An Optimal Variance Estimate in Stochastic Homogenization of Discrete Elliptic Equations

Antoine Gloria, Felix Otto

no. 448

Diese Arbeit ist mit Unterstützung des von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft getragenen Sonderforschungsbereichs 611 an der Universität Bonn entstanden und als Manuskript vervielfältigt worden.

Bonn, Juni 2009

AN OPTIMAL VARIANCE ESTIMATE IN STOCHASTIC HOMOGENIZATION OF DISCRETE ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

ANTOINE GLORIA & FELIX OTTO

Abstract. We consider a discrete elliptic equation on the d-dimensional lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with random coefficients A of the simplest type: They are identically distributed and independent from edge to edge. On scales large w. r. t. the lattice spacing (i. e. unity), the solution operator is known to behave like the solution operator of a (continuous) elliptic equation with constant deterministic coefficients. This symmetric "homogenized" matrix $A_{\rm hom} = a_{\rm hom}{\rm Id}$ is characterized by $\xi \cdot A_{\rm hom}\xi = \langle(\xi + \nabla\phi) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi)\rangle$ for any direction $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where the random field ϕ (the "corrector") is the unique stationary solution of $-\nabla^* \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi) \;=\; 0$ normalized by $\langle\phi\rangle = 0$, and $\langle\cdot\rangle$ denotes the ensemble average.

It is known ("by ergodicity") that the above ensemble average of the energy density $\mathcal{E} = (\xi + \nabla\phi) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi)$, which is a stationary random field, can be recovered by a system average. We quantify this by proving that the variance of a spatial average of $\mathcal{E}$ on length scales L satisfies the optimal estimate, i. e. ${\rm var}\,[\sum \mathcal{E}\eta_L] \;\lesssim\; L^{-d}$, where the averaging function (i. e. $\sum\eta_L = 1$, ${\rm supp}\,(\eta_L) \subset \{|x| \le L\}$) has to be smooth in the sense that $|\nabla\eta_L| \lesssim L^{-1-d}$. In two space dimensions (i. e. $d = 2$), there is a logarithmic correction. This estimate is optimal since it shows that smooth averages of the energy density $\mathcal{E}$ decay in L as if $\mathcal{E}$ would be independent from edge to edge (which it is not for $d > 1$).

This result is of practical significance, since it allows to estimate the dominant error when numerically computing $a_{\rm hom}$.

Keywords: stochastic homogenization, variance estimate, difference operator.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35B27, 39A70, 60H25, 60F99.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Motivation, informal statement and optimality of the result.** We study discrete elliptic equations. More precisely, we consider real functions u of the sites x in a d-dimensional Cartesian lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Every edge e of the lattice is endowed with a "conductivity" $a(e) > 0$. This defines a discrete elliptic differential operator $-\nabla^* \cdot A\nabla$ via

$$-\nabla^* \cdot (A\nabla u)(x) \;:=\; \sum_y a(e)(u(x) - u(y)),$$

Date: May 3, 2009.

where the sum is over the $2d$ sites y which are connected by an edge $e=[x,y]$ to the site x. It is sometimes more convenient to think in terms of the associated Dirichlet form, i. e.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum \nabla v\cdot A\nabla u &:= \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} v(x)\,(-\nabla^*\cdot(A\nabla u)(x))\\ &= \sum_e (v(x)-v(y))a(e)(u(x)-u(y)),\end{aligned}$$

where the last sum is over all edges e and (x,y) denotes the two sites connected by e, i. e. $e=[x,y]$. We assume the conductivities a to be uniformly elliptic in the sense of

$$\alpha \ \le\ a(e)\ \le\ \beta \quad \text{for all edges } e$$

for some fixed constants $0<\alpha\le\beta<\infty$.

We are interested in random coefficients. To fix ideas, we consider the simplest situation possible:

$$\{a(e)\}_e \quad \text{are independently and identically distributed (i. i. d.).}$$

Hence the statistics are described by a distribution on the finite interval $[\alpha,\beta]$. We'd like to see this discrete elliptic operator with random coefficients as a good model problem for continuum elliptic operators with random coefficients of correlation length unity.

The first results in stochastic homogenization of linear elliptic equations in the continuous setting are due to Kozlov [10] and Papanicolaou & Varadhan [16], essentially using compensated compactness. The adaptation of these results to discrete elliptic equations in quite more general situations than the one considered above (that is under general ergodic assumptions) is due to Künnemann [12] following the approach by Papanicolaou & Varadhan for the continuous case, and also to Kozlov [11] (where more general discrete elliptic operators are considered). Note that the discrete elliptic operator $-\nabla^*\cdot A\nabla$ is the infinitesimal generator of a random walk in a random environment, whence the rephrasing of the homogenization result in [12] as the diffusion limit for reversible jump processes in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with random bond conductivities. With the same point of view, it is also worth mentioning the seminal paper by Kipnis & Varadhan [8] using central limit theorems for martingales.

The general homogenization result proved in these articles states that there exist *homogeneous and deterministic* coefficients $A_{\rm hom}$ such that the solution operator of the continuum differential operator $-\nabla\cdot A_{\rm hom}\nabla$ describes the large scale behavior of the solution operator of the discrete differential operator $-\nabla^*\cdot A\nabla$. As a by product of this homogenization result, one obtains a characterization of the homogenized coefficients $A_{\rm hom}$: It is shown that for every direction $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a unique stationary scalar field ϕ (stationarity means that the fields $\phi(\cdot)$ and $\phi(\cdot+z)$ have the same statistics for all shifts $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d$) such that

$$-\nabla^*\cdot(A(\xi+\nabla\phi)) \ =\ 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{1.1}$$

and normalized by $\langle\phi(0)\rangle=0$. As in periodic homogenization, the function $\mathbb{Z}^d\ni x\mapsto \xi\cdot x+\phi(x)$ can be seen as the A-harmonic function which macroscopically behaves as the affine function $\mathbb{Z}^d\ni x\mapsto\xi\cdot x$. With this "corrector" ϕ, the homogenized coefficients $A_{\rm hom}$ (which in general form a symmetric matrix and for our simple statistics in fact a multiple of the identity: $A_{\rm hom}=a_{\rm hom}\mathrm{Id}$) can be characterized as follows:

$$\xi\cdot A_{\rm hom}\xi \ =\ \langle(\xi+\nabla\phi)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi)\rangle. \tag{1.2}$$

Since the scalar field $(\xi + \nabla\phi) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi)$ is stationary, it does not matter (in terms of the distribution) at which site x it is evaluated in the formula (1.2), so that we suppress the argument x in our notation.

The representation (1.2) is of no immediate practical use, since the equation (1.1) has to be solved

- for *every realization* of the coefficients $\{a(e)\}_e$ and
- in the *whole space* $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

In order to overcome the first difficulty, it is natural to appeal to ergodicity (in the sense that ensemble averages are equal to system averages), which suggests to replace (1.2) by

$$\xi \cdot A_{\mathrm{hom}}\xi \;\rightsquigarrow\; \sum(\xi + \nabla\phi) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi)\eta_L, \tag{1.3}$$

where η_L is a suitable averaging function of length scale $L \gg 1$, that is,

$$\mathrm{supp}\,(\eta_L) \subset \{|x| \le L\}, \quad |\eta_L| \lesssim L^{-d}, \quad \sum \eta_L = 1. \tag{1.4}$$

In fact, on expects the energy density $(\xi + \nabla\phi) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi)$, which is a stationary random field, to display a decay of correlations over large distances, so that (1.3) seems a good approximation for $L \gg 1$.

However, one still has to solve (1.1) on the whole space $\mathbb{Z}^d$, albeit for a single realization of the coefficients. In order to overcome this second difficulty, we start with the following observation: Since ϕ on the ball $\{|x| \le L\}$ is expected to be little correlated to ϕ outside the ball $\{|x| \ge R\}$ for $R - L \gg 1$, it seems natural to replace ϕ in (1.3) by ϕ_R:

$$\sum(\xi + \nabla\phi) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi)\eta_L \;\rightsquigarrow\; \sum(\xi + \nabla\phi_R) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi_R)\eta_L, \tag{1.5}$$

where ϕ_R is the solution of an equation on a domain (say, a ball) of size R with homogeneous boundary conditions (say, Dirichlet):

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla^* \cdot (A(\xi + \nabla\phi_R)) &= 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \{|x| < R\}, \\ \phi_R &= 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \{|x| \ge R\}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

so that the r. h. s. of (1.5) is indeed computable.

However, ϕ_R defined by (1.6) is not statistically stationary, which is a handicap for the error analysis. It is therefore common in the analysis of the error from spatial cut-off to introduce an intermediate step which consists in replacing equation (1.1) by

$$T^{-1}\phi_T - \nabla^* \cdot (A(\xi + \nabla\phi_T)) \;=\; 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{1.7}$$

Clearly, the zero order term in (1.7) introduces a characteristic length scale $\sqrt{T}$ (the notation T that alludes to time is used because T^{-1} corresponds to the death rate in the random walker interpretation of the operator $T^{-1} - \nabla^* \cdot A\nabla$). In a second step, (1.7) is then replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} T^{-1}\phi_T - \nabla^* \cdot (A(\xi + \nabla\phi_{T,R})) &= 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \{|x| < R\}, \\ \phi_{T,R} &= 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \{|x| \ge R\}. \end{aligned}$$

The Green's function $G_T(x, y)$ of the operator $T^{-1} - \nabla^* \cdot A\nabla$ is known to decay faster than any power in $\frac{\sqrt{T}}{|x-y|} \ll 1$ uniformly in the realization of the coefficients. Therefore one expects that ϕ_T and $\phi_{T,R}$ agree on the ball $\{|x| \le L\}$ up to an error which is of *infinite* order in $\varepsilon = \frac{\sqrt{T}}{R-L}$ (ε is the inverse of the distance of the ball $\{|x| \le L\}$ to the Dirichlet boundary $\{|x|=R\}$ measured in units of $\sqrt{T}$, see for instance [2, Section 3] for related arguments). Hence we shall consider $\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L$ as a very good proxy to the practically computable $\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_{T,R})\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_{T,R})\eta_L$:

$$\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L \;\approx\; \sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_{T,R})\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_{T,R})\eta_L.$$

In view of this remark, we restrict our attention to the error we make when replacing

$$\xi\cdot A_{\mathrm{hom}}\xi \;\rightsquigarrow\; \sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L.$$

It is natural to measure this error in terms of the expected value of its square. This error splits into two parts, the first arising from the finiteness of the averaging length scale L and the other arising from the finiteness of the cut-off length scale $\sqrt{T}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle\left|\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L-\xi\cdot A_{\mathrm{hom}}\xi\right|^2\right\rangle\\
&\overset{(1.2)}{=}\quad \left\langle\left|\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L-\langle(\xi+\nabla\phi)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi)\rangle\right|^2\right\rangle\\
&=\quad \mathrm{var}\left[\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L\right] &(1.8)\\
&+\quad \left|\left\langle\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L\right\rangle-\langle(\xi+\nabla\phi)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi)\rangle\right|^2. &(1.9)
\end{aligned}$$

In view of the stationarity of $(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)$, of (1.4) and of (1.1), the second part (1.9) of the error can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left\langle\sum(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\eta_L\right\rangle-\langle(\xi+\nabla\phi)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi)\rangle\right|^2\\
&=\quad |\langle(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi_T)-(\xi+\nabla\phi)\cdot A(\xi+\nabla\phi)\rangle|^2\\
&=\quad \langle(\nabla\phi_T-\nabla\phi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T-\nabla\phi)\rangle^2. &(1.10)
\end{aligned}$$

What scaling can we expect for the two error terms (1.8) & (1.10)? A heuristic prediction can be easily inferred from the regime of small ellipticity contrast, i. e. $1-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\ll 1$ (and $\alpha=1$ w. l. o. g.). In this regime, to leading order, the two error terms (1.8) & (1.10) behave like

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum\left(\xi\cdot(A-\langle A\rangle)\xi+2\xi\cdot\nabla\bar\phi\right)\eta_L\right]\quad\text{and}\quad\langle|\nabla\bar\phi_T-\nabla\bar\phi|^2\rangle^2,$$

where $\bar\phi$ and $\bar\phi_T$ are defined via

$$\begin{aligned}
-\triangle\bar\phi &= \nabla^*\cdot((A-\langle A\rangle)\xi), &(1.11)\\
T^{-1}\bar\phi_T-\triangle\bar\phi_T &= \nabla^*\cdot((A-\langle A\rangle)\xi), &(1.12)
\end{aligned}$$

respectively. In the first error term, we have replaced $\bar\phi_T$ by $\bar\phi$ for simplicity of the exposition.

These error terms can be computed in a straightforward manner. Indeed, as shown in the Appendix, they scale for any direction $|\xi| = 1$ as:

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum \left(\xi \cdot (A - \langle A \rangle)\xi + 2\xi \cdot \nabla\bar{\phi}\right) \eta_L\right] \quad \sim \quad L^{-d} \tag{1.13}$$

$$\langle|\nabla\bar{\phi}_T - \nabla\bar{\phi}|^2\rangle^2 \quad \sim \quad \begin{cases} T^{-d} & \text{for} \quad d < 4, \\ T^{-4}\ln^2 T & \text{for} \quad d = 4, \\ T^{-4} & \text{for} \quad d > 4. \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

We now argue that the first error term (1.13) is the dominant one (in dimensions $d < 8$). In order to do so, we argue that the choice of $L \sim \sqrt{T}$ is natural (for which (1.13) dominates (1.14) in dimensions $d < 8$). Indeed, we recall that in the ball $\{|x| \le L\}$, ϕ_T is a proxy for the computable $\phi_{T,R}$ (defined on the larger ball $\{|x| \le R\}$). The error is of *infinite* order in the distance between the two balls, measured in the length scale $\sqrt{T}$, i. e. in $\varepsilon := \sqrt{T}/(R - L) \ll 1$. Hence for the sake of discussing rates we may indeed think of $L \sim \sqrt{T} \sim R$.

In this paper, we therefore focus on the error term (1.8) coming from the finite range L of the spatial average. In Theorem 1 (see also Remark 1), we shall establish that (1.13) holds as an estimate also for its nonlinear counterpart (1.8), that is,

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum(\xi + \nabla\phi_T) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi_T)\eta_L\right] \lesssim L^{-d}, \tag{1.15}$$

with two minor restrictions:

- In dimension $d = 2$, the prefactor depends logarithmically on T (whereas for $d \neq 2$, the prefactor depends only on the ellipticity constants).
- The spatial averaging function η_L has to be smooth in the sense that $|\nabla\eta_L| \lesssim L^{-d-1}$ in addition to (1.4).

The estimate for the lower order term (1.9) will be the object of a subsequent work.

1.2. **Discussion of the works of Yurinskii and of Naddaf & Spencer.** In this subsection, we comment on two papers on error estimates (in the sense of the previous subsection) which from our perspective are the essential ones. We also explain how our work relates to these two papers.

Still unsurpassed is the first quantitative paper, the inspiring 1986 work by Yurinskii [17]. He essentially deals with the error (1.9) arising from the spatial cut-off T. In our discrete setting of i. i. d. coefficients $a(e)$ and for dimension $d > 2$, his result translates into

$$\langle|\nabla\phi_T - \nabla\phi|^2\rangle \quad \lesssim \quad T^{\frac{2-d}{4+d}+\delta}, \tag{1.16}$$

for $T \gg 1$ and some arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$, see [17, Theorem 2.1] (and [5, Lemma A.5] for this rephrasing of Yurinskii's result).

Yurinskii derives estimate (1.16) by fairly elementary arguments from the following crucial *variance estimate* of the spatial averages $\sum \phi_T\eta_L$ of ϕ_T on length scales L:

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum \phi_T\eta_L\right] \lesssim T\left(\frac{T}{L^d}\right)^{1/2-\delta} \tag{1.17}$$

for $1 \ll T \ll L^d$ and some arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$, see [17, Lemma 2.4]. Let us comment a bit on the proof of (1.17): By stationarity of ϕ_T, the variance can be reformulated as a covariance, i. e.

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum \phi_T \eta_L\right] \;=\; \mathrm{cov}\left[\sum \phi_T \tilde{\eta}_L; \phi_T(0)\right],$$

with a modified averaging function $\tilde{\eta}_L$. The starting point for (1.17) is to control the covariance by:

i) An additive decomposition of $\phi_T(0)$ over all finite subsets S of the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, i. e. $\phi_T(0) = \sum_{S\subset\mathbb{Z}^d} \phi_{T,S}(0)$, where $\phi_{T,S}(0)$ only depends on $a_{|S}$, i. e. the coefficients a restricted to the subset S.

ii) An estimate on how sensitively $\sum \phi_T \tilde{\eta}_L$ depends on $a_{|S}$.

The decomposition in i) is based on the probability measure on path space $[0,\infty) \ni t \mapsto \eta(t) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ describing the random walk generated by the operator $-\nabla^* \cdot A\nabla$ (for a fixed realization of a). Indeed, this probability measure on path space allows for a well-known representation of $\phi_T(0)$ in terms of paths starting in 0 (via the expected value). Hence the splitting can be obtained from restricting the expected value to all paths η with image S (up to some exit time larger than T), see [17, Lemma 2.3].

