m_\beta^2 \right| \\ & \quad + \int_{N-1}^N dx \int_N^{N+1} dy J(|x-y|) |m(x) \cdot m(y) - m_\beta m_{\rho,N}(x) \cdot s_N| \\ & \quad + \int_{-N}^{-N+1} dx \int_{-N-1}^{-N} dy J(|x-y|) |m(x) \cdot m(y) - m_\beta m_{\rho,N}(x) \cdot s_{-N-1}|. \end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

The first integral in the last line of (130) is bounded by  $\rho |X_\rho| \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \downarrow 0$ . The second one is bounded by  $\|m - m_\beta s\|_{T_N^c} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ . The last two integrals can be estimate in a same way, let us consider the first one. By adding and subtracting  $m_{\rho,N}(x) \cdot m(y)$  one checks that it is bounded by

$$\int_{N-1}^N dx |m(x) - m_{\rho,N}(x)| + \|m - m_\beta s\|_{[N, N+1]}^2$$

that goes to 0 as  $\rho \downarrow 0$  and  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  (recall (125)). We conclude that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  we can choose  $\rho_\varepsilon$  and  $N_\varepsilon$  such that  $m_{\rho_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon} \in A$  and

$$\mathcal{F}(m) \geq \mathcal{F}(m_{\rho_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{131}$$

Since  $m_{\rho_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon} \in A$  there are  $\delta_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon$  and  $R_\varepsilon$  such that  $V_{\delta_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon, R_\varepsilon}(m_{\rho_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon}) \subseteq A$ . Since we can always assume  $R_\varepsilon \geq N_\varepsilon$ , by applying Proposition 3.5, for any  $\delta, \zeta$  small enough,

$$\liminf_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta, \gamma}(V_{\delta, \zeta, R_\varepsilon}(m_{\rho_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon})) \geq \mathcal{F}(m_{\rho_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{132}$$

Choosing  $\delta \leq \delta_\varepsilon$  and  $\zeta \leq \zeta_\varepsilon$ , from (131) and (132) we find

$$\liminf_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \gamma \log \mu_{\beta, \gamma}(A) \geq \mathcal{F}(m) - \varepsilon$$

from which (31) follows by the arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$ .

## 4 Typical behavior

In this section we prove Theorems 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5

*Proof of Theorem 2.3.*

Since  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}$  is shift invariant, recalling the definitions (20) and (78), we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(\{|m^{(\delta)}(x)| - m_\beta| \leq \zeta \text{ for any } |x| \leq \gamma^{-p}\}) \\ \geq 1 - 2\gamma^{-1-p} \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(0, \cdot) = 0). \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

Using Proposition 3.3 (with parameters  $(\delta, \zeta)$  much smaller than the above one's) and Lemma 3.4, there is  $c > 0$ , depending on  $\delta$  and  $\zeta$ , such that  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(\eta_{\delta,\zeta}(0, \cdot) = 0) \leq \exp[-c\gamma^{-1}]$  for any  $\gamma$  small enough. Therefore (22) follows from (133).

Now we prove (23). By standard density arguments it is sufficient to prove the convergence of the distribution of the spins in a finite interval  $\Delta \subset \mathbb{Z}$  that we can assume centered in the origin. By the DLR equations, the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\mu_{\beta,\gamma}(d\sigma_\Delta)$  with respect to the a priori product measure on  $\mathcal{S}_\Delta$  is

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\beta,\gamma}(\sigma_\Delta) = \int \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(d\sigma_{\Delta^c}) \frac{1}{Z_{\beta,\gamma}^{\Delta,\sigma_{\Delta^c}}} \exp \left[ -\beta H_\gamma(\sigma_\Delta) + \beta \sum_{i \in \Delta} h_\gamma(i|\sigma_{\Delta^c}) \cdot \sigma_i \right] \quad (134)$$

where  $h_\gamma(i|\sigma_{\Delta^c}) \equiv \sum_{j \in \Delta^c} J_\gamma(i-j)\sigma_j$ . Since  $\Delta$  is fixed independent on  $\gamma$  and  $|\sigma_k| = 1$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\limsup_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \sup_{\sigma_\Delta} H_\gamma(\sigma_\Delta) = 0, \quad \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \max_{i \in \Delta} \sup_{\sigma_{\Delta^c}} |h_\gamma(i|\sigma_{\Delta^c}) - h_\gamma(0|\sigma_{\Delta^c})| = 0$$

so that

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\beta,0+}(\sigma_\Delta) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \int \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(d\sigma_{\Delta^c}) \prod_{i \in \Delta} \varphi(\beta h_\gamma(\sigma_{\Delta^c}))^{-1} \exp[\beta h_\gamma(\sigma_\Delta) \cdot \sigma_i] \quad (135)$$

where we shorthand  $h_\gamma(0|\sigma_{\Delta^c}) = h_\gamma(\sigma_{\Delta^c})$  and  $\varphi(\cdot)$  is defined in (10). By using the symmetry of the Gibbs measure with respect to global rotations, (135)

gives

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\beta,0^+}(\sigma_\Delta) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \int \nu(ds) \int \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(d\sigma_{\Delta^c}) \prod_{i \in \Delta} \varphi(\beta|h_\gamma(\sigma_{\Delta^c})|s)^{-1} \exp[\beta|h_\gamma(\sigma_\Delta)|s \cdot \sigma_i]. \quad (136)$$

But from (2) and (133), for any  $\zeta > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(\{|h_\gamma(\sigma_\Delta)| - m_\beta| < \zeta\}) = 1. \quad (137)$$

By (136), (137) and the arbitrariness of  $\zeta$  we finally get

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\beta,0^+}(\sigma_\Delta) = \int \nu(ds) \prod_{i \in \Delta} \varphi(\beta m_\beta s)^{-1} \exp[\beta m_\beta s \cdot \sigma_i] \quad (138)$$

that proves (23) since, from the mean field equation (16),  $\beta m_\beta s = t^*(m_\beta)s = h^*(m_\beta s)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of the Theorem 2.4.*

Using the translation invariance of the system, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \{|m^{(\delta'')}(\mathbf{x})| - m_\beta| \geq \zeta'' \text{ for some } |\mathbf{x}| \leq e^{c\gamma^{-1+\alpha}(1-\varepsilon)}\} \right) \\ \leq 2(\delta'')^{-1} e^{c\gamma^{-1+\alpha}(1-\varepsilon)} \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \{|m^{(\delta'')}(0)| - m_\beta| \geq \zeta''\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

To estimate this last probability, we can use the estimate (97) with parameters  $\tilde{\delta}''$  and  $\tilde{\zeta}''$  much smaller than the parameters  $\delta''$  and  $\zeta''$ . Using the first inequality in (112) to bound the infimum of the rate functional, after some easy estimates we get that, for some constant  $\bar{c} > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\beta,\gamma} \left( \{|m^{(\delta'')}(0)| - m_\beta| \geq \zeta''\} \right) \\ \leq (R'')^2 \ell^*(\tilde{\zeta}'')^2 \\ \times \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} \left( c'\delta''(\zeta'')^3 - \bar{c}(\tilde{\delta}'' + \tilde{\zeta}'') - \bar{c}R''(\delta^* + \gamma(\delta^*)^{-1} \log(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})) \right) \right] \\ + \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} \left( c'R''(\tilde{\delta}'')^2(\tilde{\zeta}'')^{3+q} - 2C - \bar{c}R''(\delta^* + \gamma(\delta^*)^{-1} \log(\delta^*\gamma^{-1})) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

Note that we have taken the worst term for the estimates of  $p(\tilde{\delta}'', \tilde{\zeta}'')$ , see (112). The next step is just to make an appropriate choice of all the parameters. Let

us first remark that in order that the last exponential goes to zero, we need

$$R'' \geq \frac{c_1}{(\tilde{\delta}'' )^2 (\tilde{\zeta}'' )^{3+q}} \quad (141)$$

for some constant  $c_1 > 2C/c'$ , and also, to compensate the entropy term,

$$c' (\tilde{\delta}'' )^2 (\tilde{\zeta}'' )^{3+q} \geq c_2 (\delta^* + \gamma (\delta^*)^{-1} \log (\delta^* \gamma^{-1})) \approx \gamma^{1/2} \log \gamma^{-1/2} \quad (142)$$

for some positive constant  $c_2 > \bar{c}$ . In the last step we have used that the minimum of the term in the middle is reached by choosing  $\delta^* \approx (\gamma^{1/2} \log \gamma^{-1/2})$ . Looking at the second exponential in the formula (140), we want to take the smallest possible  $\tilde{\delta}'' + \tilde{\zeta}''$ . Given that (142) has to be satisfied, it is a simple minimization problem with a constraint, the solution is  $\tilde{\delta}'' = c_3 \tilde{\zeta}''$  for some positive constant  $c_3$  and this implies that we have to satisfy, for some  $c_4 > 0$ ,

$$\tilde{\zeta}'' > c_4 (\gamma^{1/2} \log \gamma^{-1/2})^{(5+q)^{-1}} \quad (143)$$

We choose  $\tilde{\zeta}'' = \gamma^{d''}$  with  $d'' < (2(5+q))^{-1}$ . In which case (141) is satisfied with  $R'' = c_1 \gamma^{-(5+q)d''} / c_3^2$

Now, in order that the first exponential in (140) goes to zero, we need at least for suitable  $c_5, c_6 > 0$ ,

$$\delta'' (\zeta'')^3 > c_5 \gamma^{(1/2-(5+q)d'')} \log \gamma^{-1/2} + c_6 \gamma^{d''} . \quad (144)$$

Taking  $d'' < 1/2 - (5+q)d''$  that is  $d'' < (2(6+q))^{-1}$  the condition we get is just

$$\delta'' (\zeta'')^3 > (c_5 + c_6) \gamma^{d''} \quad (145)$$

Clearly the Theorem 2.4 follows with any  $c > c_5 + c_6$ .  $\square$

*Proof of the Theorem 2.5.*

It is sufficient to prove that

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \mu_{\beta, \gamma} (\mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c) = 0 . \quad (146)$$

Using the formula (97), for some  $c > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{\beta,\gamma}(\mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c) \\
& \leq R^2 \ell^*(\zeta)^2 \\
& \quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} \left[ \inf_{\mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c \cap \mathcal{M}_R} \mathcal{F}(m^{(\delta^*)}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. \left. - c(L+R)(\delta^* + \gamma(\delta^*)^{-1} \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1})) - c(\zeta + \delta) \right] \right] \\
& \quad + \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} [cR(c'\zeta^{3+q}\delta^2 - (\delta^* + \gamma(\delta^*)^{-1} \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1}))) - 2C] \right]. \quad (147)
\end{aligned}$$

The next step is to estimate the previous infimum. Note that  $\mathcal{F}(m^{(\delta^*)}) \geq \mathcal{F}_{[-L,+L]}(m^{(\delta^*)})$ , moreover

$$\mathcal{F}_{[-L,+L]}(m^{(\delta^*)}) \geq U_L(m^{(\delta^*)}) \quad (148)$$

where

$$U_L(m) \equiv \frac{1}{4} \int_{-L}^L dx \int_{-L}^L dy J(x-y) |m(x) - m(y)|^2. \quad (149)$$