The sensitivity estimate ii) comes in form of the deterministic energy-type estimate

$$|\sum \phi_T \tilde{\eta}_L - \sum \tilde{\phi}_T \tilde{\eta}_L|^2 \;\lesssim\; \frac{T}{L^d} \sum_{\text{edges } e \text{ s. t. } e\cap S\neq\emptyset} (1 + |\nabla\phi_T(e)|^2),$$

where $\tilde{\phi}_T$ is the solution of $T^{-1}\tilde{\phi}_T - \nabla^* \cdot \tilde{A}(\xi + \nabla\tilde{\phi}_T) = 0$ with coefficients $\tilde{A}$ which differ from A only on the subset S, see [17, (1.17)].

The third ingredient for (1.17) is an estimate of the probability that a path η starting in 0 crosses a given edge e. This probability can be estimated in terms of the *Green's function* $G_T(x,0)$ of the operator $T^{-1} - \nabla^* \cdot A\nabla$ (where x is one of the two sites on the edge e). Yurinskii then appeals to estimates on $G_T(x,y)$ that only depend on the ellipticity bounds $\alpha \le a \le \beta$ of A (and therefore do not depend on the realization of a) see [17, Lemma 2.1]. As is well-known, these type of estimates rely on the *Harnack inequality*.

Our variance estimate (1.15) also relies on these deterministic estimates of the Green's function $G_T(x,y)$, see Lemma 8. However, our strategy to estimate a variance differs substantially from Yurinskii's strategy of i) & ii). As a matter of fact, with our methods, we could derive the optimal variance estimate

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum \phi_T \eta_L\right] \;\lesssim\; L^{2-d} \tag{1.18}$$

for $L \gg 1$. Estimate (1.18) is optimal in the sense that we obtain the above scaling in the regime of "vanishing ellipticity ratio" $1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \ll 1$ by the arguments in the previous subsection. Still, the optimal estimate (1.18) would not yield the optimal estimate (1.14) by Yurinskii's argument to pass from (1.17) to (1.16).

Our strategy of estimating a variance is inspired by an unpublished paper by Naddaf & Spencer [15]. They use a *spectral gap* estimate to control the variance of some function X of the coefficients $\{a(e)\}_{\text{edges } e}$ (i. e. a random variable):

$$\mathrm{var}\,[X] \;\lesssim\; \left\langle \sum_{\text{edges } e} \left(\frac{\partial X}{\partial a(e)}\right)^2 \right\rangle, \tag{1.19}$$

see [15, p.4]. This type of estimate can be seen as a Poincaré estimate with mean value zero w. r. t. the infinite product measure that describes the distribution of the coefficients (and the optimal constant in this estimate is given by the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of the corresponding elliptic operator, whence "spectral gap"). Naddaf & Spencer derive (1.19) via the Brascamp-Lieb inequality for a large class of statistics for $\{a(e)\}_{\text{edges } e}$, which however does not include all i. i. d. statistics of $\{a(e)\}_{\text{edges } e}$ considered by us. We therefore rely on a slight modification of (1.19), see Lemma 3.

We also follow Naddaf & Spencer in the sense that we treat the variance of an *energy density*. However, they express their result not in terms of the energy density of ϕ_T but of a generic solution u with a *compactly supported, deterministic* r. h. s. f, i. e.

$$-\nabla^* \cdot A\nabla u \;=\; \nabla^* \cdot f. \tag{1.20}$$

Using (1.20), they obtain the formula $\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} \sum \nabla u \cdot A\nabla u = -|\nabla u(e)|^2$ so that an application of (1.19) yields the following estimate on the energy density $X = \sum \nabla u \cdot A\nabla u$:

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum \nabla u \cdot A\nabla u\right] \;\lesssim\; \left\langle \sum |\nabla u|^4 \right\rangle, \tag{1.21}$$

see [15, Proposition 1].

Naddaf and Spencer also remark that provided the ellipticity contrast $1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is small enough, *Meyer's estimate* holds which states that

$$\sum |\nabla u|^4 \;\lesssim\; \sum |f|^4, \tag{1.22}$$

with a constant that only depends on α, β. The combination of (1.21) & (1.22) yields the a priori estimate

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\sum \nabla u \cdot A\nabla u\right] \;\lesssim\; \sum |f|^4, \tag{1.23}$$

see [15, Theorem 1]. Since the l. h. s. of (1.23) scales as $(\text{volume})^2$, while the r. h. s. only scales as volume, this estimate reveals the optimal decay of fluctuations on the macroscopic level, very much like (1.15). — There is a somewhat theatrical convention in the homogenization literature to call the lattice spacing ε instead of 1 which highlights this scaling. Following Naddaf & Spencer, we use Meyer's estimate, albeit applied on the Green's function $G_T(x, y)$, see Lemma 9.

We will make use of the following notation:

- $d \geq 2$ is the dimension;
- $\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} dx$ denotes the sum over $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\int_D dx$ denotes the sum over $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $x \in D$, D open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$;
- $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the ensemble average, or equivalently the expectation in the underlying probability space;
- $\mathrm{var}[\cdot]$ is the variance associated with the ensemble average;
- $\lesssim$ and $\gtrsim$ stand for $\leq$ and $\geq$ up to a multiplicative constant which only depends on the dimension d and the constants α, β (see Definition 1 below) if not otherwise stated;
- when both $\lesssim$ and $\gtrsim$ hold, we simply write $\sim$;
- we use $\gg$ instead of $\gtrsim$ when the multiplicative constant is (much) larger than 1;
- $(\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_d)$ denotes the canonical basis of $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

2. Main results

2.1. General framework.

Definition 1. We say that $a : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}^+, (x, y) \mapsto a(x, y)$ is a conductivity function on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ if there exist $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < \infty$ such that

- $a(x, y) = 0$ if $|x - y| \neq 1$,
- $a(x, y) = a(y, x) \in [\alpha, \beta]$ if $|x - y| = 1$.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ the set of such conductivity functions.

Definition 2. The elliptic operator $L : L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \to L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d), u \mapsto Lu$ associated with a conductivity function $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ is defined for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ by

$$(Lu)(x) = -\nabla^* \cdot A(x)\nabla u(x) \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\nabla u(x) := \begin{bmatrix} u(x + \mathbf{e}_1) - u(x) \\ \vdots \\ u(x + \mathbf{e}_d) - u(x) \end{bmatrix}, \ \nabla^* u(x) := \begin{bmatrix} u(x) - u(x - \mathbf{e}_1) \\ \vdots \\ u(x) - u(x - \mathbf{e}_d) \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$A(x) := \mathrm{diag}\left[a(x, x + \mathbf{e}_1), \dots, a(x, x + \mathbf{e}_d)\right].$$

In particular, it holds that

$$(Lu)(x) = \sum_{y, |x-y|=1} a(x, y)(u(x) - u(y)).$$

If $a(x, y) = 1$ for $|x - y| = 1$, then the associated elliptic operator L is the discrete Laplace operator, and is denoted by $-\triangle$.

Definition 3 (discrete integration by parts)**.** Let $d \geq 2$, $h \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and $g \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then the discrete integration by parts reads

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h(x)\nabla^* \cdot g(x)\, dx \ = \ -\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla h(x) \cdot g(x)\, dx.$$

We now turn to the definition of the statistics of the conductivity function.

Definition 4. A conductivity function is said to be independent and identically distributed (i. i. d.) if the coefficients $a(x, y)$ for $|x - y| = 1$ are i. i. d. random variables.

Definition 5. We say that a random field $F : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is stationary if for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $F(\cdot + z, \cdot + z)$ has the same statistics as $F(\cdot, \cdot)$. In particular, if F is stationary, then

$$\langle F(x + z, y + z)\rangle = \langle F(x, y)\rangle$$

for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Lemma 1 (corrector)**.** [12, Theorem 3] *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be an i. i. d. conductivity function, then for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a unique stationary random function $\phi \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ which satisfies the corrector equation*

$$-\nabla^* \cdot A(x)\left(\nabla\phi(x) + \xi\right) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{2.2}$$

and such that $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$. In addition, $\left\langle |\nabla\phi|^2 \right\rangle \lesssim |\xi|^2$.

We also define an "approximation" of the corrector as follows:

Lemma 2 (approximate corrector)**.** [12, Proof of Theorem 3] *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be an i. i. d. conductivity function, then for all $T > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a unique stationary random function $\phi_T \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ which satisfies the "approximate" corrector equation*

$$T^{-1}\phi_T(x) - \nabla^* \cdot A(x)\,(\nabla\phi_T(x) + \xi) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{2.3}$$

and such that $\langle \phi_T \rangle = 0$. In addition, $T^{-1}\left\langle \phi_T^2 \right\rangle + \left\langle |\nabla\phi_T|^2 \right\rangle \lesssim |\xi|^2$.

Definition 6 (homogenized coefficients)**.** Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be an i. i. d. conductivity function and let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and ϕ be as in Lemma 1. We define the homogenized $d \times d$-matrix A_{hom} as

$$\xi \cdot A_{\mathrm{hom}}\xi \;=\; \langle(\xi + \nabla\phi) \cdot A(\xi + \nabla\phi)(0)\rangle\,. \tag{2.4}$$

Note that (2.4) fully characterizes A_{hom} since A_{hom} is a symmetric matrix (it is in particular of the form $a_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathrm{Id}$ for an i. i. d. conductivity function).

2.2. **Statement of the main result.** Our main result shows that the energy density $\mathcal{E} := T^{-1}\phi_T^2 + (\nabla\phi_T + \xi) \cdot A(\nabla\phi_T + \xi)$ of the approximate corrector ϕ_T, which is a stationary scalar field, decorrelates sufficiently rapidly so that smooth spatial averages (defined with help of η_L) fluctuate as they would if $\mathcal{E}$ would be independent from site to site (as is the case for the tensor field A of the coefficients). The strength of fluctuation is expressed in terms of the variance. In more than two space dimensions (i. e. $d > 2$), the estimate does *not* depend on the cut-off scale $\sqrt{T}$ and thus carries over to the energy density of the corrector ϕ. In two space dimensions, we are not able to rule out a weak (i. e. logarithmic) dependence on the cut-off scale $\sqrt{T}$:

Theorem 1. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be an i. i. d. conductivity function, and let ϕ and ϕ_T denote the corrector and approximate correctors associated with the conductivity function a and direction $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|\xi| = 1$. We then define for all $L > 0$ and $T \gg 1$ the symmetric matrix $A_{L,T}$ characterized by*

$$\xi \cdot A_{L,T}\xi := \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \big(T^{-1}\phi_T(x)^2 + (\nabla\phi_T(x) + \xi) \cdot A(x)(\nabla\phi_T(x) + \xi)\big)\eta_L(x)\,dx,$$

where $x \mapsto \eta_L(x)$ is an averaging function on $(-L, L)^d$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \eta_L(x)dx = 1$ and $|\nabla\eta_L|_{L^\infty} \lesssim L^{-d-1}$. Then, there exists an exponent $q > 0$ depending only on α, β such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \textit{for } d = 2: & \mathrm{var}\,[\xi \cdot A_{L,T}\xi] \lesssim L^{-2}(\ln T)^q, \\ \textit{for } d > 2: & \mathrm{var}\,[\xi \cdot A_{L,T}\xi] \lesssim L^{-d}. \end{array} \tag{2.5}$$

In particular, $\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\nabla\phi(x) + \xi) \cdot A(x)(\nabla\phi(x) + \xi)\eta_L(x)\,dx\right] \lesssim L^{-d}$ *for $d > 2$.*

Remark 1. While it is natural to include the zero-order term $T^{-1}\langle\phi_T^2\rangle$ into the definition of the energy density, it is not essential for our result. Here comes the argument: By a simplified version of the string of arguments which lead to Theorem 1 we can show that the variance of the zero-order term is estimated as

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \phi_T(x)^2\eta_L(x)dx\right] \lesssim \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (\ln T)^q & \text{for } d = 2, \\ L^{2-d} & \text{for } d > 2. \end{array}\right.$$

Hence this term is of lower order in the regime of interest $L \lesssim \sqrt{T}$.

The main ingredient to the proof of Theorem 1 is of independent interest. It states that all finite stochastic moments of the approximate corrector ϕ_T are bounded independently of T for $d > 2$ and grow at most logarithmically in T for $d = 2$.

Proposition 1. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be an i. i. d. conductivity function, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|\xi| = 1$ and let ϕ_T denote the approximate corrector associated with the conductivity function a, and ξ. Then there exists a continuous function $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^+$, there exists a constant C_q such that for all $T > 0$,*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{for } d = 2: & \langle |\phi_T(0)|^q \rangle \leq C_q (\ln T)^{\gamma(q)}, \\ \text{for } d > 2: & \langle |\phi_T(0)|^q \rangle \leq C_q. \end{array} \tag{2.6}$$

In addition, $\gamma(2n) = n(n+1)$ for all $n = 2^l$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough.

In $d = 1$, we expect $\langle |\phi_T(0)|^q \rangle \sim \sqrt{T}^{q/2}$, so that there is a transition between unboundedness and boundedness in T for some $d \in (1, 3)$. The linearization of the problem in the regime of vanishing ellipticity contrast, i. e. $1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \ll 1$, suggests that $d = 2$ is indeed the critical dimension for Proposition 1, i. e. the dimension where a logarithmic behavior is to be expected. However, there is no reason why $d = 2$ should be critical for Theorem 1. Indeed, in the case of $d = 1$, the statement of Theorem 1 holds without a logarithm.

Let us point out that Proposition 1 and Theorem 1 hold true for more general distributions, provided the variance estimate of Lemma 3 below holds. In particular, the law of $a(x, x + \mathbf{e}_i)$ may depend on the direction $\mathbf{e}_i$, which would give a general diagonal homogenized matrix (not necessarily a multiple of the identity matrix). More generally, $a(x, x')$ and $a(y, y')$ may also be slightly correlated. We do not pursue this direction in this article.

2.3. **Structure of the proof and statement of the auxiliary results.** Not surprisingly, in order to control the variance of some function X of the coefficients a (like the spatial average of the energy density of the approximate corrector ϕ_T), one needs to control the gradient of X w. r. t. a. As in [15], this is quantified by the following general variance estimate:

Lemma 3 (variance estimate)**.** *Let $a = \{a_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i. i. d. random variables with range $[\alpha, \beta]$. Let X be a Borel measurable function of $a \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ (i. e. measurable w. r. t. the smallest σ-algebra on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ for which all coordinate functions $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \ni a \mapsto a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are Borel measurable, cf.* [9, Definition 14.4]*). Then we have*

$$\mathrm{var}\,[X] \;\leq\; \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sup_{a_i} \left| \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i} \right|^2 \right\rangle \mathrm{var}\,[a_1]\,, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\sup_{a_i} \left|\frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i}\right|$ denotes the supremum of the modulus of the i-th partial derivative

$$\frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i}(a_1, \cdots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \cdots)$$

of X with respect to the variable $a_i \in [\alpha, \beta]$.

Remark 2. Let us comment a bit on Lemma 3. Estimate (2.7) is a weakened version of a spectral gap estimate

$$\mathrm{var}\,[X] \;\lesssim\; \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i} \right|^2 \right\rangle, \tag{2.8}$$

which already played a central role in Naddaf & Spencer's analysis of stochastic homogenization [15, Section 2]. We note that for i. i. d. random variables, such a spectral gap estimate (2.8) follows "by tensorization" from the one-dimensional spectral gap estimate

$$\langle X(a_1)^2\rangle - \langle X(a_1)\rangle^2 \;\lesssim\; \left\langle \left|\frac{\partial X}{\partial a_1}\right|^2 \right\rangle, \tag{2.9}$$

see for instance [13, Lemma 1.1]. The one-dimensional spectral gap estimate (2.9) holds under mild assumptions on the distribution of a_1. Yet, (2.9) does not hold for atomic measures like $\langle X(a_1)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(X(1) + X(2))$. Since Lemma 3 covers the case of atomic measures, we only obtain the weaker form (2.7) of (2.8). Despite this technical detail, the proof of Lemma 3 is very similar to the one in [13, Lemma 1.1].

As in [15], in the proof of Theorem 1, we will make use of the fact that $T^{-1}\phi_T^2 + (\nabla\phi_T + \xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)$ is an energy density, which yields the following elementary formula for the partial derivative w. r. t. the value $a(e)$ of the coefficient in the edge $e = [z, z+\mathbf{e}_i]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\int (T^{-1}\phi_T^2 + (\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))(x)\eta_L(x)dx \\
&= \;\; -2\int\left(\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\nabla\eta_L\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right)(x)dx + (\eta_L(\nabla_i\phi_T+\xi_i))^2(z),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

up to minor modifications coming from the discrete Leibniz rule, see Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 1.

This formula makes the gradient of the averaging function η_L appear; in order to benefit from this, we assume that the averaging function is smooth so that we get an extra power of L^{-1}. The merit of (2.10) is that we need to control the partial derivative $\frac{\partial\phi_T(x)}{\partial a(e)}$ of the approximate corrector $\phi_T(x)$ (and not of its spatial derivatives). Not surprisingly, this partial derivative involves the Green's function $G_T(x,\cdot)$. More precisely, it involves the gradient $\nabla_{z_i}G_T(x,z)$ of the Green's function with singularity in z (and not its second gradient $\nabla_{z_i}\nabla_x G_T(x,z)$, for which we would *not* have the optimal decay rate uniformly in a). We define discrete Green's functions as follows:

Definition 7 (discrete Green's function)**.** Let $d \geq 2$. For all $T > 0$, the Green's function $G_T : \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}\times\mathbb{Z}^d\times\mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{Z}^d, (a,x,y) \mapsto G_T(x,y;a)$ associated with the conductivity function a is defined for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ as the unique solution in $L^2_x(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ to

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} T^{-1}G_T(x,y;a)v(x)\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla v(x)\cdot A(x)\nabla_x G_T(x,y;a)\,dx = v(y), \qquad \forall v\in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d), \tag{2.11}$$

where A is as in (2.1).