Therefore

$$\inf_{m \in \mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c \cap \mathcal{M}_R} \mathcal{F}(m^{(\delta^*)}) \geq \inf_{m \in \mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c} U_L(m^{(\delta^*)}) \quad (150)$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c & \subset \{m \in \mathcal{M} : \exists x \in [-L, +L], |m^{(\rho)}(x) - m^{(\rho)}(x + \rho)| > \frac{\Theta\rho}{2L}\} \\
& \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c. \quad (151)
\end{aligned}$$

For any  $x \in [-L, +L]$  let  $n = n(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$  be such that  $n\rho \leq x < (n+1)\rho$ ,

$$\mathcal{U}_x \equiv \{u \in \mathbb{Z} : n \leq u\delta^* < (n+1)\delta^*\} \quad (152)$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_x \equiv \mathcal{U}_{x+\rho/\delta^*}. \quad (153)$$

By triangular inequality,

$$|m^{(\rho)}(x) - m^{(\rho)}(x + \rho)| \leq \left(\frac{\delta^*}{\rho}\right)^2 \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{U}_x \\ v \in \mathcal{V}_x}} |m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*) - m^{(\delta^*)}(v\delta^*)| \quad (154)$$

and, by similar arguments as in (100), if we denote by

$$B_x(m) \equiv \left\{ (u, v) \in \mathcal{U}_x \times \mathcal{V}_x : |m^{(\delta^*)}(u\delta^*) - m^{(\delta^*)}(v\delta^*)| > \frac{\Theta\rho}{4L} \right\} \quad (155)$$

then, for any  $m \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c$ , we have

$$|B_x(m)| \geq \frac{\Theta\rho}{8L} \left( \frac{\rho}{\delta^*} \right)^2 \quad (156)$$

from which we get

$$\inf_{m \in \mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c} U_L(m^{(\delta^*)}) \geq (\delta^*)^2 \left( \frac{\Theta\rho}{4L} \right)^2 \frac{\Theta\rho}{8L} \left( \frac{\rho}{\delta^*} \right)^2 \equiv \frac{c(\Theta, \rho)}{L^3}. \quad (157)$$

We insert (157) in (147) and we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_{\beta, \gamma}(\mathcal{R}_L(\Theta, \rho)^c) \\ & \leq R^2 (l^*(\zeta))^2 \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} [c(\Theta, \rho)L^{-3} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - c(L+R)(\delta^* + \gamma\delta^{*-1} \log \delta^* \gamma^{-1}) - c(\zeta + \delta)] \right] \\ & \quad + \exp \left[ -\beta\gamma^{-1} [cR(c'\zeta^{3+q}\delta^2 - (\delta^* + \gamma(\delta^*)^{-1} \log(\delta^* \gamma^{-1}))) - 2C] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

It remains to choose the parameters  $R, \delta, \zeta, \delta^*$  in such a way that the right hand side of (158) goes to zero. Making similar arguments as after (141), one can check that the choice  $\delta = \zeta = \gamma^{(2(6+q))^{-1}}$ ,  $R = c_1 \gamma^{-(5+q)/2(6+q)}$ ,  $c_1$  a positive constant, and  $\delta^* \approx \gamma^{1/2} \log \gamma^{-1/2}$  implies that, if  $L \leq \gamma^{-\lambda}$  with  $\lambda < (6(6+q))^{-1}$  then the right hand side of (158) goes to zero, and this ends the proof of the Theorem 2.5.  $\square$

## 5 Estimates for the independent model

In this section we prove Theorem 2.2.



It is possible to compute an explicit expression for the density of  $\nu_N$ . By using the integral representation of the  $\delta$ -function on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\nu_N}{dm}(m) &= \int \prod_{i=1}^N \nu(d\sigma_i) \delta(m_N(\sigma) - m) \\ &= \left(\frac{N}{2\pi}\right)^q \int_{\mathbb{R}^q} d\lambda e^{-iN\lambda \cdot m} \left( \int \nu(dv) e^{i\lambda \cdot v} \right)^N. \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

We recall now the following integral representation of the Bessel functions, [45], p. 47. For any  $p \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\operatorname{Re}(p) > -1/2$ ,

$$\mathcal{J}_p(z) = \frac{(z/2)^p}{\Gamma(p+1/2)\Gamma(1/2)} \int_0^\pi d\theta e^{iz \cos \theta} \sin^{2p} \theta, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \quad (160)$$

From the spherical symmetry of the problem, by using polar coordinates and recalling that  $|S^{q-1}| = 2\pi^{q/2}/\Gamma(q/2)$ , it is not difficult to obtain

$$\frac{d\nu_N}{dm}(m) = \frac{N^q \Gamma(q/2)}{\pi^{q/2} (N|m|)^{q-1}} \int_0^\infty dt \left(\frac{tN|m|}{2}\right)^{q/2} \mathcal{J}_{q/2-1}(tN|m|) \left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{q/2-1}(t)}{(t/2)^{q/2-1}}\right)^N \quad (161)$$

We point out that  $P_N^q(N|m|) \equiv N^{-q}(d\nu_N/dm)(m)$  is the well known formula of the density of the probability distribution for the Pearson's walk, [45], p. 419. The integral in the r.h.s. of (161) is absolutely convergent for  $N \geq 2$  and identically 0 for  $|m| > 1$ . So the density is well defined for  $N \geq 2$  and identically 0 for  $|m| > 1$ .