Throughout this paper, when no confusion occurs, we use the short-hand notation $G_T(x,y)$ for $G_T(x,y;a)$.

The following lemma provides the elementary formula relating the "susceptibility" $\frac{\partial\phi_T(x)}{\partial a(e)}$ of $\phi_T(x)$ to the Green's function $G_T(x,y)$:

Lemma 4. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be an i. i. d. conductivity function, and let G_T and ϕ_T be the associated Green's function and approximate corrector for $T > 0$ and $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $|\xi| = 1$.*

Then, for all $e=[z,z+\mathbf{e}_i]$ *and* $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\frac{\partial \phi_T(x;a)}{\partial a(e)} = -(\nabla_i\phi_T(z;a)+\xi_i)\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x;a), \tag{2.12}$$

and for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{a(e)}\left|\frac{\partial \phi_T(x;a)^{n+1}}{\partial a(e)}\right| \lesssim |\phi_T(x;a)|^n(|\nabla_i\phi_T(z;a)|+1)|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x;a)| \\ +(|\nabla_i\phi_T(z;a)|+1)^{n+1}|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x;a)|^{n+1}. \tag{2.13}$$

In addition, it holds that

$$\sup_{a(e)}|\nabla_i\phi_T(z;a)| \lesssim |\nabla_i\phi_T(z;a)|+1. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that the multiplicative constant in (2.13) depends on n *next to* α, β, *and* d.

In addition, Lemma 4 provides uniform estimates on $\frac{\partial\phi_T(x)^n}{\partial a(e)}$ in $a(e)$ (the case $n>1$ is needed in Proposition 1). In order to obtain this uniform control in $a(e)$, we need to control $\nabla_z G(z,x;a)$ uniformly in $a(e)$. Again, this comes from considering $\frac{\partial\nabla_z G(z,x;a)}{\partial a(e)}$. The following lemma provides the elementary formula for $\frac{\partial\nabla_z G(z,x;a)}{\partial a(e)}$ and a uniform estimate in $a(e)$.

Lemma 5. *Let* $G_T:\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}\times\mathbb{Z}^d\times\mathbb{Z}^d\to\mathbb{R},(a,x,y)\mapsto G_T(x,y;a)$ *be the Green's function associated with the conductivity function* a *for* $T>0$. *For all* $e=[z,z+\mathbf{e}_i]$ *and for all* $x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, *it holds that*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}G_T(x,y;a) = -\nabla_{z_i}G_T(x,z;a)\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,y;a). \tag{2.15}$$

As a by-product we also have: For all $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\sup_{a(e)}|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x;a)| \lesssim |\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x;a)|. \tag{2.16}$$

There is a technical difficulty arising from the fact that a has infinitely many components. In Lemma 3 this technical difficulty is handled by the strong measurability assumptions on X. The following lemma establishes these measurability properties for ϕ_T, so that we can apply Lemma 3.

Lemma 6. *Let* $a\in\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ *be an i. i. d. conductivity function, and let* $G_T(\cdot,\cdot;a)$ *and* $\phi_T(\cdot;a)$ *be the associated Green's function and approximate corrector for* $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $d\geq 2$, *and* $T>0$. *Then for fixed* $x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, $G_T(x,y,\cdot)$ *and* $\phi_T(x;\cdot)$ *are continuous w. r. t. the product topology of* $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ *(i. e. the smallest/coarsest topology on* $\mathbb{R}^E$, *where* E *denotes the set of edges, such that the coordinate functions* $\mathbb{R}^E\ni a\mapsto a_e\in\mathbb{R}$ *are continuous for all edges* $e\in E$*).*
In particular, $G_T(x,y;\cdot)$ *and* $\phi_T(x;\cdot)$ *are Borel measurable functions of* $a\in\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$, *so that one may apply Lemma 3 to* $\phi_T(x;\cdot)$ *and nonlinear funtions thereof.*

The proof of Theorem 1 crucially relies on the fact that ϕ_T is almost bounded independently of T (in $d>2$). More precisely, it relies on the fact that any moment $\langle\phi_T(0)^n\rangle$ is bounded independently of T as stated in Proposition 1. Starting point for Proposition 1 is again Lemma 3, which is iteratively applied to $\phi_T(0)^m$ where m increases dyadically.

This is how Lemma 4 comes in again. However, the crucial gain in stochastic integrability is provided by the following lemma. It can be interpreted as a Cacciopoli estimate in probability and relies on the stationarity of ϕ_T.

Lemma 7. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be an i. i. d. conductivity function, and let ϕ_T be the approximate corrector associated with the coefficients a for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|\xi| = 1$. Then for $d \geq 2$ and for all $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$,*

$$\left\langle |\phi_T|^n (|\nabla \phi_T|^2 + |\nabla^* \phi_T|^2)(0) \right\rangle \lesssim \langle |\phi_T|^n(0) \rangle \,, \tag{2.17}$$

where the multiplicative constant does depend on n next to α, β, and d, but not on $T > 0$.

In order to prove Proposition 1 via Lemma 3 (applied to $\phi_T(0)^n$) and Lemma 4, we need the optimal decay of the gradient $\nabla_z G_T(x,z)$ of Green's function in $|x-z|$, that is,

$$|\nabla_z G_T(x,z;a)| \ \lesssim \ |x-z|^{1-d} \quad \text{uniformly in } a \text{ and } T. \tag{2.18}$$

The same decay property is also required to prove Theorem 1 via Lemma 3 (applied to (2.10)) and Lemma 4. It is well-known from the continuum case that there are no *pointwise* in z bounds of the type (2.18) which would hold uniformly in the ellipticity constants α, β. However, (2.18) holds in the *square averaged* sense on dyadic annuli, as can be seen by a standard Cacciopoli argument based on the optimal decay of the Green's function itself, that is,

$$G_T(x,z) \ \lesssim \ |x-z|^{2-d} \quad \text{uniformly in } a \text{ and } T, \tag{2.19}$$

in the case $d > 2$. The pointwise estimate (2.19) in x and z is a classical result [6, Theorem 1.1] that relies on Harnack's inequality. It has been partially extended to discrete settings, see in particular the Harnack inequality on graphs [3]. However, we did not find a suitable reference for the BMO-type estimate in the case of $d = 2$. On the other hand, we don't require the *pointwise* version of (2.19), but just an averaged version on dyadic annuli. The statements we need are collected in the following lemma:

Lemma 8. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$, $T > 0$ and G_T be the associated Green's function. For all $d \geq 2$ and $q < \infty$,*

(i) *BMO and L^q estimate: for all $R \gg 1$,*

$$\textit{for } d = 2: \qquad \int_{|x-y|\leq R} |G_T(x,y) - \bar{G}_T(\cdot,y)_{\{|x-y|\leq R\}}|^q \, dx \ \lesssim \ R^2, \tag{2.20}$$

$$\textit{for } d > 2: \qquad \int_{R\leq|x-y|\leq 2R} G_T(x,y)^q \, dx \ \lesssim \ R^d \, (R^{2-d})^q. \tag{2.21}$$

where $\bar{G}_T(\cdot,y)_{\{|y-x|\leq R\}}$ denotes the average of $G_T(\cdot,y)$ over the ball $\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, |x-y| \leq R\}$.

(ii) *Behavior for $R \sim \sqrt{T}$ and $d = 2$:*

$$R^{-2} \int_{|x|\leq R} G_T(x,y)^2 \, dx \ \lesssim \ 1. \tag{2.22}$$

(iii) *Decay at infinity: for all $R \geq \sqrt{T}$,*

$$\int_{R\leq|x-y|\leq 2R} G_T(x,y)^2 \, dx \ \lesssim \ (\sqrt{T} R^{-1})^q. \tag{2.23}$$

The multiplicative constants in (2.20), (2.21), and (2.23) depend on q next to α, β, and d.

We present a proof of Lemma 8 which for $d = 2$ is a direct version of the indirect argument developed in [4, Lemma 2.5] in case of a nonlinear, continuum equation. For the convenience of the reader, we also include the proof for $d > 2$ — anyway, it has the same building blocks as the argument for $d = 2$. This makes our paper self-contained w. r. t. the properties of G_T.

However, it is not quite enough to know (2.18) in the *square*-averaged sense on dyadic annuli. In order to compensate for the fact that we only control *finite* stochastic moments of $\nabla\phi_T(0)$ via Proposition 1, we need to control a p-th power of the gradient $\nabla_z G_T(x,z)$ of Green's function in the optimal way for some $p > 2$. This slight increase in integrability is provided by Meyer's estimate, which yields such a $p > 2$ as a function of the ellipticity bounds α, β only. Meyer's estimate has already been crucially used in [15], however in a somewhat different spirit. There it is used that for sufficiently small ellipticity contrast, $1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \ll 1$, one has $p \ge 4$. The following lemma is the version of Meyer's estimate we need and will prove:

Lemma 9 (higher integrability of gradients)**.** *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ be a conductivity function, and G_T be its associated Green's function. Then, for $d \ge 2$, there exists $p > 2$ depending only on α, β, and d such that for all $T > 0$, $p \ge q \ge 2$ and $R \gg 1$,*

$$\text{for } d = 2: \quad \int_{R\le|z|\le 2R} |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q dz \lesssim R^{2-q}\min\{1, \sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^q, \tag{2.24}$$

$$\text{for } d > 2: \quad \int_{R\le|z|\le 2R} |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q dz \lesssim R^d (R^{1-d})^q. \tag{2.25}$$

For technical reasons, we need a *pointwise* decay of $G_T(x,y;a)$ in $|x-y|$ uniformly in a (but not in T). The decay we obtain is suboptimal and easily follows from Lemmas 8 & 9 using the discreteness:

Corollary 1. *For all $d \ge 2$ and $T > 0$, there exists a bounded radially symmetric function $h_T \in L^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ depending only on d, α, β, and T such that*

$$G_T(x,y;a) \;\le\; h_T(x-y)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$.

Lemmas 8 & 9 only treat G_T away from the diagonal $x = y$ — which is a consequence of the fact that the scaling symmetry is broken by the discreteness. Using the discreteness, the following corollary establishes a bound independent of T and a.

Corollary 2. *For all $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$, $T > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,*

$$|\nabla G_T(x,y;a)| \;\lesssim\; 1.$$

Finally, for the proof of Theorem 1, we need to know that also the *convolution* of the gradients of the Green's functions decays at the optimal rate, i. e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(x,z)||\nabla_z G_T(x',z)|dz \;\lesssim\; |x-x'|^{2-d} \quad \text{uniformly in } a \text{ and } T. \tag{2.26}$$

As for (2.18), it is not necessary to know (2.26) *pointwise* in (x,x'), but only in an averaged sense on dyadic annuli. The following lemma shows that (2.26) for linear averages can be inferred from (2.18) for quadratic averages:

Lemma 10. *Let $h_T \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ be such that for all $R \gg 1$ and $T > 0$,*

$$\text{for } d = 2: \qquad \int_{R<|z|\le 2R} h_T^2(z)dz \lesssim \min\{1, \sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^2, \tag{2.27}$$

$$\text{for } d > 2: \qquad \int_{R<|z|\le 2R} h_T^2(z)dz \lesssim R^{2-d}, \tag{2.28}$$

and for $R \sim 1$

$$\text{for } d \ge 2: \qquad \int_{|z|\le R} h_T^2(z)dz \lesssim 1. \tag{2.29}$$

Then for $R \gg 1$

$$\text{for } d = 2: \qquad \int_{|x|\le R}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)\,dz\,dx \lesssim R^2 \max\{1, \ln(\sqrt{T}R^{-1})\}, \tag{2.30}$$

$$\text{for } d > 2: \qquad \int_{|x|\le R}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)\,dz\,dx \lesssim R^2. \tag{2.31}$$

3. Proofs of the main results

3.1. **Proof of Proposition 1.** Starting point are Lemmas 3 and 6, which yield

$$\text{var}\,[\phi_T(0)^m] \lesssim \sum_e \left\langle \sup_{a(e)} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_T(0)^m}{\partial a(e)} \right|^2 \right\rangle,$$

where $\sum_e$ denotes the sum over the edges. Using now Lemma 4, this inequality turns into

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}\,[\phi_T(0)^m] \;\lesssim\; & \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{i=1}^d \Big\langle \phi_T(0)^{2(m-1)}(|\nabla_i\phi_T(z)|+1)^2|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,0)|^2 \\ & + (|\nabla_i\phi_T(z)|+1)^{2m}|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,0)|^{2m}\Big\rangle\,dz, \end{aligned}$$

where we have replaced the sum over edges e by the sum over sites $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and directions $\mathbf{e}_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ according to $e = [z, z+\mathbf{e}_i]$. Simplifying further, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}\,[\phi_T(0)^m] \;\lesssim\; & \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \Big\langle \phi_T(0)^{2(m-1)}(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|+1)^2|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^2 \\ & + (|\nabla\phi_T(z)|+1)^{2m}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{2m}\Big\rangle\,dz. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

We proceed in four steps. Assuming first that for n big enough and for all $m \le n$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \Big\langle \phi_T(0)^{2(m-1)}(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|+1)^2|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^2 + (|\nabla\phi_T(z)|+1)^{2m}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{2m}\Big\rangle\,dz \\ & \lesssim (\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\rangle^{\frac{m}{n}-\frac{1}{n(n+1)}} + 1)\begin{cases} \ln T & \text{for } d = 2, \\ 1 & \text{for } d > 2, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

we prove the claim in the first step. The last three steps are dedicated to the proof of (3.2) for n large enough.

Step 1. Proof that (3.1) and (3.2) imply (2.6).

For notational convenience we set $\mu_d(T)=1$ for $d>2$ and $\mu_d(T)=\ln T$ for $d=2$. Let $n=2^l$, $l\in\mathbb{N}^*$. Using the elementary fact that

$$\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2m}\right\rangle \;\le\; \langle \phi_T(0)^m\rangle^2+\mathrm{var}\left[\phi_T(0)^m\right],$$

from the cascade of inequalities (3.1) & (3.2) for $m=2^{l-q}$, $q\in\{0,\dots,l\}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2\cdot 2^l}\right\rangle &\lesssim \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2^l}\right\rangle^2+\mu_d(T)(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{1-\frac{1}{n(n+1)}}+1), && \text{(estimate 0)}\\
&\vdots\\
\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2\cdot 2^{l-q}}\right\rangle &\lesssim \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2^{l-q}}\right\rangle^2+\mu_d(T)(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2^q}-\frac{1}{n(n+1)}}+1), && \text{(estimate } q)\\
&\vdots\\
\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2\cdot 2^0}\right\rangle &\lesssim \underbrace{\langle \phi_T(0)\rangle^2}_{\overset{\text{Lemma 2}}{=}\,0}+\mu_d(T)(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{n(n+1)}}+1). && \text{(estimate } l)
\end{aligned}$$

We then take the power 2^q of each (estimate q) and obtain using Young's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle &\lesssim \langle \phi_T(0)^n\rangle^2+\mu_d(T)(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{1-\frac{1}{n(n+1)}}+1),\\
&\vdots\\
\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2\cdot 2^{l-q}}\right\rangle^{2^q} &\lesssim \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2^{l-q}}\right\rangle^{2^{q+1}}+\mu_d(T)^{2^q}(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{1-\frac{2^q}{n(n+1)}}+1),\\
\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2^{l-q}}\right\rangle^{2^{q+1}} &\lesssim \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2^{l-q-1}}\right\rangle^{2^{q+2}}+\mu_d(T)^{2^{q+1}}(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{1-\frac{2^{q+1}}{n(n+1)}}+1),\\
&\vdots\\
\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2}\right\rangle^{n} &\lesssim \mu_d(T)^n(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{1-\frac{1}{n+1}}+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing these $l+1$ inequalities then yields

$$\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle \lesssim \sum_{q=0}^{l}\mu_d(T)^{2^q}(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle^{1-\frac{2^q}{n(n+1)}}+1). \tag{3.3}$$

Using Young's inequality, each term gives the same contribution and (3.3) turns into

$$\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n}\right\rangle \lesssim \mu_d(T)^{n(n+1)}. \tag{3.4}$$

Formula (2.6) is then proved for all $q\le 2n$ using Hölder's inequality in probability.

Step 2. Estimate for the Green's function.
Let $p>2$ be as in Lemma 9. We shall prove that for all $q\ge 1$ and $R\gg 1$ the following holds

$$\text{for } d=2: \qquad \int_{R<|z|\le 2R}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q dz \lesssim R^{2\max\{1,\frac{q}{p}\}}R^{-q}\min\{1,\sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^q, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\text{for } d>2: \qquad \int_{R<|z|\le 2R}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q dz \lesssim R^{d\max\{1,\frac{q}{p}\}}(R^{1-d})^q. \tag{3.6}$$

We split the argument into two parts to treat $q\ge p$ and $q<p$ respectively. For $q\ge p$, we use the discrete $\ell^q-\ell^p$ estimate, which ensures that

$$\left(\int_{R<|z|\le 2R}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q dz\right)^{1/q} \le \left(\int_{R<|z|\le 2R}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^p dz\right)^{1/p},$$

and proves (3.5) & (3.6) in combination with (2.24) & (2.25) in Lemma 9.
For $q < p$, we simply use Hölder's inequality in the form

$$\left(R^{-d}\int_{R<|z|\le 2R}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q dz\right)^{1/q} \lesssim \left(R^{-d}\int_{R<|z|\le 2R}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^p dz\right)^{1/p},$$

that we also combine with (2.24) & (2.25).

Step 3. General estimate.
Let $\chi \ge 0$ be a random variable. In order to prove (3.2), we will need to estimate terms of the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\ dz$$

for $q, r > 1$. Relying on (3.5) & (3.6), we show that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\ dz \\ &\lesssim\ \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}\begin{cases} \ln T & \text{if}\quad 2\max\{1, 1-\frac{1}{r}+\frac{q}{rp}\} - \frac{q}{r} = 0, \qquad d=2,\\ 1 & \text{if}\quad d\max\{1, 1-\frac{1}{r}+\frac{q}{rp}\} + (1-d)\frac{q}{r} < 0, \quad d\ge 2.\end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Let $i_{\min} \in \mathbb{N}, i_{\min} \sim 1$ be such that Lemma 9 holds for $R \ge 2^{i_{\min}}$. To prove (3.7) we use a dyadic decomposition of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ in annuli of radii $R_i = 2^i$, $i \ge i_{\min}$, and Hölder's inequality with $(r, \frac{r}{r-1})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\ dz \\ =\ & \underbrace{\int_{|z|\le 2^{i_{\min}}} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\ dz}_{} \\ & \overset{\text{Corollary 2}}{\lesssim}\ \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\sum_{i=i_{\min}}^{\infty}\int_{R_i<|z|\le R_{i+1}} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\ dz}_{} \\ & \overset{\text{Hölder}}{\lesssim} \sum_{i=i_{\min}}^{\infty}(R_i^d)^{1-1/r}\left(\int_{R_i<|z|\le R_{i+1}} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle\ dz\right)^{1/r} \\ \lesssim\ & \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r} + \sum_{i=i_{\min}}^{\infty}(R_i^d)^{1-1/r}\left\langle \chi\int_{R_i<|z|\le R_{i+1}} |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\ dz\right\rangle^{1/r}.\end{aligned}$$

Using then (3.5) & (3.6), we get

$$\left\langle \chi\int_{R_i<|z|\le R_{i+1}} |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\ dz\right\rangle \lesssim \begin{cases}\langle\chi\rangle\, R_i^{2\max\{1,\frac{q}{p}\}} R_i^{-q}\min\{1,\sqrt{T}R_i^{-1}\}^q, & d=2,\\ \langle\chi\rangle\, R_i^{d\max\{1,\frac{q}{p}\}}(R_i^{1-d})^q, & d\ge 2.\end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\,dz \lesssim \begin{cases} \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}\sum_{i=0}^\infty R_i^{2\max\{1,1-\frac1r+\frac{q}{rp}\}-\frac{q}{r}}\min\{1,\sqrt{T}R_i^{-1}\}^{q/r}, & d=2,\\ \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}\sum_{i=0}^\infty R_i^{d\max\{1,1-\frac1r+\frac{q}{rp}\}+(1-d)\frac{q}{r}}, & d\geq 2.\end{cases}$$

We distinguish two cases. If $d\max\{1,1-\frac1r+\frac{q}{rp}\}+(1-d)\frac{q}{r}<0$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\,dz \lesssim \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}\sum_{i=0}^\infty R_i^{d\max\{1,1-\frac1r+\frac{q}{rp}\}+(1-d)\frac{q}{r}} \lesssim \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}.$$

If $2\max\{1,1-\frac1r+\frac{q}{rp}\}-\frac{q}{r}=0$ (for $d=2$), then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^2} \langle \chi |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^q\rangle^{1/r}\,dz &\lesssim \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}\sum_{i=0}^\infty \min\{1,\sqrt{T}R_i^{-1}\}^{q/r}\\ &\lesssim \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}(\ln T+\sum_{i=0}^\infty R_i^{-q/r})\\ &\lesssim \langle\chi\rangle^{1/r}(1+\ln T).\end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.7).

Step 4. Proof of (3.2).
Let $n\geq 1$ and $n\geq m\geq 1$. We first treat the first term of the l. h. s. of (3.2). In that case Hölder's inequality in probability for $(n+1,\frac{n+1}{n})$ and the stationarity of $\nabla\phi_T$ show

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2(m-1)}(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|+1)^2|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^2\right\rangle dz\\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\left\langle|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^{2(n+1)}\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{n+1}}+1\right)\left\langle|\phi_T(0)|^{\frac{2(m-1)(n+1)}{n}}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{\frac{2(n+1)}{n}}\right\rangle^{\frac{n}{n+1}}dz\\ &= \left(\left\langle|\nabla\phi_T(0)|^{2(n+1)}\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{n+1}}+1\right)\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left\langle|\phi_T(0)|^{\frac{2(m-1)(n+1)}{n}}|\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{\frac{2(n+1)}{n}}\right\rangle^{\frac{n}{n+1}}dz.\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

We apply Lemma 7 to bound the first ensemble average in (3.8):

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle|\nabla\phi_T(0)|^{2(n+1)}\right\rangle &\lesssim \left\langle\sum_{i=1}^d|\nabla\phi_T(0)|^2(\phi(0)^{2n}+\phi(\mathbf{e}_i)^{2n})\right\rangle\\ &\overset{\text{stationarity}}{=} 2\left\langle\sum_{i=1}^d|\nabla\phi_T(0)|^2\phi(0)^{2n}\right\rangle\\ &\overset{(2.17)}{\lesssim} \left\langle\phi(0)^{2n}\right\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

We now want to apply Step 3 to the r. h. s. integral of (3.8), i.e. setting $q = \frac{2(n+1)}{n}$, $r = \frac{n+1}{n}$, and $\chi = |\phi_T(0)|^{\frac{2(m-1)(n+1)}{n}}$. Estimate (3.7) involves the number

$$d \max\{1, 1 - \frac{1}{r} + \frac{q}{rp}\} + (1-d)\frac{q}{r} = d \max\{1, \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{2}{p}\} + 2(1-d). \tag{3.10}$$

We distinguish the cases $d > 2$ and $d = 2$. For $d > 2$, we have that the number (3.10) is equal to $d + 2(1-d) = 2-d$ and thus negative for n sufficiently large since $p > 2$. Hence, (3.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle |\phi_T(0)|^{\frac{2(m-1)(n+1)}{n}} |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{\frac{2(n+1)}{n}} \right\rangle^{\frac{n}{n+1}} dz &\lesssim \left\langle |\phi_T(0)|^{\frac{2(m-1)(n+1)}{n}} \right\rangle^{\frac{n}{n+1}} \\ &\le \left\langle |\phi_T(0)|^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{m-1}{n}},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we appealed to Jensen in probability using $\frac{2(m-1)(n+1)}{n} \le \frac{2(n-1)(n+1)}{n} \le 2n$. The combination of this with (3.8) and (3.9) yields as desired

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2(m-1)} (|\nabla \phi_T(z)| + 1)^2 |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^2 \right\rangle dz \\ &\lesssim \left\langle \phi(0)^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{m-1}{n}} + 1 = \left\langle \phi(0)^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{m}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)}} + 1.\end{aligned}$$

We turn to the case $d = 2$. We note that the number (3.10) is zero for n large enough since $p > 2$. Thus from (3.7) we infer as we did above that

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2(m-1)} (|\nabla \phi_T(z)| + 1)^2 |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^2 \right\rangle dz \lesssim (\ln T) \left(\left\langle \phi(0)^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{m}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)}} + 1 \right).$$

Let us now treat the second term of the l. h. s. of (3.2), which differs from the first term only when $m \ge 2$. As for the first term, Hölder's inequality in probability with $(\frac{n+1}{m}, \frac{n+1}{n-m+1})$, the stationarity of $\nabla \phi_T$ and Lemma 7 imply

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle (|\nabla \phi_T(z)| + 1)^{2m} |\nabla_{z_i} G_T(z,0)|^{2m} \right\rangle dz \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\left\langle |\nabla \phi_T(z)|^{2(n+1)} \right\rangle^{\frac{m}{n+1}} + 1 \right) \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{\frac{2(n+1)m}{n-m+1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{n-m+1}{n+1}} dz \\ &\lesssim \left(\left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{m}{n+1}} + 1 \right) \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{\frac{2(n+1)m}{n-m+1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{n-m+1}{n+1}} dz.\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

We use (3.7) with $\chi \equiv 1$, $q = \frac{2(n+1)m}{n-m+1}$ and $r = \frac{n+1}{n-m+1}$, in which case we have

$$d \max\{1, 1 - \frac{1}{r} + \frac{q}{rp}\} + (1-d)\frac{q}{r} = d \max\{1, \frac{m}{n+1} + \frac{2m}{p}\} + (1-d)2m. \tag{3.12}$$

We claim that this number is negative for n sufficiently large. Indeed, if $\max\{1, \frac{m}{n+1} + \frac{2m}{p}\} = 1$, then

$$d \max\{1, \frac{m}{n+1} + \frac{2m}{p}\} + (1-d)2m = d + 2m(1-d) = (2m-1)(1-d) + 1 < 0$$

since $d \geq 2$ and $m \geq 2$. Otherwise, $\max\{1, \frac{m}{n+1} + \frac{2m}{p}\} = \frac{m}{n+1} + \frac{2m}{p}$, and

$$d \max\{1, \frac{m}{n+1} + \frac{2m}{p}\} + (1-d)2m = 2m\left(d\left(\frac{1}{2(n+1)} + \frac{1}{p}\right) + 1 - d\right) < 2m\left(1 - \frac{d}{2}\right) \leq 0$$

for $d \geq 2$ and n large enough since $\frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{2}$. This shows that (3.12) is negative so that we obtain by (3.7)

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{\frac{2(n+1)m}{n-m+1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{n-m+1}{n+1}} dz \quad \lesssim \quad 1.$$

Combining this with (3.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^2} \left\langle (|\nabla \phi_T(z)| + 1)^{2m} |\nabla_z G_T(z,0)|^{2m} \right\rangle dz \quad &\lesssim \quad \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{m}{n+1}} + 1 \\
&= \quad \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{m}{n} - \frac{m}{n(n+1)}} + 1 \\
&\leq \quad \left\langle \phi_T(0)^{2n} \right\rangle^{\frac{m}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)}} + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the proposition.

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.** Let us define the spatial average of a function $h : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with the mask η_L by

$$\langle\langle h \rangle\rangle_L := \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h(x)\eta_L(x)dx,$$

where η_L satisfies

$$\eta_L : \mathbb{Z}^d \to [0,1], \quad \operatorname{supp}(\eta_L) \subset (-L,L)^d, \quad \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \eta_L(x)\, dx = 1, \quad |\nabla \eta_L| \lesssim L^{-d-1}. \tag{3.13}$$

The claim of the theorem is that there exists q depending only on α, β, and d such that

$$\operatorname{var}\left[\langle\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2 + (\nabla\phi_T + \xi) \cdot A(\nabla\phi_T + \xi)\rangle\rangle_L\right] \lesssim L^{-d}\mu_d(T)^q,$$

where $\mu_d(T) = 1$ for $d > 2$ and $\mu_d(T) = \ln T$ for $d = 2$. Since we are not interested in the precise value of q, we adopt the convention that q is a non-negative exponent which only depends on α, β, and d but which may vary from line to line in the proof.

Starting point is the estimate provided by Lemmas 3 and 6

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{var}\left[\langle\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2 + (\nabla\phi_T + \xi) \cdot A(\nabla\phi_T + \xi)\rangle\rangle_L\right] \\
&\lesssim \left\langle \left(\sum_e \sup_{a(e)} \left|\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} \langle\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2 + (\nabla\phi_T + \xi) \cdot A(\nabla\phi_T + \xi)\rangle\rangle_L\right|^2\right)\right\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Step 1. In this step, using the notation $e = [z, z + \mathbf{e}_i]$, we establish the formula

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} \langle\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2 + (\nabla\phi_T + \xi) \cdot A(\nabla\phi_T + \xi)\rangle\rangle_L \\
&= \quad 2\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla_i \phi_T(z) + \xi_i)\nabla_{z_i} G_T(z,x) \left(\sum_{j=1}^d a(x - \mathbf{e}_j, x)\nabla_j^* \eta_L(x)(\nabla_j^* \phi_T(x) + \xi_j)\right) dx \\
&\quad + \eta_L(z)(\nabla_i \phi_T + \xi_i)^2(z).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Indeed, by definition of $\langle\!\langle\cdot\rangle\!\rangle_L$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\left\langle\!\left\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right\rangle\!\right\rangle_L\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta_L(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\left(T^{-1}\phi_T^2+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right)(x)dx.\end{aligned}$$

We note

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\left(T^{-1}\phi_T^2+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right)(x)\\ &= \left(2T^{-1}\phi_T\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}+2\nabla\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot\frac{\partial A}{\partial a(e)}(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right)(x)\\ &= 2T^{-1}\Big(\phi_T\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\Big)(x)+2\Big(\nabla\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\Big)(x)+(\nabla_i\phi_T+\xi_i)^2(z)\delta(x-z),\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\left\langle\!\left\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right\rangle\!\right\rangle_L\\ &= 2\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\eta_L\Big(T^{-1}\phi_T\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}+\nabla\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\Big)\right)(x)dx\\ &\quad+\eta_L(z)(\nabla_i\phi_T+\xi_i)^2(z). \qquad (3.16)\end{aligned}$$

Using the discrete integration by parts formula of Definition 3, the first term of the r. h. s. of (3.16) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\eta_L(T^{-1}\phi_T\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}+\nabla\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))\right)(x)dx\\ &= -\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}(x)\nabla^*\cdot(\eta_LA(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))(x)\,dx+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\eta_LT^{-1}\phi_T\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\right)(x)\,dx. \qquad (3.17)\end{aligned}$$

We now use the following discrete Leibniz rule:

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla^*\cdot(\eta_LA(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))(x)\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d\Big(\eta_L(x)[A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)]_j(x)-\eta_L(x-\mathbf{e}_j)[A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)]_j(x-\mathbf{e}_j)\Big)\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d\eta_L(x)\Big([A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)]_j(x)-[A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)]_j(x-\mathbf{e}_j)\Big)\\ &\qquad+\sum_{j=1}^d\Big(\eta_L(x)-\eta_L(x-\mathbf{e}_j)\Big)[A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)]_j(x-\mathbf{e}_j)\\ &= \eta_L(x)\left(\nabla^*\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right)(x)+\sum_{j=1}^d\nabla_j^*\eta_L(x)[A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)]_j(x-\mathbf{e}_j),\end{aligned}$$

where $[A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)]_j$ denotes the j-th coordinate of the vector $A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)$. For notational convenience, we take advantage of the diagonal structure of A (although this is not crucial) to rewrite the latter equality in the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla^*\cdot(\eta_L A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))\,(x)\\ &=\ \eta_L(x)\,(\nabla^*\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))\,(x)+\sum_{j=1}^d a(x-\mathbf{e}_j,x)\nabla_j^*\eta_L(x)(\nabla_j^*\phi_T(x)+\xi_j).\end{aligned}\tag{3.18}$$

The combination of (3.18) with (3.17) and the use of the equation satisfied by ϕ_T,

$$T^{-1}\phi_T-\nabla^*\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)=0,$$

yield

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\eta_L(T^{-1}\phi_T\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}+\nabla\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))\right)(x)dx\\ &=\ -\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}(x)\left(\sum_{j=1}^d a(x-\mathbf{e}_j,x)\nabla_j^*\eta_L(x)(\nabla_j^*\phi_T(x)+\xi_j)\right)dx.\end{aligned}$$

Using now Lemma 4, this turns into

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\eta_L(T^{-1}\phi_T\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}+\nabla\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))\right)(x)dx\\ &\overset{(2.12)}{=}\ \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\nabla_i\phi_T(z)+\xi_i)\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x)\\ &\qquad\left(\sum_{j=1}^d a(x-\mathbf{e}_j,x)\nabla_j^*\eta_L(x)(\nabla_j^*\phi_T(x)+\xi_j)\right)dx.\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

Inserting (3.19) into (3.16) proves (3.15).

Step 2. In this step, we provide the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{a(e)}\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\left\langle\!\left\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right\rangle\!\right\rangle_L\right|\\ &\lesssim\ \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)|(|\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^2+|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2+1)\,dx\\ &\quad+\eta_L(z)(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2+1).\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

Indeed, from Step 1, the boundedness of a, and $|\xi|=1$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{a(e)}\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\left\langle\!\left\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\right\rangle\!\right\rangle_L\right|\\ &\lesssim\ \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\sup_{a(e)}|\nabla_i\phi_T(z)|+1)\sup_{a(e)}|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)|(\sup_{a(e)}|\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|+1)\,dx\\ &\quad+\eta_L(z)(\sup_{a(e)}|\nabla_i\phi_T(z)|^2+1).\end{aligned}\tag{3.21}$$

Hence, in the remainder of this step, we have to deal with the suprema over $a(e)$. Recalling that $e = [z, z + \mathbf{e}_i]$, the two following inequalities are consequences of Lemmas 5 and 4:

$$\sup_{a(e)} |\nabla_{z_i} G_T(z,x)| \overset{(2.16)}{\lesssim} |\nabla_{z_i} G_T(z,x)|, \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

$$\sup_{a(e)} |\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| \overset{(2.14)}{\lesssim} |\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| + 1.$$

The last inequality we need is

$$\sup_{a(e)} |\nabla^* \phi_T(x)| \lesssim |\nabla^* \phi_T(x)| + \sup_{a(e)} |\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| + 1 \overset{(2.14)}{\lesssim} |\nabla^* \phi_T(x)| + |\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| + 1.$$

It is then proved combining the boundedness of a and the following bound on the derivative of $\nabla^* \phi_T(x)$ with respect to $a(e)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} \nabla^* \phi_T(x) \right| &= \left| \nabla^*_x \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} \phi_T(x) \right| \\
&\overset{(2.12)}{=} \left| \nabla^*_x \left((\nabla_i \phi_T(z) + \xi_i) \nabla_{z_i} G_T(z,x) \right) \right| \\
&= \left| (\nabla_i \phi_T(z) + \xi_i) \nabla_{z_i} \nabla^*_x G_T(z,x) \right| \\
&\le 2(|\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| + |\xi_i|) \sup_{\mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G_T| \\
&\lesssim |\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| + 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the uniform bound on ∇G_T provided by Corollary 2.