Now we prove (18). Let  $r \in (0, 1)$  and denote by  $B_r$  the closed ball in  $\mathbb{R}^q$  of radius  $r$  and center in the origin. Fix  $m \in B_r$  and let  $h^* = h^*(m)$  be as in (14). Then

$$\frac{d\nu_N}{dm}(m) = N^q \exp[-NI(m)] \int \prod_{i=1}^N \nu_m(d\sigma_i) \delta\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i - Nm\right) \quad (162)$$

having introduced the measure

$$\nu_m(dv) \equiv \varphi(h^*)^{-1} e^{h^* \cdot v} \nu(dv) \quad (163)$$

Calling

$$\varphi_m(k) = e^{-ik \cdot m} \int \nu_m(dv) e^{ik \cdot v}, \quad k \in \mathbb{R}^q \quad (164)$$

and using again the integral representation of the  $\delta$ -function, we get

$$\frac{d\nu_N}{dm}(m) = \exp[-NI(m)] \left(\frac{N}{2\pi}\right)^q \int dk \varphi_m(k)^N \quad (165)$$

so that

$$\varepsilon(m, N) = \frac{1}{N} \log \left[ \left(\frac{N}{2\pi}\right)^q \int dk \varphi_m(k)^N \right]. \quad (166)$$

Next we will prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.1** *Fix  $r \in (0, 1)$  and let  $\varphi_m(k)$  be as in (164) with  $m \in B_r$ . Then  $k \mapsto \varphi_m(k)$  is a smooth complex function such that:*

- (i)  $|\varphi_m(k)| \leq \varphi_m(0) = 1$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{R}^q$ .
- (ii) In a neighbor of the origin we have the expansion

$$\varphi_m(k) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}Q_m(k) + \zeta_m(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}^q \quad (167)$$

where  $Q_m(\cdot)$  is a quadratic form, uniformly positive for  $m \in B_r$ , and  $\zeta_m(k)$  a smooth function satisfying  $|\zeta_m(k)| \leq c_1(r)|k|^3$  for some  $c_1(r) > 0$ .

- (iii) There are positive constants  $c_2(r)$  and  $\kappa(r)$  such that

$$|\varphi_m(k)| \leq \frac{c_2(r)}{|k|^{q/2}}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{R}^q : |k| \geq \kappa(r). \quad (168)$$

- (iv)  $|\varphi_m(k)|$  reaches its maximum value only for  $k = 0$  which is a strict maximum for this function.

We fix  $\delta \in (1/3, 1/2)$  and decompose

$$\int dk \varphi_m(k)^N = \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i(N, \delta)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
G_1(N, \delta) &= \int_{|k| \leq N^{-\delta}} dk \varphi_m(k)^N, \\
G_2(N, \delta) &= \int_{N^{-\delta} < |k| \leq N} dk \varphi_m(k)^N, \\
G_3(N, \delta) &= \int_{|k| > N} dk \varphi_m(k)^N.
\end{aligned} \tag{169}$$

We estimate the three terms separately. By changing variables and using Lemma 5.1, item (ii),

$$\begin{aligned}
G_1(N, \delta) &= \frac{1}{N^{q/2}} \int_{|k| \leq N^{1/2-\delta}} dk \varphi_m \left( \frac{k}{\sqrt{N}} \right)^N \\
&= \frac{1}{N^{q/2}} \int_{|k| \leq N^{1/2-\delta}} dk \exp \left[ N \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N} Q_m(k) + \zeta_m \left( \frac{k}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N^{q/2}} \int_{|k| \leq N^{1/2-\delta}} dk \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} Q_m(k) \right] \left( 1 + N \hat{\zeta}_m \left( \frac{k}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{N^{q/2}} \left( \frac{\pi}{\det Q_m} \right)^{q/2} [1 + O(N^{-(3\delta-1)})]
\end{aligned} \tag{170}$$

where  $\hat{\zeta}_m(k)$  is a smooth function with the same properties of  $\zeta_m(k)$  so that the rest  $O(N^{-(3\delta-1)})$  is uniformly bounded when  $m \in B_r$ . From items (ii), (iii) and (iv) of Lemma 5.1, there is  $C_1(r) > 0$  such that for any  $N$  large enough  $|\varphi_m(k)| \leq 1 - C_1(r)N^{-2\delta}$  when  $|k| \geq N^{-\delta}$ . Then

$$|G_2(N, \delta)| \leq N^q |S^{q-1}| \sup_{|k| > N^{-\delta}} |\varphi_m(k)|^N \leq N^q |S^{q-1}| \left( 1 - \frac{C_1(r)}{N^{2\delta}} \right)^N$$

so that, for some  $C_2(r) > 0$ ,

$$|G_2(N, \delta)| \leq \exp[-C_2(r)N^{1-2\delta}]. \tag{171}$$

Finally, by using item (iv) of Lemma 5.1,

$$|G_3(N, \delta)| \leq \int_{|k| > N} dk \left( \frac{c_2(r)}{|k|^{q/2}} \right)^N \leq N^q |S^{q-1}| \left( \frac{c_2(r)}{N^{q/2}} \right)^N. \tag{172}$$

From (166), (170), (171) and (172) the bound (18) for some  $c(r) > 0$  follows.