Combining these three inequalities with (3.21) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{a(e)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} \langle\langle T^{-1} \phi_T^2 + (\nabla \phi_T + \xi) \cdot A(\nabla \phi_T + \xi) \rangle\rangle_L \right| \\
&\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (|\nabla \phi_T(z)| + 1) |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)| |\nabla^* \eta_L(x)| (|\nabla^* \phi_T(x)| + |\nabla \phi_T(z)| + 1) \, dx \\
&\quad + \eta_L(z)(|\nabla \phi_T(z)|^2 + 1),
\end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce (3.20).

Step 3. In this step, we argue that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{var}\left[\langle\langle T^{-1} \phi_T^2 + (\nabla \phi_T + \xi) \cdot A(\nabla \phi_T + \xi) \rangle\rangle_L \right] \\
&\lesssim \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)| |\nabla^* \eta_L(x)| |\nabla^* \phi_T(x)|^2 \, dx \right)^2 dz \right\rangle && (3.22) \\
&\quad + \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)| |\nabla^* \eta_L(x)| |\nabla \phi_T(z)|^2 \, dx \right)^2 dz \right\rangle && (3.23) \\
&\quad + \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)| |\nabla^* \eta_L(x)| \, dx \right)^2 dz \right\rangle && (3.24) \\
&\quad + \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \eta_L(z)^2 (|\nabla \phi_T(z)|^2 + 1)^2 dz \right\rangle. && (3.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, inserting (3.20) in (3.14) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{var}\left[\langle\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^2+(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\rangle\rangle_L\right]\\
&\lesssim \left\langle\sum_e\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)|(|\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^2+|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2+1)\,dx\right)^2\right\rangle\\
&\quad+\left\langle\sum_e\eta_L^2(z)(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2+1)^2\right\rangle.
\end{aligned}
$$

We then use Young's inequality in the first term of the r. h. s. of this inequality and we replace the sum $\sum_e$ over edges $[z,z+\mathbf{e}_i]$ by d times the sum over $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ to establish this step.

It now remains to estimate the terms (3.22), (3.23), (3.24) and (3.25) to conclude the proof of the theorem.

Step 4. Estimate of (3.25):

$$
\left\langle\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta_L(z)^2(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2+1)^2dz\right\rangle\lesssim\mu_d(T)^qL^{-d}. \tag{3.26}
$$

Indeed, by stationarity we have

$$
\left\langle|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^4\right\rangle\lesssim\sum_{i=1}^d\left\langle|\phi_T(z+\mathbf{e}_i)|^4+|\phi_T(z)|^4\right\rangle=2d\left\langle\phi_T(0)^4\right\rangle,
$$

so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta_L(z)^2(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2+1)^2\,dz\right\rangle &\lesssim \left\langle\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta_L(z)^2(|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^4+1)\,dz\right\rangle\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta_L(z)^2(\left\langle|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^4\right\rangle+1)\,dz\\
&\lesssim (\left\langle\phi_T(0)^4\right\rangle+1)\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta_L(z)^2\,dz.
\end{aligned}
$$

On the one hand, it follows from Proposition 1 that

$$
\left\langle\phi_T(0)^4\right\rangle\lesssim\mu_d(T)^q.
$$

On the other hand, it follows from (3.13) that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta_L(z)^2\,dz\lesssim L^{-d}.
$$

This establishes Step 4.

Step 5. Estimate of (3.24):

$$
\left\langle\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla_zG_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)|\,dx\right)^2dz\right\rangle\lesssim\mu_d(T)^qL^{-d}. \tag{3.27}
$$

We expand the square

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^* \eta_L(x)|\, dx \right)^2 dz \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x')||\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')|\, dx\, dx'\, dz \right\rangle \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x')| \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')| \right\rangle dz\, dx\, dx'.
\end{aligned}$$

We then use Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality in probability and the stationarity of G_T:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')| \right\rangle \\
&\leq \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)|^2 \right\rangle^{1/2} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x')|^2 \right\rangle^{1/2} \\
&= \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z-x,0)|^2 \right\rangle^{1/2} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z-x',0)|^2 \right\rangle^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, with the notation

$$h(y) := \left\langle |\nabla_y G_T(y,0)|^2 \right\rangle^{1/2},$$

we have by definition of η_L:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^* \eta_L(x)|\, dx \right)^2 dz \right\rangle \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x')| \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h(z-x)h(z-x')\, dz\, dx\, dx' \\
&\lesssim L^{-2(d+1)} \int_{|x|\leq L}\int_{|x'|\leq L}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h(z-x)h(z-x')\, dz\, dx\, dx' \\
&= L^{-2(d+1)} \int_{|x|\leq L}\int_{|x'|\leq L}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h(z')h(z'+x-x')\, dz'\, dx\, dx' \\
&\leq L^{-d-2} \int_{|y|\leq 2L}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h(z')h(z'-y)\, dz'\, dy.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\int_{R<|y|\leq 2R} h^2(y)\, dy = \left\langle \int_{R<|y|\leq 2R} |\nabla_y G_T(y,0)|^2\, dy \right\rangle.$$

On the one hand, for $R \gg 1$ we have according to Lemma 9 (for $q=2$)

$$\text{for } d=2: \quad \int_{R<|y|\leq 2R} h^2(y)\, dy \lesssim R^{2-2}\min\{1,\sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^2 = \min\{1,\sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^2,$$

$$\text{for } d>2: \quad \int_{R<|y|\leq 2R} h^2(y)\, dy \lesssim R^d(R^{1-d})^2 = R^{2-d}.$$

On the other hand, for $R\sim 1$, Corollary 2 implies

$$\text{for } d\geq 2: \quad \int_{|y|\leq R} h^2(y)\, dy \lesssim 1.$$

Hence we are in position to apply Lemma 10, which yields as desired

$$\int_{|y|\leq 2L}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h(z')h(z'-y)\, dz'\, dy \lesssim L^2\mu_d(T).$$

Note that for $d=2$, we have used the elementary fact that $\max\{1,\ln\sqrt{T}L^{-1}\}\lesssim \ln T$.

Step 6. Estimate of (3.23):

$$\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2\,dx\right)^2 dz\right\rangle \lesssim \mu_d(T)^q L^{-d}. \tag{3.28}$$

As in Step 5,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2\,dx\right)^2 dz\right\rangle\\ &\quad= \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x')|\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left\langle|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')||\nabla\phi_T(z)|^4\right\rangle dz\,dx\,dx'.\end{aligned}$$

This time, we use Hölder's inequality with $(p,p,\frac{p}{p-2})$ in probability (where $p>2$ is the exponent in Lemma 9):

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')||\nabla\phi_T(z)|^4\right\rangle\\ &\quad\le \left\langle|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)|^p\right\rangle^{\frac1p}\left\langle|\nabla_z G_T(z,x')|^p\right\rangle^{\frac1p}\left\langle|\nabla\phi_T(z)|^{\frac{4p}{p-2}}\right\rangle^{\frac{p-2}{p}}.\end{aligned}$$

By stationarity of G_T and ϕ_T we obtain with Proposition 1

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')||\nabla\phi_T(z)|^4\right\rangle\\ &\quad\lesssim \mu_d(T)^q\left\langle|\nabla_z G_T(z-x,0)|^p\right\rangle^{\frac1p}\left\langle|\nabla_z G_T(z-x',0)|^p\right\rangle^{\frac1p}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, with the notation

$$h(y):=\left\langle|\nabla_y G_T(y,0)|^p\right\rangle^{1/p},$$

by definition of η_L:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla\phi_T(z)|^2\,dx\right)^2 dz\right\rangle\\ &\quad\lesssim \mu_d(T)^q\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x')|\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}h(z-x)h(z-x')\,dz\,dx\,dx'\\ &\quad\lesssim \mu_d(T)^q L^{-d-2}\int_{|y|\le 2L}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}h(z')h(z'-y)\,dz'\,dy.\end{aligned}$$

As in Step 5, we shall establish that for $R\gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{for } d=2: \quad \int_{R<|y|\le 2R}h^2(y)\,dy \lesssim \min\{1,\sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^2,\\ &\text{for } d>2: \quad \int_{R<|y|\le 2R}h^2(y)\,dy \lesssim R^{2-d},\end{aligned}\tag{3.29}$$

and for $R\sim 1$

$$\text{for } d\ge 2: \quad \int_{|y|\le R}h^2(y)\,dy \lesssim 1, \tag{3.30}$$

Once this is done, Lemma 10 implies as desired

$$\int_{|y|\le 2L}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}h(z')h(z'-y)\,dz'\,dy \lesssim L^2\mu_d(T),$$

using in addition that $\max\{1, \ln\sqrt{T}L^{-1}\} \lesssim \ln T$ for $d = 2$. As above, (3.30) is a direct consequence of Corollary 2. We now deal with (3.29). Note that according to Lemma 9, we have for $R \gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } d = 2: \quad & \int_{R<|y|\le 2R} h^p(y)\,dy \;\lesssim\; R^{2-p}\min\{1, \sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^p, \\ \text{for } d > 2: \quad & \int_{R<|y|\le 2R} h^p(y)\,dy \;\lesssim\; R^d(R^{1-d})^p. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

We now argue that this yields (3.29). Indeed, by Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left(R^{-d}\int_{R<|x|\le 2R} h^2(x)dx\right)^{1/2} \quad & \le \quad \left(R^{-d}\int_{R<|x|\le 2R} h^p(x)dx\right)^{1/p} \\ & \overset{(3.31)}{\lesssim} \begin{cases} \left(R^{-2}R^{2-p}\min\{1, \sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^p\right)^{1/p}, & d = 2 \\ \left(R^{-d}R^d(R^{1-d})^p\right)^{1/p}, & d > 2 \end{cases} \\ & = \quad \begin{cases} R^{-1}\min\{1, \sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}, & d = 2, \\ R^{1-d}, & d > 2, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.29).

Step 7. Estimate of (3.22):

$$\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^2\,dx\right)^2 dz\right\rangle \lesssim \mu_d(T)^q L^{-d}. \tag{3.32}$$

As in Steps 5 and 6,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^2\,dx\right)^2 dz\right\rangle \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^*\eta_L(x)||\nabla^*\eta_L(x')| \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')||\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^4\right\rangle dz\,dx\,dx'. \end{aligned}$$

Hölder's inequality with $(p, p, \frac{p}{p-2})$ in probability (where $p > 2$ is the exponent in Lemma 9) then yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')||\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^4\right\rangle \\ & \le \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)|^p\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x')|^p\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\langle |\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^{\frac{4p}{p-2}}\right\rangle^{\frac{p-2}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

The stationarity of G_T and ϕ_T, and Proposition 1 show

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z,x)||\nabla_z G_T(z,x')||\nabla^*\phi_T(x)|^4\right\rangle \\ & \lesssim \mu_d(T)^q \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z-x,0)|^p\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\langle |\nabla_z G_T(z-x',0)|^p\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

We may now conclude as in Step 6.

The theorem follows from the combination of Step 3 with (3.26), (3.27), (3.28) & (3.32).

4. Proofs of the auxiliary lemmas

Before addressing the proofs proper, let us make a general comment. In what follows, we shall replace the classical Leibniz rule by its discrete counterpart. Although they are essentially the same, the expressions that appear are more intricate in the discrete case. In order to keep the proofs clear, we first present the arguments using the classical Leibniz rule (though it does not hold at the discrete level) and we later give a separate argument to show that the various results still hold with the true discrete version.

4.1. **Proof of Lemma 8.** Without loss of generality, we may assume $y = 0$ and suppress the y-dependance of G_T in our notation. We will first give the proof in the continuum case (that is using the classical Leibniz rule) and then sketch the modifications arising from the discreteness.

We first argue that for any d,

$$T^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} G_{T,M}^2\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G_{T,M}|^2\,dx \;\lesssim\; M, \tag{4.1}$$

where for $0 < M < \infty$, $G_{T,M}$ denotes the following truncated version of G_T

$$G_{T,M} \;=\; \min\{G_T, M\} \;\geq\; 0.$$

Indeed, we consider $T^{-1}G_T - \nabla^* \cdot A\nabla G_T = \delta$ in its weak form, that is

$$T^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \zeta\, G_T\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla\zeta \cdot A\nabla G_T\,dx \;=\; \zeta(0), \tag{4.2}$$

and select $\zeta = G_{T,M}$. Since $G_{T,M}\,G_T \geq G_{T,M}^2$ and provided that $\nabla G_{T,M} \cdot A\nabla G_T \geq \nabla G_{T,M} \cdot A\nabla G_{T,M}$, we obtain (4.1) by uniform ellipticity. Indeed, since A is diagonal,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla G_{T,M} \cdot A\nabla G_T(x) \;&=\; \sum_{i=1}^d a(x+\mathbf{e}_i, x)(G_{T,M}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - G_{T,M}(x))(G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - G_T(x)) \\
&\geq\; \sum_{i=1}^d a(x+\mathbf{e}_i, x)(G_{T,M}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - G_{T,M}(x))^2 \\
&\geq\; \alpha|\nabla G_{T,M}(x)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 1. Proof of (i) for $d > 2$.
Following [6, Theorem 1.1], we argue that (4.1) implies a weak-$L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}$ estimate, i. e.

$$\mathcal{L}^d(\{G_T \geq M\}) \;\lesssim\; M^{-\frac{d}{d-2}}. \tag{4.3}$$

For this purpose, we appeal to Sobolev's inequality in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, i. e.

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} G_{T,M}^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2d}} \;\lesssim\; \left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G_{T,M}|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2}.$$

Via Chebycheff's inequality and (4.1), this yields

$$M\,\mathcal{L}^d(\{G_T \geq M\})^{\frac{d-2}{2d}} \;\lesssim\; M^{1/2},$$

which is (4.3).

We now argue that the weak-$L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}$ estimate (4.3) in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ yields a strong L^q-estimate on balls $\{|x| \le R\}$ for $1 < q < \frac{d}{d-2}$. More precisely, we have

$$\int_{|x|\le R} G_T^q \, dx \ \lesssim\ R^d\,(R^{2-d})^q. \tag{4.4}$$

Indeed, we have on the one hand

$$\int_{G_T>M} G_T^q \, dx \ =\ q\int_M^\infty \mathcal{L}^d(\{G_T > M'\})\, M'^{q-1}\, dM' + M^q \mathcal{L}^d(\{|G_T| > M\}) \ \overset{(4.3)}{\lesssim}\ M^{q-\frac{d}{d-2}}, \tag{4.5}$$

where we have used $q < \frac{d}{d-2}$. On the other hand, we have trivially

$$\int_{\{G_T\le M\}\cap\{|x|\le R\}} G_T^q \, dx \ \lesssim\ R^d\, M^q. \tag{4.6}$$

With the choice of $M = R^{2-d}$, the combination of (4.5) and (4.6) yields (4.4).

In order to increase the exponent q in (4.4), one combines a Cacciopoli estimate[1] for monotone functions of G_T with a Poincaré-Sobolev estimate to obtain a "reverse Hölder" inequality (as in the proof of Harnack's inequality, see [7, Chapter 4, Method II]). We start with the Cacciopoli estimate, i. e.

$$\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R} |\nabla G_T^{q/2}|^2 \, dx \ \lesssim\ R^{-2} \int_{R\le|x|\le 8R} G_T^q \, dx \tag{4.7}$$

for all $1 < q < \infty$. For that purpose, we test (4.2) with $\zeta = \eta^2 G_T^{q-1}$, where the spatial cut-off function η has the properties

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta \ \equiv\ 1 \ \text{ in } \{2R \le |x| \le 4R\}, \quad \eta \ \equiv\ 0 \ \text{ outside } \{R \le |x| \le 8R\}, \\ &|\nabla\eta| \ \lesssim\ R^{-1}, \quad 0 \ \le\ \eta\ \le\ 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

This yields

$$T^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \eta^2\, G_T^q \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1}) \cdot A\nabla G_T \, dx \ =\ 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Since by the uniform ellipticity of A, there exists a generic constant $C < \infty$ (which only depends on q, α, β) such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1}) \cdot A\nabla G_T \\ &\quad = \quad (q-1)\,\eta^2\, G_T^{q-2}\, \nabla G_T \cdot A\nabla G_T + 2\,\eta\, G_T^{q-1}\, \nabla\eta \cdot A\,\nabla G_T \\ &\quad \overset{\text{Young}}{\ge} \quad C^{-1}\,\eta^2\, G_T^{q-2}\, |\nabla G_T|^2 - C\, G_T^q\, |\nabla\eta|^2 \\ &\quad \gtrsim \quad C^{-1}\,\eta^2\, |\nabla G_T^{q/2}|^2 - C\, G_T^q\, |\nabla\eta|^2, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \eta^2\, |\nabla G_T^{q/2}|^2 \, dx \ \lesssim\ \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} G_T^q\, |\nabla\eta|^2 \, dx.$$

In view of the properties (4.8) of η, this yields (4.7) for $d > 2$.