We are left with the proof of (19). Denoting by  $P$  the probability distribution of  $\sigma$ , we have

$$\nu_N(|m| > r) = P(A_r) \quad (173)$$

where  $A_r$  is the cylinder set defined by

$$A_r = \left\{ \sigma : \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j > r^2 N^2 \right\} \quad (174)$$

Consider now the sets

$$\Omega_{i,j}^{(r)} = \{ \sigma : \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j > r^2 + r - 1 \}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, N$$

and define the stochastic variable

$$\sigma \mapsto n(\sigma) \equiv \# \{ (i, j) : \sigma \in \Omega_{i,j}^{(r)} \} .$$

Clearly, for any  $\sigma$ ,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j \leq (N^2 - n(\sigma))(r^2 + r - 1) + n(\sigma) .$$

so that, for any  $r \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$A_r \subseteq \{ \sigma : n(\sigma) > f(r)N^2 \}, \quad f(r) = \frac{r^2 - (r^2 + r - 1)}{1 - (r^2 + r - 1)} = \frac{1}{2 + r} . \quad (175)$$

Since  $f([0, 1]) = [1/3, 1/2]$ , from (175) we conclude that, for any  $r \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$A_r \subseteq G_r, \quad G_r \equiv \{ \sigma : n(\sigma) > N^2/3 \} . \quad (176)$$

Then we need an estimate of the probability of  $G_r$ . For any subset  $I$  of  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  let

$$\Omega_I^{(r)} \equiv \left\{ \sigma : \text{there are } |I| \text{ indexes } j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus I \text{ such that } \sigma \in \Omega_{i,j}^{(r)} \right\} .$$

We claim that

$$G_r \subseteq \bigcup_{I:|I| \geq N/6} \Omega_I^{(r)} . \quad (177)$$

In fact, it is possible to extract at least  $N/6$  disjoint pairs  $(i, j)$  from a set of pairs whose cardinality is bigger than  $N^2/3$ . Now, since the  $\sigma_i$ 's are i.i.d., for any  $I$ ,

$$P\left(\Omega_I^{(r)}\right) = P\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{|I|} \Omega_{i, i+|I|}^{(r)}\right) = P\left(\Omega_{1,2}^{(r)}\right)^{|I|}. \quad (178)$$

On the other hand, by using polar coordinates,

$$P\left(\Omega_{1,2}^{(r)}\right) = \int \nu(d\sigma_1) \int \nu(d\sigma_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 > r^2 + r - 1\}} \leq \frac{\arccos(r^2 + r - 1)}{\pi}. \quad (179)$$

Collecting together (176), (177), (178), (179) and observing that

$$0 < \frac{\arccos(r^2 + r - 1)}{\pi} < \frac{\sqrt{6(1-r)}}{\pi}, \quad \text{for any } r \in (0, 1)$$

we finally get

$$P(A_r) \leq N \binom{N}{N/6} P\left(\Omega_{1,2}^{(r)}\right)^{N/6} \leq N \exp[N I_{\text{Ber}}(1/6)] \left(\frac{\sqrt{6(1-r)}}{\pi}\right)^{N/6} \quad (180)$$

where  $I_{\text{Ber}}(\cdot)$  is the Bernoulli entropy. Clearly (180) gives (19) for a suitable choice of  $b > 0$ . Theorem 2.2 is proved.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* Since  $\nu_m$  is compactly supported, the smoothness of  $\varphi_m(k)$  comes from direct inspection. Now we prove properties (i)–(iv).

(i) It holds trivially.

(ii) From the definition of  $h^*$ ,

$$\int \nu_m(dv) v = \varphi(h^*)^{-1} \int \nu(dv) e^{h^* \cdot v} v = (\nabla_h \log \varphi)(h^*) = m. \quad (181)$$

Then, by expanding  $\varphi_m$  in  $k = 0$ , we get (167) with

$$Q_m(k) = \int \nu_m(dv) [k \cdot (v - m)]^2, \quad \zeta_m(k) = \int \nu_m(dv) e^{in_{m,k}(v)} [k \cdot (v - m)]^3 \quad (182)$$

where  $\eta_{m,k}(v)$  is a suitable number in the interval  $[0 \wedge k \cdot (v - m), 0 \vee k \cdot (v - m)]$ . Recalling the definition (163) of  $\nu_m$  and (14) of  $h^*$  it is easy to check that  $Q_m(k)$  and  $\zeta_m(k)$  have the desired properties stated in the Lemma. We omit the details.

(iii) We analyze separately the cases  $q = 2$  and  $q = 3$ :

$q = 2$  : Calling  $\alpha$  the angle between the vectors  $k$  and  $m$  and using polar coordinates, we have, for any  $|k| > 0$ ,

$$\varphi_m(k) = \frac{e^{-i|k||m|\cos\alpha}}{2\pi\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{t^* \cos\theta + i|k|\cos(\theta-\alpha)} \quad (183)$$

where we used (12) and that  $|h^*| = t^*$ , see (14) and (15). Now we recall the following integral representation of Bessel functions of integer order  $n$ , [45], p. 19,

$$\mathcal{J}_n(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{iz \sin\theta - in\theta}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \quad (184)$$

which gives the Fourier expansion

$$e^{iz \sin\varphi} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{J}_n(z) e^{in\varphi}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R}$$

so that

$$\varphi_m(k) = \frac{e^{-i|k||m|\cos\alpha}}{\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{J}_n(|k|) e^{in(\pi/2-\alpha)} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{t^* \cos\theta + in\theta}. \quad (185)$$

Using again (184) we get

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{t^* \cos\theta + in(\theta+\pi/2)} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{t^* \sin\theta - in\theta} = \mathcal{J}_n(-it^*) \quad (186)$$

and so

$$|\varphi_m(k)| \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{J}_n(|k|)| |\mathcal{J}_n(-it^*)|. \quad (187)$$

In [45], p. 205–206, it is proven that, for any  $x$  and  $p$  positive,

$$\mathcal{J}_{\pm p}(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi x}} \left[ \cos \left( x \mp \frac{p\pi}{2} - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) Q_+(x, p) - \sin \left( x \mp \frac{p\pi}{2} - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) Q_-(x, p) \right] \quad (188)$$

where

$$Q_{\pm}(x, p) \equiv \frac{1}{2\Gamma(p+1/2)} \int_0^{\infty} du e^{-u} u^{p-1/2} \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{iu}{2x} \right)^{p-1/2} \pm \left( 1 - \frac{iu}{2x} \right)^{p-1/2} \right] \quad (189)$$

Now

$$|Q_{\pm}(x, 0)| \leq 1 \quad (190)$$

and, for any integer  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{\pm}(x, n)| &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(n+1/2)} \int_0^{\infty} du e^{-u} u^{n-1/2} \left[ \left( 1 + \left( \frac{u}{2x} \right)^2 \right)^{n/2-1/4} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(n+1/2)} \left[ 2^{n/2-1/4} \int_0^{2x} du e^{-u} u^{n-1/2} + \frac{2^{n/2-1/4}}{(2x)^{n-1/2}} \int_{2x}^{\infty} du e^{-u} u^{2n-1} \right] \\ &\leq 2^{n/2-1/4} \left[ 1 + \frac{\Gamma(2n)}{(2x)^{n-1/2}\Gamma(n+1/2)} \right] = 2^{n/2-1/4} \left[ 1 + \frac{2^{n-1/2}\Gamma(n)}{\sqrt{\pi}x^{n-1/2}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (191)$$

where in the last equality we used the ‘‘Legendre’s duplication formula’’

$$2^{2z-1}\Gamma(z)\Gamma(z+1/2) = \sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(2z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

In [45], p. 49, it is proven also that for any real order  $p > -1/2$ ,

$$|\mathcal{J}_p(z)| \leq \frac{(|z|/2)^p}{\Gamma(p+1)} \exp[\operatorname{Im}(z)], \quad z \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (192)$$

We use (188), (190), (191) to bound  $|\mathcal{J}_n(|k|)|$  and, since  $\mathcal{J}_{-n}(z) = (-1)^n \mathcal{J}_n(z)$  for any integer  $n$ , we can use (192) to bound  $|\mathcal{J}_n(-it^*)|$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . From (187) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_m(k)| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi|k|}} \left[ 1 + \frac{4e^{-t^*}}{\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \frac{t^*}{2} \right)^n \frac{2^{n/2-1/4}}{\Gamma(n+1)} \left( 1 + \frac{2^{n-1/2}\Gamma(n)}{\sqrt{\pi}|k|^{n-1/2}} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi|k|}} \left[ 1 + \frac{4}{\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}e^{-t^*}}{\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{(\sqrt{2}t^*)^n}{\sqrt{\pi}|k|^{n-1/2}} \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi|k|}} \left( 1 + \frac{4}{\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} \right) + \frac{4e^{-t^*}}{\pi\mathcal{J}_0(it^*)} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{2}t^*}{|k|} \right)^n. \end{aligned} \quad (193)$$

Since  $t^*$  is an increasing function of  $|m|$ , by choosing  $\kappa(r) > \sqrt{2}t^*(r)$ , from (193) we get (168) for  $q = 2$  with  $c_2(r)$  a suitable function of  $t^*(r)$ .

( $q = 3$ ) : As before, calling  $\alpha$  the angle between the vectors  $k$  and  $m$ , by introducing polar coordinates and recalling (12), we have, for any  $|k| > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_m(k) &= \frac{t^* e^{-i|k||m| \cos \alpha}}{4\pi \sinh(t^*)} \int_0^\pi d\theta \int_0^{2\pi} d\psi e^{t^* \cos \theta + i|k| \cos \alpha \cos \theta} e^{i|k| \sin \alpha \sin \theta \cos \psi} \sin \theta \\ &= \frac{t^* e^{-i|k||m| \cos \alpha}}{2 \sinh(t^*)} \int_0^\pi d\theta e^{t^* \cos \theta + i|k| \cos \alpha \cos \theta} \mathcal{J}_0(|k| \sin \alpha \sin \theta) \sin \theta. \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

By Fourier-Legendre expansion of  $\exp[t^* \cos \theta]$ , (194) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_m(k) &= \frac{t^* e^{-i|k||m| \cos \alpha}}{2 \sinh(t^*)} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{n \geq 0} c_n(t^*) \int_0^\pi d\theta e^{i|k| \cos \alpha \cos \theta} \mathcal{J}_0(|k| \sin \alpha \sin \theta) P_n(\cos \theta) \sin \theta \end{aligned} \quad (195)$$

where  $P_n(x)$ ,  $x \in [-1, 1]$ , is the Legendre polynomial of order  $n$  and

$$c_n(t^*) = \frac{2n+1}{2} \int_0^\pi d\theta e^{t^* \cos \theta} P_n(\cos \theta) \sin \theta. \quad (196)$$