[1] this is the only place where we use the Leibniz rule

We now derive the "reverse Hölder" inequality

$$\left(R^{-d}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R} G_T^{\frac{qd}{d-2}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{d-2}{qd}} \lesssim \left(R^{-d}\int_{R\le|x|\le 8R} G_T^{q}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \tag{4.10}$$

For that purpose, we appeal to the Poincaré-Sobolev estimate on the annulus $\{2R\le|x|\le 4R\}$:

$$\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R}|u-\bar u_{\{2R\le|x|\le 4R\}}|^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2d}} \lesssim \left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R}|\nabla u|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2},$$

which we use in form of

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(R^{-d}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R}|u|^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2d}}\\ &\lesssim \left(R^{2-d}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R}|\nabla u|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2}+\left(R^{-d}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R}|u|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

We apply the latter to $u=G_T^{q/2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(R^{-d}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R} G_T^{\frac{qd}{d-2}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{d-2}{qd}}\\ &\lesssim \left(R^{2-d}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R}|\nabla G_T^{q/2}|^2\,dx\right)^{1/q}+\left(R^{-d}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 4R} G_T^{q}\,dx\right)^{1/q}.\end{aligned}$$

The combination of this with (4.7) yields (4.10).

We now may conclude in the case of $d>2$: Indeed, (4.10) allows us to iteratively increase the integrability q in multiplicative increments of $\frac{d}{d-2}$ in the estimate (4.4). Since any $p<\infty$ can be reached in finite multiplicative increments starting from a $1<q<\frac{d}{d-2}$, the side effect that the annuli get dyadically larger at every step does not matter qualitatively (in this sense, the above argument is much less subtle than the proof of the Harnack inequality). This proves (2.21).

Step 2. Proof of (i) for $d=2$.
We now tackle the case of $d=2$, which in fact amounts to the L^1-BMO estimate

$$\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u-\bar u_{\{|x|\le R\}}|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|f|\,dx \tag{4.11}$$

for

$$T^{-1}u-\nabla^*\cdot A\nabla u \;=\; f, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\bar u_{\{|x|\le R\}}$ denotes the average of u on the ball of radius R. We fix an exponent $q<\infty$ and a radius $1\ll R<\infty$ and assume w. l. o. g.

$$\bar u_{\{|x|\le R\}} \;=\; 0. \tag{4.13}$$

As in (4.1), we have

$$\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla u_M|^2\,dx \;\lesssim\; M \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |f|\,dx, \tag{4.14}$$

As opposed to the case of $d > 2$, this is the only time we use the equation (4.12).

Estimate (4.14) is used in connection with the Poincaré-Sobolev inequality with mean value zero, i. e.

$$\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R} |u_M - (\overline{u_M})_{\{|x|\le R\}}|^s\,dx\right)^{1/s} \lesssim \left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla u_M|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2},$$

for any $s < \infty$, which we use once for $s = q$, i. e.

$$\begin{aligned}\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R} |u_M - (\overline{u_M})_{\{|x|\le R\}}|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q} &\lesssim \left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla u_M|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} \\ &\overset{(4.14)}{\lesssim} \left(M\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |f|\,dx\right)^{1/2},\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

and once for arbitrary s (which we think of being larger than q) in the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R} |u_M|^s\,dx\right)^{1/s} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla u_M|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} + |(\overline{u_M})_{\{|x|\le R\}}| \\ &\overset{(4.14)}{\lesssim} \left(M\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |f|\,dx\right)^{1/2} + \left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R} |u|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

We use (4.16) to estimate the peaks of u. More precisely, we claim that for $s > 2q$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(R^{-2}\int_{\{|x|\le R\}\cap\{|u|>M\}} |u|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim M^{1-s/(2q)}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |f|\,dx\right)^{s/(2q)} + M^{1-s/q}\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R} |u|^q\,dx\right)^{s/q^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

The argument for (4.17) is similar to the case of $d > 2$: Estimate (4.16) yields the weak estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&M\,\left(R^{-2}\,\mathcal{L}^2\left(\{|x|\le R\}\cap\{|u|>M\}\right)\right)^{1/s} \\ &\lesssim \left(M\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |f|\,dx\right)^{1/2} + \left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R} |u|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q},\end{aligned}$$

which we rewrite as

$$\begin{aligned} & R^{-2}\,\mathcal{L}^2(\{|x|\le R\}\cap\{|u|>M\}) \\ \lesssim\ & M^{-s/2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|f|\,dx\right)^{s/2}+M^{-s}\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u|^q\,dx\right)^{s/q}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{|x|\le R\}\cap\{|u|>M\}}|u|^q\,dx \ =\ & q\int_M^\infty \mathcal{L}^2(\{|x|\le R\}\cap\{|u|>M'\})\,M'^{q-1}\,dM' \\ & +M^q\mathcal{L}^2(\{|x|\le 1\}\cap\{|u|>M\}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Since $s>2q$, the combination of (4.18) and (4.19) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & R^{-2}\int_{\{|x|\le R\}\cap\{|u|>M\}}|u|^q\,dx \\ \lesssim\ & M^{q-s/2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|f|\,dx\right)^{s/2}+M^{q-s}\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u|^q\,dx\right)^{s/q}, \end{aligned}$$

which is (4.17).

We now combine (4.15) and (4.17) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q} \\ \overset{(4.13)}{\le}\ & \left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u-(\overline{u_M})_{\{|x|\le R\}}|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q} \\ \le\ & \left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u_M-(\overline{u_M})_{\{|x|\le R\}}|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q} \\ & +\left(R^{-2}\int_{\{|x|\le R\}\cap\{|u|>M\}}|u|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q} \\ \overset{(4.15)\&(4.17)}{\lesssim}\ & M^{1/2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|f|\,dx\right)^{1/2} \\ & +M^{1-s/(2q)}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|f|\,dx\right)^{s/(2q)}+M^{1-s/q}\left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u|^q\,dx\right)^{s/q^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that this estimate contains the desired estimate. Indeed, using the abbreviations

$$U\ :=\ \left(R^{-2}\int_{|x|\le R}|u|^q\,dx\right)^{1/q}\quad\text{and}\quad F\ :=\ \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|f|\,dx,$$

we rewrite the above as

$$U\ \lesssim\ M^{1/2}\,F^{1/2}+M^{1-s/(2q)}\,F^{s/(2q)}+M^{1-s/q}\,U^{s/q}. \tag{4.20}$$

Since $s > q$, choosing $M \sim U$ sufficiently large, we may absorb the last term of (4.20) into the l. h. s. yielding

$$U \lesssim U^{1/2} F^{1/2} + U^{1-s/(2q)} F^{s/(2q)}.$$

Using Young's inequality twice in the r. h. s. since $s > 2q$, we obtain as desired $U \lesssim F$, which shows

$$\left(R^{-2} \int_{|x|\le R} |G_T - \overline{G_T}_{|x|\le R}|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q} \lesssim 1.$$

Step 3. Proof of (ii).
We first derive a weak L^4-estimate on $\{|x| \le R\}$:

$$R^{-2}\mathcal{L}^2(\{G_T > M\} \cap \{|x| \le R\}) \lesssim M^{-4}. \tag{4.21}$$

For that purpose, we combine (4.1), which for $R \sim \sqrt{T}$ turns into

$$R^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} G_{T,M}^2 \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G_{T,M}|^2 \, dx \lesssim M, \tag{4.22}$$

with the Poincaré-Sobolev estimate

$$\left(R^{-2} \int_{|x|\le R} |G_{T,M} - \overline{G_{T,M}}_{\{|x|\le R\}}|^8 \, dx\right)^{1/8} \lesssim \left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla G_{T,M}|^2 \, dx\right)^{1/2}$$

in form of

$$\left(R^{-2} \int_{|x|\le R} G_{T,M}^8 \, dx\right)^{1/8} \lesssim \left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla G_{T,M}|^2 \, dx\right)^{1/2} + \left(R^{-2} \int_{|x|\le R} G_{T,M}^2 \, dx\right)^{1/2}.$$

This yields (4.21):

$$(R^{-2}M^8\mathcal{L}^2(\{G_T > M\} \cap \{|x| \le R\}))^{1/8} \le \left(R^{-2} \int_{|x|\le R} G_{T,M}^8 \, dx\right)^{1/8} \lesssim M^{1/2}.$$

We now argue that (4.21) & (4.22) yield (2.22). Indeed, combining

$$\begin{aligned} R^{-2} \int_{\{G_T > M\}\cap\{|x|\le R\}} G_T^2 \, dx &= 2R^{-2} \int_M^\infty \mathcal{L}^2(\{G_T > M'\} \cap \{|x| \le R\}) M' dM' \\ &\quad + R^{-2} M^2 \mathcal{L}^2(\{G_T > M\} \cap \{|x| \le R\}) \\ &\overset{(4.21)}{\lesssim} M^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

with (4.22) in the form of

$$R^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} G_{T,M}^2 \, dx \lesssim M$$

for $M = 1$ yields property (iii) of the Lemma.

Step 4. Proof of (iii).
Due to (2.21) for $d > 2$ and (2.22) for $d = 2$, the following holds for $d \ge 2$:

$$R^{-d} \int_{R\le|x|\le 2R} G_T^2 dx \lesssim 1 \qquad \text{for } R \sim \sqrt{T}. \tag{4.23}$$

We now establish for all $R \gg 1$

$$R^{-d}\int_{|x|\geq 2R} G_T^2 dx \lesssim \frac{T}{R^2} R^{-d}\int_{R\leq |x|\leq 2R} G_T^2 dx. \tag{4.24}$$

Indeed, we test (4.2) with $\eta^2 G_T$ where the cut-off function η is chosen as follows

$$\begin{array}{l} \eta \equiv 1 \text{ in } \{|x|\geq 2R\}, \quad \eta \equiv 0 \text{ in } \{|x|\leq R\}, \\ |\nabla\eta| \lesssim R^{-1}, \quad 0 \leq \eta \leq 1, \end{array}$$

yielding

$$T^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \eta^2 G_T^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla(\eta^2 G_T)\cdot A\nabla G_T dx = 0.$$

Arguing as for (4.9), this yields

$$T^{-1}\int_{|x|\geq 2R} G_T^2\, dx + \int_{|x|\geq 2R} |\nabla G_T|^2\, dx \lesssim R^{-2}\int_{R\leq |x|\leq 2R} G_T^2\, dx,$$

so in particular (4.24).

We now turn to (2.23). We introduce the abbreviations

$$\begin{aligned} R_k &:= 2^k\sqrt{T}, \\ \Lambda_k &:= R_k^{-d}\int_{R_k\leq |x|\leq R_{k+1}} G_T^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

so that (4.23) and (4.24) turn into

$$\Lambda_0 \leq C \text{ and } \Lambda_{k+1} \leq C\frac{T}{R_k^2}\Lambda_k = C4^{-k}\Lambda_k,$$

where C denotes a constant depending only on α, β, and d. This yields by iteration

$$\Lambda_k \leq C^{k+1}\Pi_{i=0}^{k-1}4^{-i} = C^{k+1}4^{-\frac{(k-1)k}{2}} = C^{k+1}2^{-(k-1)k}.$$

Thus, for k large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln\Lambda_k &\leq (k+1)\ln C - k^2\ln 2 \sim -k^2 \\ &\sim -\ln^2(\sqrt{T}R_k^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\Lambda_k \lesssim \exp(-\ln^2(\sqrt{T}R_k^{-1}))$$

and for all $q > 0$,

$$\left(\frac{R_k}{\sqrt{T}}\right)^q \Lambda_k \lesssim \exp\big(-\ln(\sqrt{T}R_k^{-1})(\ln(\sqrt{T}R_k^{-1}) + q)\big) \lesssim 1$$

for $R_k \geq \sqrt{T}$ (note that the constant depends on q). This proves property (iii) of the Lemma.

Step 5. Modifications due to the discreteness.

The only place where we have used the Leibniz rule is the proof of the Cacciopoli inequality (4.7). At the discrete level, we have for $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_i(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1})(x) \\
&= \eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - \eta^2(x)G_T^{q-1}(x) \\
&= \frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta^2(x)}{2}(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - G_T^{q-1}(x)) \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)-\eta^2(x)}{2}(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) + G_T^{q-1}(x)). \qquad (4.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking advantage of the diagonal structure of A (although this is not essential), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1}) \cdot A\nabla G_T(x) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_i(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1})(x) a(x, x+\mathbf{e}_i)\nabla_i G_T(x) \\
&\overset{(4.25)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^d a(x, x+\mathbf{e}_i)\frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta^2(x)}{2}\underbrace{(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - G_T^{q-1}(x))\nabla_i G_T(x)}_{\geq 0} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^d a(x, x+\mathbf{e}_i)\frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)-\eta^2(x)}{2}(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) + G_T^{q-1}(x))\nabla_i G_T(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the underbraced term is non-negative, the lower and upper bounds on a yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1}) \cdot A\nabla G_T(x) \\
&\geq \alpha \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta^2(x)}{2}(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - G_T^{q-1}(x))\nabla_i G_T(x) \\
&\quad -\beta \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla_i \eta(x)| \frac{\eta(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta(x)}{2}(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) + G_T^{q-1}(x))|\nabla_i G_T(x)| \\
&\overset{\text{Young}}{\geq} \alpha \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta^2(x)}{2}(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - G_T^{q-1}(x))\nabla_i G_T(x) \\
&\quad -\beta C \sum_{i=1}^d (G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)^q + G_T(x)^q)|\nabla_i \eta(x)|^2 \\
&\quad -\beta C^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \underbrace{\left(\frac{\eta(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta(x)}{2}\right)^2}_{\leq \frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta^2(x)}{2}} (\nabla_i G_T(x))^2 (G_T^{q-2}(x+\mathbf{e}_i) + G_T^{q-2}(x)).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality (proved at the end of the step)

$$2(b^{q-1} - c^{q-1})(b-c) \;\geq\; (b-c)^2(b^{q-2} + c^{q-2}) \qquad \text{for } b, c \geq 0, q \geq 2, \qquad (4.26)$$

we may absorb the last term of the r. h. s. of the latter inequality into the first term for C large enough, so that it turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1})\cdot A\nabla G_T(x)\\
&\quad\geq\ (\alpha-2\beta C^{-1})\sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta^2(x)}{2}(G_T^{q-1}(x+\mathbf{e}_i)-G_T^{q-1}(x))\nabla_i G_T(x)\\
&\qquad-\beta C\sum_{i=1}^{d}(G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)^q+G_T(x)^q)|\nabla_i\eta(x)|^2. \qquad (4.27)
\end{aligned}$$

Using now the following inequality

$$(b^{q-1}-c^{q-1})(b-c)\ \gtrsim\ (b^{q/2}-c^{q/2})^2 \qquad \text{for } b,c\geq 0, q>1, \qquad (4.28)$$

(4.27) finally turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla(\eta^2\, G_T^{q-1})\cdot A\nabla G_T(x)\\
&\quad\gtrsim\ \sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{\eta^2(x+\mathbf{e}_i)+\eta^2(x)}{2}(G_T^{q/2}(x+\mathbf{e}_i)-G_T^{q/2}(x))^2\\
&\qquad-C\sum_{i=1}^{d}(G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)^q+G_T(x)^q)|\nabla_i\eta(x)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (4.9) yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\eta^2(x)|\nabla G_T^{q/2}(x)|^2\,dx\ \lesssim\ \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)^q+G_T(x)^q)|\nabla_i\eta(x)|^2\,dx,$$

which implies as desired

$$\int_{2R\leq|x|<4R}|\nabla G_T^{q/2}(x)|^2\,dx\ \lesssim\ R^{-2}\int_{R\leq|x|<8R}G_T(x)^q\,dx,$$

provided that η satisfies in addition

$$\eta(x)=0 \qquad \text{for } x\notin\{y: R+1\leq|y|\leq 8R-1\},$$

which is no restriction since $R\gg 1$.
We quickly sketch the proofs of (4.26) and (4.28) to conclude. Inequality (4.26) follows by symmetry from

$$\begin{aligned}
(b^{q-1}-c^{q-1})(b-c)-(b-c)^2c^{q-2}\ &=\ (b-c)(b^{q-1}-bc^{q-2})\\
&=\ b(b-c)(b^{q-2}-c^{q-2})\\
&=\ b|b-c||b^{q-2}-c^{q-2}|\ \geq\ 0.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove (4.28) we first note that by homogeneity and non-negativity of b and c, it is enough to consider $c=1$ and $b\geq 0$. We introduce the function $h=\mathbb{R}^+\to\mathbb{R}^+$ defined by

$$h(b)\ =\ \begin{cases}\dfrac{(b^{q/2}-1)^2}{(b^{q-1}-1)(b-1)} & b\neq 1,\\[2ex] \dfrac{q^2}{4(q-1)} & b=1.\end{cases}$$

Since $h \geq 0$, the claim is proved if h is bounded on $\mathbb{R}^+$. As $h(0) = 1$ and $\lim_{b\to\infty} h(b) = 1$, it is enough to prove that h is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^+$. A Taylor expansion around $b = 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} (b^{q/2} - 1)^2 &= \frac{q^2}{4}(b-1)^2 + o((b-1)^2), \\ (b^{q-1} - 1)(b-1) &= (q-1)(b-1)^2 + o((b-1)^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\lim_{b\to 1} h(b) = h(1)$, h is continuous and therefore bounded on $\mathbb{R}^+$, as desired.