By applying the Gegenbauer's formulæ, [45], p. 50, 379,

$$\int_0^\pi d\theta e^{iz \cos \theta} P_n(\cos \theta) \sin \theta = i^n \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{z}} \mathcal{J}_{n+1/2}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\pi d\theta e^{iz \cos \alpha \cos \theta} \mathcal{J}_0(z \sin \alpha \sin \theta) \sin \theta P_n(\cos \theta) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{z}} i^n \mathcal{J}_{n+1/2}(z) P_n(\cos \alpha), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \end{aligned}$$

to (196) and (195) respectively, we finally obtain the estimate

$$|\varphi_m(k)| \leq \frac{\pi}{\sinh(t^*)} \sqrt{\frac{t^*}{|k|}} \sum_{n \geq 0} (2n+1) |\mathcal{J}_{n+1/2}(-it^*)| |\mathcal{J}_{n+1/2}(|k|)|$$



where we used also that  $|P_n(x)| \leq 1$  for any  $x \in [-1, 1]$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Now we proceed analogously to the case  $q = 2$ . We use (192) to bound  $|\mathcal{J}_{n+1/2}(-it^*)|$  and the integral representation (188) to get a bound for  $|\mathcal{J}_{n+1/2}(|k|)|$  with the gain of a factor  $|k|^{-1/2}$  (observe that, by reasoning as in (191), for any  $n \geq 0$  and  $x > 0$ ,  $|Q_{\pm}(x, n + 1/2)| \leq 2^{n/2}[1 + \Gamma(2n + 1)/((2x)^n \Gamma(n + 1))]$ ). We omit the details.

(iv) From (i) and (ii),  $k = 0$  is a strict absolute maximum. From (183) and (194) when  $q = 2$  and  $q = 3$  respectively,  $|\varphi_m(k)| = |\Phi_{\alpha}(|k|)|$  where, for any  $\alpha \in [0, \pi]$ ,  $\Phi_{\alpha}(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , is the characteristic function of a suitable real random variable  $\xi_{\alpha}$ . By standard results on characteristic functions ([22], p. 501, Lemma 4) if for some  $\alpha$  there is  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $|\Phi_{\alpha}(\lambda)| = 1$ , then  $|\Phi_{\alpha}(t)|$  is a periodic function of period  $\lambda$ . But this implies

$$\limsup_{|k| \rightarrow +\infty} |\varphi_m(|k|)| = 1$$

which contradicts property (iii).  $\square$

## References

- [1] G. Alberti, G. Bellettini, M. Cassandro, and E. Presutti, *Surface tension in Ising system with Kac potentials*. J. Stat. Phys. **82**, no. 3–4, 743–796 (1996).
- [2] O. Benois, T. Bodineau, P. Buttà, and E. Presutti, *On the validity of the van der Waals theory of surface tension*. to appear in Markov Proc. Rel. Fields.
- [3] T. Bodineau, *Interface in a one-dimensional Ising spin system*. Stoch. Proc. Appl. **61**, 1–23 (1996).
- [4] T. Bodineau, *Interface for one-dimensional random Kac model*. to appear Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré.
- [5] T. Bodineau and E. Presutti, *Phase diagram of Ising systems with additional long range forces*. to appear in Commun. Math. Phys. (1997).

- 
- [6] C.A. Bonato, J.F. Perez, and A. Klein, *The Mermin-Wagner phenomenon and cluster properties of one and two-dimensional models*. J. Stat. Phys. **29**, 159–175 (1982).
- [7] A. Bovier and M. Zahradnik, *The low temperature phase of Kac-Ising models*. to appear in J. Stat. Phys. **87** (1997).
- [8] A. Bovier, V. Gayrard, and P. Picco, *Large deviation principles for the Hopfield model and the Kac-Hopfield model*. Prob. Theor. Rel. Fields **101**, 511–546 (1995).
- [9] A. Bovier, V. Gayrard, and P. Picco, *Distribution of profiles for the Kac-Hopfield model*. to appear in Commun. Math. Phys. (1997).
- [10] J. Bricmont, J. Fontaine, and J. Landau, *On the uniqueness of the equilibrium state for plane rotator*. Commun. Math. Phys. **56**, 281–286 (1977).
- [11] P. Buttà, I. Merola, and E. Presutti, *On the validity of the van der Waals theory in Ising systems with long range interactions*. Markov Proc. Rel. Fields, to appear **3**, (1997).
- [12] M. Cassandro, R. Marra, and E. Presutti, *Corrections to the critical temperature in 2d Ising systems with Kac potentials*. J. Stat. Phys. **78**, 1131–1138 (1995).
- [13] M. Cassandro, E. Orlandi, and E. Presutti, *Interfaces and typical Gibbs configurations for one-dimensional Kac potentials*. Prob. Theor. Rel. Fields **96**, 57–96 (1993).
- [14] M. Cassandro and E. Presutti, *Phase transitions in Ising systems with long but finite range*. Markov Proc. Rel. Fields **2**, 241–262 (1996).
- [15] A. De Masi, E. Orlandi, E. Presutti, and L. Triolo, *Motion by curvature by scaling non local evolution equations*. J. Stat. Phys. **73**, 543–570 (1993).
- [16] A. De Masi, E. Orlandi, E. Presutti, and L. Triolo, *Glauber evolution with Kac potentials. I. Mesoscopic and macroscopic limits, interface dynamics*. Nonlinearity **7**, 1–67 (1994).