4.2. **Proof of Lemma 9.** The proof relies on three ingredients: a Meyers' estimate, a Caccioppoli estimate and the estimates of Lemma 8.

Step 1: Meyers' estimate.
We follow the original proof by Meyers in [14]. Let $u : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the equation

$$\gamma u(x) - \nabla^* \cdot A(x)\nabla u(x) = \nabla^* \cdot g(x) + f(x) \qquad \text{for } |x| \leq R, \tag{4.29}$$

with $f \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, $g \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and some $\gamma \geq 0$ to be chosen later. We claim that there exists $p > 2$ depending only on α, β, and d such that for all $R \gg 1$, if u is such that $u(x) = 0$ for $|x| > R$, then the following L^p-estimate holds

$$\left(\int_{|x|\leq R} |\nabla u(x)|^p \, dx\right)^{1/p} \lesssim \left(\int_{|x|\leq R} |g(x)|^p \, dx\right)^{1/p} + R^{1-d(1/2-1/p)} \left(\int_{|x|\leq R} |f(x)|^2 \, dx\right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.30}$$

The proof of (4.30) relies on the L^q-regularity theory for the discrete Laplacian and on an interpolation result. More precisely, for all $1 < q < \infty$, there exists a constant $C_q > 0$ such that for all $R \geq 1$ and $\gamma \geq 0$, if $v : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function supported in the set $\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |x| \leq R\}$ such that

$$\gamma v(x) - \triangle v(x) = \nabla^* \cdot g(x) \qquad \text{for all } |x| \leq R, \tag{4.31}$$

then the following holds

$$\left(\int_{|x|\leq R} |\nabla v(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q} \leq C_q \left(\int_{|x|\leq R} |g(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q}. \tag{4.32}$$

Let $T_{\gamma,R} : L^q(\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \to L^q(\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{R}^d), g \mapsto \nabla v$, where v is associated with g through equation (4.31) and extended by zero on $\{|x| > R\}$. Estimate (4.32) shows that the linear mapping $T_{\gamma,R}$ is continuous for all $q > 1$ and that $\|T_{\gamma,R}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q(\mathbb{Z}^d,\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_q$. Let $q^* > 2$. Riesz-Thorin's interpolation theorem (see [1, Chapter 1]) then implies that for all $q = 2\theta + (1-\theta)q^*$, $\theta \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$C_q \leq C_2^\theta C_{q^*}^{1-\theta} = C_{q^*}^{1-\theta}, \tag{4.33}$$

since one can take $C_2 = 1$.

We now rewrite the l. h. s. of (4.29) as a perturbation of the operator $\gamma - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\triangle$:

$$\gamma u - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2} \triangle u = \nabla^* \cdot \left(g + (A - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathrm{Id})\nabla u\right) + f,$$

or equivalently in the form

$$\frac{2\gamma}{\alpha+\beta} u - \triangle u = \nabla^* \cdot \left(\frac{2}{\alpha+\beta}(g + (A - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathrm{Id})\nabla u)\right) + \frac{2}{\alpha+\beta} f.$$

Let us assume for now that $f \equiv 0$. The regularity estimate (4.32) then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla u(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q} \\
&\le \; C_q \frac{2}{\alpha+\beta}\left(\int_{|x|\le R} \left| g(x) + \left(A(x) - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathrm{Id}\right)\nabla u(x)\right|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q}. \qquad (4.34)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality (4.34) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla u(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q} \; &\le \; C_q \frac{2}{\alpha+\beta}\left(\int_{|x|\le R} |g(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q} \\
&\quad + C_q \frac{2}{\alpha+\beta}\left(\int_{|x|\le R} \left|\left(A(x) - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathrm{Id}\right)\nabla u(x)\right|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q}. \qquad (4.35)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\left|\left(A(x) - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathrm{Id}\right)\nabla u(x)\right| \le \frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}|\nabla u(x)|$ and we may absorb the term

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_q \frac{2}{\alpha+\beta}\left(\int_{|x|\le R} \left|\left(A(x) - \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathrm{Id}\right)\nabla u(x)\right|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q} \\
&\le \; C_q \frac{\beta-\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}\left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla u(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q}
\end{aligned}$$

into the l. h. s. of (4.35) provided that

$$C_q \underbrace{\frac{\beta-\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}_{<1} < 1. \qquad (4.36)$$

The interpolation property (4.33) ensures there exists $p > 2$ such that (4.36) holds for all $p \ge q \ge 2$.

It remains to argue that the case $f \not\equiv 0$ can be dealt with the same way as above. The L^q-regularity theory for the discrete Laplacian also ensures there exists $\tilde{C}_q > 0$ such that if $w \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is supported in the set $\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |x| \le R\}$ and

$$-\triangle w(x) = f(x) \qquad \text{for all } |x| \le R, \qquad (4.37)$$

then it holds that

$$\left(\int_{|x|\le R} |\nabla w(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{1/q} \; \le \; \tilde{C}_q R^{1-d(1/2-1/q)}\left(\int_{|x|\le R} |f(x)|^2 \, dx\right)^{1/2}. \qquad (4.38)$$

We then replace f by $-\nabla^* \cdot \nabla w$ in (4.29) to include this term in the function g. The combination of (4.35) with (4.38) concludes the proof of (4.30).

Step 2. Cacciopoli estimates.

In the following we will need

$$\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |\nabla G_T(x)|^2\,dx \lesssim R^{-2}\int_{R\le|x|\le 32R} G_T(x)^2\,dx, \tag{4.39}$$

$$\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |\nabla G_T(x)|^2\,dx \lesssim R^{-2}\int_{R\le|x|\le 32R} |G_T(x)-\overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}}|^2\,dx, \tag{4.40}$$

which are both consequences of the general Cacciopoli estimate (4.7) for $q=2$ derived in the proof of Lemma 8.

Step 3. Proof of (2.25).
We apply Meyers' estimate (4.30) with $\gamma = T^{-1}$ to the function $u=\eta G_T$, where $\eta:\mathbb{Z}^2\to[0,1]$ is such that

$$\eta(x)=1 \text{ for } 4R\le|x|\le 8R,\quad \eta(x)=0 \text{ for } \begin{cases} |x|\le 2R+1\\ |x|\ge 16R-1\end{cases},\quad |\nabla\eta|\lesssim R^{-1}. \tag{4.41}$$

The discrete Leibniz rule yields $\nabla_i u(x) = \eta(x)\nabla_i G_T(x) + G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)\nabla_i\eta(x)$ for $i\in\{1,\dots,d\}$. Hence, since $A(x)$ is diagonal, we may define f and g as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&T^{-1}u(x) - \nabla^*\cdot A\nabla u(x)\\
&= T^{-1}\eta(x)G_T(x) - \underbrace{\eta(x)\nabla^*\cdot A\nabla G_T(x)}_{\overset{(4.41)\&(2.11)}{=}\ \eta(x)T^{-1}G_T(x)} - \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_i^*\eta(x)a(x-\mathbf{e}_i,x)\nabla_i^* G_T(x)\\
&\quad -\sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_i^*\big(G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)a(x+\mathbf{e}_i,x)\nabla_i\eta(x)\big)\\
&= \nabla^*\cdot\underbrace{\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^d G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)a(x+\mathbf{e}_i,x)\nabla_i\eta(x)\mathbf{e}_i\Big)}_{:=g(x)} + \underbrace{\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_i^*\eta(x)a(x-\mathbf{e}_i,x)\nabla_i^*G_T(x)\Big)}_{:=f(x)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate (4.30) then yields using (4.41)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_{|x|\le 16R}|\nabla u(x)|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} &\lesssim \left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} R^{-p}G_T(x)^p\,dx\right)^{1/p}\\
&\quad + R^{1-d(1/2-1/p)}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} R^{-2}|\nabla G_T(x)|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

Using the Cacciopoli estimate (4.39) and property (2.21) once with exponent p and once with exponent 2, (4.42) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{|x|\le 16R}|\nabla u(x)|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p}\\
&\lesssim R^{-1}(R^{d+(2-d)p})^{1/p} + R^{1-d(1/2-1/p)}R^{-1}(R^{-2}R^{d+(2-d)2})^{1/2}\\
&\sim R^{d/p-d+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

For $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$, the discrete Leibniz rule yields $\nabla_i u(x) = \eta(x)\nabla_i G_T(x) + G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)\nabla_i\eta(x)$. Hence (4.41) implies that $\nabla u(x) = \nabla G_T(x)$ for $4R \le |x| \le 8R$, so that (4.43) yields (2.25).

Step 4. Proof of (2.24).
We apply Meyers' estimate (4.30) with $\gamma = 0$ to the function $u = \eta(G_T - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}})$, where $\eta : \mathbb{Z}^d \to [0,1]$ is as in (4.41). For all $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$, the discrete Leibniz rule yields $\nabla_i u(x) = (G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}})\nabla_i\eta(x) + \eta(x)\nabla_i G_T(x)$. Hence the functions f and g are now defined via

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\nabla^*\cdot A\nabla u(x)\\
&= - \underbrace{\eta(x)\nabla^*\cdot A\nabla G_T(x)}_{\overset{(4.41)\&(2.11)}{=}\ \eta(x)T^{-1}G_T(x)} - \sum_{i=1}^{2}\nabla_i^*\eta(x)a(x-\mathbf{e}_i,x)\nabla_i^* G_T(x)\\
&\quad -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\nabla_i^*\big((G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)-\overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}})a(x,x+\mathbf{e}_i)\nabla_i\eta(x)\big)\\
&= \nabla^*\cdot\underbrace{\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^{2}(G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)-\overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}})a(x,x+\mathbf{e}_i)\nabla_i\eta(x)\mathbf{e}_i\Big)}_{:=g(x)}\\
&\quad +\underbrace{\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^{2}\nabla_i^*\eta(x)a(x-\mathbf{e}_i,x)\nabla_i^*G_T(x)-\eta(x)T^{-1}G_T(x)\Big)}_{:=f(x)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since u has support in $\{|x| \le 16R\}$, we may apply estimate (4.30) which yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{|x|\le 16R} |\nabla u(x)|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_i\eta(x)|^p |G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i) - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}}|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \\
&\quad + R^{1-2(1/2-1/p)}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (|\nabla^*\eta(x)|^2|\nabla^* G_T(x)|^2 + T^{-2}\eta(x)^2 G_T(x)^2)\,dx\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_i^*\eta(x)|^p |G_T(x) - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}}|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \\
&\quad + R^{2/p}\left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (|\nabla\eta(x)|^2|\nabla G_T(x)|^2 + T^{-2}\eta(x)^2 G_T(x)^2)\,dx\right)^{1/2} \\
&\overset{(4.41)}{\lesssim} R^{-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |G_T(x) - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}}|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \\
&\quad + R^{2/p}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} (R^{-2}|\nabla G_T(x)|^2 + T^{-2}G_T(x)^2)\,dx\right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim R^{-1}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |G_T(x) - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}}|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \\
&\quad + R^{2/p-1}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |\nabla G_T(x)|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} + R^{2/p}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} T^{-2}G_T(x)^2\,dx\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.44}
$$

We distinguish two regimes: $R \le \sqrt{T}$ and $R \ge \sqrt{T}$. For $R \le \sqrt{T}$, we bound the first term of the r. h. s. of (4.44) using the BMO estimate (2.20) of Lemma 8, and for the second term we use the Cacciopoli estimate (4.40) together with the BMO estimate (2.20), so that (4.44) turns into

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{|x|\le 16R} |\nabla u(x)|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \\
&\lesssim R^{-1}(R^2)^{1/p} + R^{2/p-1}(R^{-2}R^2)^{1/2} + R^{2/p}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} T^{-2}G_T(x)^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} \\
&= 2R^{2/p-1} + R^{2/p}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} T^{-2}G_T(x)^2\,dx\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.45}
$$

We then appeal to the estimate (2.22) of Lemma 8, which yields

$$\int_{|x|\le 16R} T^{-2}G_T(x)^2\,dx \;\le\; T^{-2}\int_{|x|\le 16\sqrt{T}} G_T(x)^2\,dx \;\overset{(2.22)}{\lesssim}\; T^{-2}\sqrt{T}^2 = T^{-1} \le R^{-2}. \quad (4.46)$$

For $R \ge \sqrt{T}$, we treat all the terms of inequality (4.44) separately. Note that the estimates hereafter are not optimal. Indeed, since the leading order contribution among terms of the form (2.24) is for R small, we do not need finer estimates for $R \ge \sqrt{T}$. We use the $\ell^p - \ell^2$ estimate together with the decay estimate (2.23) with exponent 2. This yields for the first term in (4.44)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |G_T(x) - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}}|^p\,dx \\
&\quad\lesssim \int_{R\le|x|\le 32R} G_T(x)^p\,dx \\
&\quad\overset{\ell^p-\ell^2}{\le} \left(\int_{R\le|x|\le 32R} G_T(x)^2\,dx\right)^{p/2} \\
&\quad\overset{(2.23)}{\lesssim} (\sqrt{T}R^{-1})^p,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$R^{-1}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |G_T(x) - \overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}}|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \lesssim R^{-1}\sqrt{T}R^{-1} \;\le\; R^{2/p-1}\sqrt{T}R^{-1}. \quad (4.47)$$

For the second term in (4.44) we use the decay estimate (2.23) with exponent 2, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |\nabla G_T(x)|^2\,dx \quad &\lesssim \quad \int_{R\le|x|\le 32R} G_T(x)^2\,dx \\
&\overset{(2.23)}{\lesssim} \quad (\sqrt{T}R^{-1})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$R^{2/p-1}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} |\nabla G_T(x)|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} \quad\lesssim\quad R^{2/p-1}\sqrt{T}R^{-1}. \quad (4.48)$$

For the last term in (4.44), we use the decay estimate (2.23) with exponent 4 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&R^{2/p}\left(\int_{2R\le|x|\le 16R} T^{-2}G_T(x)^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad\lesssim\; R^{2/p}T^{-1}(\sqrt{T}R^{-1})^2 = (R^{2/p-1}\sqrt{T}R^{-1})T^{-1/2} \le R^{2/p-1}\sqrt{T}R^{-1}. \quad (4.49)
\end{aligned}$$

The combination of (4.44) with (4.45) and (4.46) for $R \le \sqrt{T}$, and with (4.47), (4.48), and (4.49) for $R \ge \sqrt{T}$ finally proves

$$\int_{|x|\le 16R} |\nabla u(x)|^p\,dx \quad\lesssim\quad R^{2-p}\min\{1, \sqrt{T}R^{-1}\}^p. \quad (4.50)$$

We conclude as in Step 3: Since $\nabla_i u(x) = (G_T(x+\mathbf{e}_i)-\overline{G}_{T\{R\le|x|\le 32R\}})\nabla_i\eta(x)+\eta(x)\nabla_i G_T(x)$, (4.41) implies $\nabla u(x) = \nabla G_T(x)$ for $4R \le |x| \le 8R$, so that (4.50) yields (2.24).

4.3. **Proof of Corollaries 1 and 2.** These results are easy consequences of Lemmas 8 and 9. We include their proofs for convenience.

4.3.1. *Proof of Corollary 1.* W. l. o. g. we assume $y = 0$ and skip the dependence on y in the notation. We distinguish two regimes: $|x| \le \sqrt{T}$ and $|x| \ge \sqrt{T}$.
In the first case, we use (2.22) and the intermediate results (4.4) in the proof of Lemma 8, which yield

$$\text{for } d = 2: \quad \int_{|x|\le\sqrt{T}} G_T^2(x)\,dx \lesssim T,$$
$$\text{for } d > 2: \quad \int_{|x|\le\sqrt{T}} G_T^q(x)\,dx \lesssim \sqrt{T}^d(\sqrt{T}^{2-d})^q,$$

and imply for $q = \frac{d-1}{d-2} \in (1, \frac{d}{d-2})$ by the $\ell^\infty - \ell^2$ estimate

$$G_T(x) \lesssim \sqrt{T} \qquad \text{for } |x| \le \sqrt{T}. \tag{4.51}$$

For $|x| \ge \sqrt{T}$, we use the decay estimate (2.23) of Lemma 8 in the form

$$\int_{R\le|x|\le 2R} G_T^2(x)\,dx \lesssim (\sqrt{T}R^{-1})^{2d+1}$$

so that we may deduce

$$G_T(x) \lesssim (\sqrt{T}R^{-1})^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \qquad \text{for } R \le |x| \le 2R. \tag{4.52}$$

We then define $h_T \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$h_T(x) \sim \begin{cases} 2^{-k(d+\frac{1}{2})}, & \sqrt{T}2^k \le |x| \le \sqrt{T}2^{k+1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \sqrt{T} & |x| \le \sqrt{T}, \end{cases}$$

so that $G_T(x) \le h_T(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This concludes the proof since the factors in (4.51) and (4.52) only depend on α, β, and d.