- 
- [17] A. De Masi, E. Orlandi, E. Presutti, and L. Triolo, *Stability of the interface in a model of phase separation*. Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh **124A**, 1013–102 (1994).
- [18] A. De Masi, E. Orlandi, E. Presutti, and L. Triolo, *Uniqueness and global stability of the instanton in non local evolution equations*. Rendiconti di Matematica **14**, 693–723 (1994).
- [19] A. De Masi, E. Orlandi, E. Presutti, and L. Triolo, *Glauber evolution with Kac potentials. II. Fluctuation*. Nonlinearity **9**, 27–51 (1996).
- [20] A. De Masi, E. Orlandi, E. Presutti, and L. Triolo, *Glauber evolution with Kac potentials. III. Spinodal decomposition*. Nonlinearity **9**, 53–114 (1996).
- [21] R.L. Dobrushin and S. Shlosman, *Absence of breakdown of continuous symmetry in two-dimensional models of statistical physics*. Commun. Math. Phys. **42**, 31–40 (1975).
- [22] W. Feller, *An introduction to probability theory and its applications*. vol II, Wiley, New York London, (1963).
- [23] J. Fröhlich and C.E. Pfister, *On the absence of spontaneous symmetry breaking and crystalline ordering in two dimensional systems*. Commun. Math. Phys. **81**, 277–298 (1981).
- [24] J. Fröhlich and C.E. Pfister, *Spin waves, vortices, and the structure of equilibrium states in the classical XY model*. Commun. Math. Phys. **89**, 303–327 (1983).
- [25] J. Fröhlich, B. Simon, and T. Spencer, *Infrared bound, phase transitions and continuous symmetry breaking*. Commun. Math. Phys. **50**, 79–85 (1976).
- [26] J. Fröhlich and T. Spencer, *The Kosterlitz-Thouless transition in two dimensional abelian spin systems and the Coulomb gas*. Commun. Math. Phys. **81**, 527–607 (1981).

- 
- [27] H.O. Georgii, *Gibbs measures and phase transitions*. (De Gruyter studies in mathematics 9), Berlin New York: Walter de Gruyter, (1988).
- [28] P.C. Hemmer and J.L. Lebowitz, *Systems with weak long-range potentials*. in “Phase transition and critical phenomena” vol **5 b** Domb and Green ed. (1976).
- [29] K.R. Ito, *Clustering in low-dimensional  $SO(n)$ -invariant statistical models with long range interactions*. J. Stat. Phys. **29**, 747–760 (1982).
- [30] M. Kac, G. Uhlenbeck, and P.C. Hemmer, *On the van der Waals theory of vapour-liquid equilibrium. I. Discussion of a one-dimensional model*. J. Math. Phys. **4**, 216–228 (1963).
- [31] M. Kac, G. Uhlenbeck, and P.C. Hemmer, *On the van der Waals theory of vapour-liquid equilibrium. II. Discussion of the distribution functions*. J. Math. Phys. **4**, 229–247 (1963).
- [32] M. Kac, G. Uhlenbeck, and P.C. Hemmer, *On the van der Waals theory of vapour-liquid equilibrium. III. Discussion of the critical region*. J. Math. Phys. **5**, 60–74 (1964).
- [33] J.M. Kosterlitz and D.V. Thouless, *Ordering metastability and phase transitions in two-dimensional systems*. J. Phys. C **6**, 1181–1203 (1973).
- [34] J. Lebowitz and O. Penrose, *Rigorous treatment of the Van der Waals Maxwell theory of the liquid vapour transition*. J. Math. Phys. **7**, 98–113 (1966).
- [35] O.A. McBryan and T. Spencer, *On the decay of correlations in  $SO(n)$ -symmetric ferromagnets*. Commun. Math. Phys. **53**, 299–302 (1977).
- [36] A. Messager, S. Miracle, and C.E. Pfister, *Correlation inequalities and uniqueness of equilibrium state for the planar rotator ferromagnetic model*. Commun. Math. Phys. **58**, 19–29 (1978).

- 
- [37] A. Messenger, S. Miracle, and J. Ruiz, *Upper bounds on the decay of correlations in  $SO(n)$ -symmetric spin systems with long range interactions*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Phys. Theo. **40**, 85–96 (1984).
- [38] P. Picco, *On the absence of breakdown of symmetry for the plane rotator model with long range random interactions*. J. Stat. Phys. **32**, 627 (1983).
- [39] P. Picco, *Upper bound on the decay of correlations in the plane rotator model with long range random interactions*. J. Stat. Phys. **36**, 489–516 (1984).
- [40] C.E. Pfister, *On the symmetry of Gibbs states in two dimensional lattice systems*. Commun. Math. Phys. **79**, 181–188 (1981)
- [41] D. Ruelle, *Superstable interactions in classical statistical mechanics*. Commun. Math. Phys. **18**, 127 (1970).
- [42] D. Ruelle, *Probability estimates for continuous spin systems*. Commun. Math. Phys. **50**, 189–194 (1976).
- [43] S.B. Shlosman, *Decrease of correlations in two-dimensional models with continuous symmetry group*. Theor. Math. Phys. **37**, 1118–1120 (1978).
- [44] C.J. Thompson and M. Silver, *The classical limit of  $n$ -vector spin models*. Commun. Math. Phys. **33**, 53–60 (1973).
- [45] G.N. Watson, *Theory of Bessel functions*. Cambridge U.P., London, (1944).



---

Unit de recherche INRIA Lorraine, Technopole de Nancy-Brabois, Campus scientifique,  
615 rue du Jardin Botanique, BP 101, 54600 VILLERS LS NANCY  
Unit de recherche INRIA Rennes, Irisa, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu, 35042 RENNES Cedex  
Unit de recherche INRIA Rhne-Alpes, 655, avenue de l'Europe, 38330 MONTBONNOT ST MARTIN  
Unit de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt, Domaine de Voluceau, Rocquencourt, BP 105, 78153 LE CHESNAY Cedex  
Unit de recherche INRIA Sophia-Antipolis, 2004 route des Lucioles, BP 93, 06902 SOPHIA-ANTIPOLIS Cedex

---

diteur  
INRIA, Domaine de Voluceau, Rocquencourt, BP 105, 78153 LE CHESNAY Cedex (France)  
<http://www.inria.fr>  
ISSN 0249-6399