4.3.2. *Proof of Corollary 2.* W. l. o. g. we assume $y = 0$ and skip the dependence on y in the notation. Let $R \sim 1$ be sufficiently large so that Lemma 9 applies. For $q = 2$, formulas (2.24) and (2.25) yield for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\int_{2^kR\le|x|\le 2^{k+1}R} |\nabla_x G_T(x)|^2\,dx \lesssim (2^kR)^d((2^kR)^{1-d})^2 = (2^kR)^{2-d} \overset{d\ge 2}{\lesssim} 1.$$

Hence, by the $\ell^\infty - \ell^2$ estimate, this shows

$$|\nabla_x G_T(x)| \lesssim 1 \qquad \text{for } |x| \ge R. \tag{4.53}$$

We now deal with $|x| \le R$, for which we use an a priori estimate. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ be fixed. We set $u(x) := G_T(x + \mathbf{e}_i) - G_T(x) = \nabla_i G_T(x)$. This function solves the equation

$$T^{-1}u - \nabla^* \cdot A\nabla u = \delta(\mathbf{e}_i - \cdot) - \delta(\cdot) \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{4.54}$$

The weak formulation of (4.54) with test-function $v \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ reads

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} T^{-1}(uv)(x)\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla v \cdot A\nabla u)(x)\,dx = v(\mathbf{e}_i) - v(0).$$

Let us now decompose u in two parts:

$$u = \overline{u} + \underline{u},$$

where $\overline{u}$ and $\underline{u}$ are defined via

$$\overline{u}(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} u(x) & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{|x| \le R\} \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \{|x| \le R\} \end{array} \right. , \quad \underline{u}(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{|x| \le R\} \\ u(x) & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \{|x| \le R\} \end{array} \right. . \tag{4.55}$$

Inserting this decomposition into the weak formulation yields the following equation for $\underline{u}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} T^{-1}(\underline{u}v)(x)\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla v \cdot A\nabla \underline{u})(x)\,dx \\ &\quad = v(\mathbf{e}_i) - v(0) - \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} T^{-1}(\overline{u}v)(x)\,dx - \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla v \cdot A \nabla \overline{u})(x)\,dx. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $v = \underline{u}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} T^{-1}\underline{u}(x)^2\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla \underline{u} \cdot A\nabla \underline{u})(x)\,dx \\ &\quad = \underline{u}(\mathbf{e}_i) - \underline{u}(0) - \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} T^{-1}(\overline{u}\underline{u})(x)\,dx - \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla \underline{u} \cdot A\nabla \overline{u})(x)\,dx \\ &\quad \overset{(4.55)}{=} \underline{u}(\mathbf{e}_i) - \underline{u}(0) - \int_{\{|x|\le R+1\}\setminus\{|x|\le R-1\}} (\nabla \underline{u} \cdot A\nabla \overline{u})(x)\,dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.56}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality,

$$|\underline{u}(\mathbf{e}_i) - \underline{u}(0)| \le \int_{\{|x|\le 1\}} |\nabla \underline{u}(x)|\,dx \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \underline{u}(x)|^2\,dx \right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.57}$$

Inserting (4.57) into (4.56), using ellipticity and boundedness of A and Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \underline{u}(x)|^2\,dx &\lesssim 1 + \int_{\{|x|\le R+1\}\setminus\{|x|\le R-1\}} |\nabla \overline{u}(x)|^2\,dx \\ &\lesssim 1 + \int_{\{|x|\le R+2\}\setminus\{|x|\le R-2\}} |\overline{u}(x)|^2\,dx \\ &\overset{(4.53)}{\lesssim} 1 \end{aligned}$$

since despite the fact that R has to be chosen sufficiently large so that Lemma 9 is applicable, it is of order 1. Since $\underline{u}$ vanishes on $\{|x| \ge R\}$ we may use Poincaré's inequality on $\{|x| \le R\}$ to get

$$\int_{\{|x|\le R\}} |\underline{u}(x)|^2\,dx \lesssim 1.$$

This implies by the $\ell^\infty - \ell^2$ estimate

$$\sup_{\{|x|\le R\}} |\underline{u}| \lesssim 1.$$

Recalling that $u(x) = \nabla_i G_T(x,0)$, this concludes the proof of the corollary.

4.4. **Proof of Lemma 3.** W. l. o. g. we may assume

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \sup_{a_i} \left| \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i} \right|^2 \right\rangle \;<\; \infty. \tag{4.58}$$

Let X_n denote the expected value of X conditioned on $a_1, \cdots, a_n$, that is

$$X_n(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \;=\; \langle X \,|\, a_1, \cdots, a_n \rangle.$$

We will establish the following two inequalities for $n < \tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\langle X_n^2 \rangle - \langle X_n \rangle^2 \;\le\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\langle \sup_{a_i} \left| \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i} \right|^2 \right\rangle \mathrm{var}\,[a_1]\,, \tag{4.59}$$

$$\langle (X_{\tilde{n}} - X_n)^2 \rangle \;\le\; \sum_{i=n+1}^{\tilde{n}} \left\langle \sup_{a_i} \left| \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i} \right|^2 \right\rangle \mathrm{var}\,[a_1]\,. \tag{4.60}$$

Before proving (4.59) & (4.60), we draw the conclusion. There is a slight technical difficulty due to the fact that there are infinitely many random variables.

From (4.60) and (4.58) we learn that $\{X_n\}_{n\uparrow\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in L^2 w. r. t. probability. Hence there exists a square integrable function $\tilde{X}$ of a such that

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \langle (\tilde{X} - X_n)^2 \rangle \;=\; 0. \tag{4.61}$$

By construction of X_n, (4.61) implies

$$\langle \tilde{X} \,|\, a_1, \cdots, a_n \rangle \;=\; \langle X \,|\, a_1, \cdots, a_n \rangle \quad \text{for a. e. } (a_1, \cdots, a_n) \text{ and all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This means that the random variables X and $\tilde{X}$ agree on all measurable finite rectangular cylindrical sets, i. e. measurable sets of the form $A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n \times \mathbb{R} \times \cdots$, where n is finite. Since these sets are stable under intersection and generate the entire σ-algebra of measurable sets, the random variables X and $\tilde{X}$ are uniquely determined by their value on these sets [9, Satz 14.12]. Hence the two random variables coincide, yielding

$$\tilde{X} \;=\; X \quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{4.62}$$

From (4.59), (4.61) & (4.62) we obtain in the limit $n \uparrow \infty$ as desired

$$\mathrm{var}\,[X] \;=\; \langle X^2 \rangle - \langle X \rangle^2 \;\le\; \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \sup_{a_i} \left| \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i} \right|^2 \right\rangle \mathrm{var}\,[a_1]\,.$$

We now turn to (4.59) & (4.60). Notice that we have the decomposition

$$\langle X_n^2 \rangle - \langle X_n \rangle^2 \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\langle X_i^2 \rangle - \langle X_{i-1}^2 \rangle \right),$$

where we have set $X_0 :\equiv \langle X \rangle$ so that $\langle X_n \rangle^2 = \langle X_0^2 \rangle$. Hence (4.59) reduces to

$$\langle X_i^2 \rangle - \langle X_{i-1}^2 \rangle \;\le\; \left\langle \sup_{a_i} \left| \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i} \right|^2 \right\rangle \mathrm{var}\,[a_1]\,. \tag{4.63}$$

Likewise,

$$\langle (X_{\tilde{n}} - X_n)^2 \rangle \;=\; \langle X_{\tilde{n}}^2 \rangle - \langle X_n^2 \rangle \;=\; \sum_{i=n+1}^{\tilde{n}} \left(\langle X_i^2 \rangle - \langle X_{i-1}^2 \rangle \right),$$

so that also (4.60) reduces to (4.63).

We finally turn to (4.63). We note that by our assumption that $\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ are i. i. d., we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_i^2(a_1,\cdots,a_i)\rangle &= \left\langle \int X_i^2(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i')\,\beta(da_i')\right\rangle, \\ X_{i-1}(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1}) &= \int X_i(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i'')\,\beta(da_i''), \end{aligned}$$

where β denotes the distribution of a_1. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle X_i^2\rangle - \langle X_{i-1}^2\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \int X_i^2(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i')\,\beta(da_i') - \left(\int X_i(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i'')\,\beta(da_i'')\right)^2\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \int\int \tfrac{1}{2}\left(X_i(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i') - X_i(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i'')\right)^2 \beta(da_i')\,\beta(da_i'')\right\rangle \\ &\le \left\langle \int\int \sup_{a_i'''}\left|\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial a_i}(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i''')\right|^2 \tfrac{1}{2}\,(a_i'-a_i'')^2\,\beta(da_i')\,\beta(da_i'')\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \sup_{a_i'''}\left|\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial a_i}(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i''')\right|^2\right\rangle \left(\int (a_i')^2\,\beta(da_i') - \left(\int a_i''\,\beta(da_i'')\right)^2\right) \\ &= \left\langle \sup_{a_i'''}\left|\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial a_i}(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i''')\right|^2\right\rangle \operatorname{var}[a_1]. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by noting that by the definition of X_i and Jensen's inequality

$$\left|\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial a_i}(a_1,\cdots,a_i)\right|^2 = \left|\left\langle \frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i}\,\Big|\,a_1,\cdots,a_i\right\rangle\right|^2 \le \left\langle \left|\frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i}\right|^2\,\Big|\,a_1,\cdots,a_i\right\rangle,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \sup_{a_i'}\left|\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial a_i}(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i')\right|^2\right\rangle \\ &\quad\le \left\langle\left\langle \sup_{a_i'}\left|\frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i}(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i',a_{i+1},\cdots)\right|^2\,\Big|\,a_1,\cdots,a_i\right\rangle\right\rangle \\ &\quad= \left\langle \sup_{a_i'}\left|\frac{\partial X}{\partial a_i}(a_1,\cdots,a_{i-1},a_i',a_{i+1},\cdots)\right|^2\right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

4.5. **Proof of Lemma 6.** We first prove the claim for G_T and deduce the result for ϕ_T appealing to an integral representation using the Green's function.

Step 1. Properties of G_T.

The product topology is the topology of componentwise convergence. Hence we consider an arbitrary sequence $\{a_\nu\}_{\nu\uparrow\infty}\subset\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ of coefficients such that

$$\lim_{\nu\uparrow\infty} a_\nu(e) = a(e) \quad \text{for all edges } e. \tag{4.64}$$

Fix $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$; by the uniform bounds on $G_T(\cdot, y; a_\nu)$ from Corollary 1, we can select a subsequence ν' such that

$$u_T(x) \;:=\; \lim_{\nu'\uparrow\infty} G_T(x, y; a_{\nu'}) \quad \text{exists for all } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{4.65}$$

It remains to argue that $u_T(x) = G_T(x, y; a)$. Because of (4.64) and (4.65), we can pass to the limit in $(T^{-1}G_T(\cdot, y; a_{\nu'}) + L_{a_{\nu'}} G_T(\cdot, y; a_{\nu'}))(x) = \delta(x - y)$ to obtain

$$(T^{-1}u_T + L_a\, u_T)(x) \;=\; \delta(x - y) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{4.66}$$

Moreover, the uniform decay of $G_T(\cdot, y; a_\nu)$ from Corollary 1 is preserved in the limit, so that $u_T \in L^1(\mathbb{Z}^d) \subset L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Note that Riesz's representation theorem on $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ yields uniqueness for the solution of (4.66) in $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Hence we conclude as desired that $u_T(\cdot) = G_T(\cdot, y; a)$. Borel measurability of $G_T(x, y; \cdot)$ in the sense of Lemma 3 follows from continuity w. r. t. the product topology, cf. [9, Satz 14.8].

Step 2. Properties of ϕ_T.
Corollary 1 ensures that $G_T(x, \cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and one may then define a function $\tilde\phi_T$ by

$$\tilde\phi_T(x) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} G_T(x, y)\nabla^* \cdot (A(y)\xi_i)\, dy. \tag{4.67}$$

Since $G_T(\cdot + z, \cdot + z)$ has the same law as $G_T(\cdot, \cdot)$ by uniqueness of the Green's function and stationarity of the coefficient A, $\tilde\phi_T(\cdot + z)$ has the same law as $\tilde\phi_T$. This shows that $\tilde\phi_T$ is stationary. In addition, $\tilde\phi_T$ is a solution of (2.3) by construction. Hence, by the uniqueness of stationary solutions of (2.3), $\tilde\phi_T = \phi_T$ almost surely, so that by the measurability properties we may assume $\tilde\phi_T \equiv \phi_T$.
Introducing for $R \geq 1$

$$\phi_{T,R}(x) := \int_{|y|\leq R} G_T(x, y)\nabla^* \cdot (A(y)\xi_i)\, dy,$$

one may rewrite (4.67) as

$$\phi_T(x) = \lim_{R\to\infty} \phi_{T,R}(x). \tag{4.68}$$

From Step 1, $\phi_{T,R}(x)$ is a continuous function of a since $G_T(x, y)$ is and the formula for $\phi_{T,R}(x)$ involves only a *finite* number of operations. Note that Corollary 1 implies that

$$\lim_{R\uparrow\infty} \sup_{a\in\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta}} \int_{|y|>R} G_T(x, y; a)\, dy \;=\; 0.$$

Hence the convergence in (4.68) is uniform in a and the continuity of $\phi_{T,R}$ in a is preserved at the limit. Therefore, ϕ_T (and continuous functions thereof) are continuous with respect to the product topology, and hence Borel measurable.

4.6. **Proof of Lemma 5.** Let us divide the proof in four steps.

Step 1. Proof of (2.15).
We recall the definition of the operator

$$(Lu)(x) = \sum_{x', |x'-x|=1} a(x, x')(u(x) - u(x')).$$

For convenience, we set $e = [z, z']$, $z' = z + \mathbf{e}_i$. We recall that $G_T(\cdot, y)$, $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is defined via

$$(T^{-1} + L)G_T(\cdot, y)(x) = \delta(x - y), \qquad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{4.69}$$

Hence we obtain by differentiating (4.69)

$$\left((T^{-1} + L)\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}G_T(\cdot, y)\right)(x) + (G_T(z, y) - G_T(z', y))\delta(x - z) \\ +(G_T(z', y) - G_T(z, y))\delta(x - z') = 0,$$

which, in view of (4.69), can be rewritten as

$$(T^{-1} + L)\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}G_T(\cdot, y) + (G_T(z, y) - G_T(z', y))G_T(\cdot, z) \\ +(G_T(z', y) - G_T(z, y))G_T(\cdot, z')\Big) \equiv 0. \tag{4.70}$$

From this, we would like to conclude

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}G_T(\cdot, y) + (G_T(z, y) - G_T(z', y))G_T(\cdot, z) + (G_T(z', y) - G_T(z, y))G_T(\cdot, z') \equiv 0, \tag{4.71}$$

which is nothing but (2.15).

In order to draw this conclusion, we will appeal to the following uniqueness result in $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$: Any $u \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ which satisfies $((T^{-1} + L)u)(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ vanishes identically. However, we cannot apply this directly to u given by the l. h. s. of (4.71), since we do not know a priori that $\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}G_T(\cdot, y)$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

For that purpose, we replace the derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}$ by the difference quotient. We thus fix a step size $h \neq 0$ and introduce the abbreviations

$$G_T(x, y) \ := \ G_T(x, y; a) \quad \text{and} \quad G'_T(x, y) \ := \ G_T(x, y, a'),$$

where the coefficients a' are defined by modifying a only at edge e by the increment h, i. e.

$$a'(e) \ = \ a(e) + h \quad \text{and} \quad a'(e') \ = \ a(e') \quad \text{for all } e' \neq e.$$

We further denote by $L_T := T + L_a$ and $L'_T := T + L_{a'}$ the operators with coefficients a and a', respectively. We mimic the derivation of (4.70) on the discrete level: From (4.69) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \ &= \ \frac{1}{h}\big(L_T G_T(\cdot, y) - L'_T G'_T(\cdot, y)\big) \\
&= \ L_T\frac{1}{h}\big(G_T(\cdot, y) - G'_T(\cdot, y)\big) + \frac{1}{h}(L_T - L'_T)G'_T(\cdot, y) \\
&= \ L_T\frac{1}{h}\big(G_T(\cdot, y) - G'_T(\cdot, y)\big) \\
&\quad + (G'_T(z, y) - G'_T(z', y))\,\delta(\cdot - z) + (G'_T(z', y) - G'_T(z, y))\,\delta(\cdot - z') \\
&= \ L_T\Big(\frac{1}{h}\big(G_T(\cdot, y) - G'_T(\cdot, y)\big) \\
&\quad + (G'_T(z, y) - G'_T(z', y))\,G_T(\cdot, z) + (G'_T(z', y) - G'_T(z, y))\,G_T(\cdot, z')\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Since for fixed $h \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_h \;:\equiv\; & \frac{1}{h}\big(G_T(\cdot,y) - G'_T(\cdot,y)\big) \\ + \;\; & (G'_T(z,y) - G'_T(z',y))\, G_T(\cdot,z) + (G'_T(z',y) - G'_T(z,y))\, G_T(\cdot,z') \end{aligned}$$

does inherit the integrability properties of $G_T(\cdot,y)$ and $G'_T(\cdot,y)$ from Corollary 1, we now may conclude that $u_h \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and therefore $u_h \equiv 0$, i. e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{h}\big(G_T(x,y) - G'_T(x,y)\big) \\ & \quad + \;\; (G'_T(z,y) - G'_T(z',y))\, G_T(x,z) + (G'_T(z',y) - G'_T(z,y))\, G_T(x,z') \;=\; 0 \end{aligned}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Since by Lemma 6, $G_T(x,y;\cdot)$ is continuous in $a(e)$, we learn that $G_T(x,y;\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable w. r. t. $a(e)$ and that (2.15) holds.

We set for abbreviation

$$\begin{aligned} G_T(x,e) &:= G_T(x,z) - G_T(x,z'), \\ G_T(e,y) &:= G_T(z,y) - G_T(z',y), \\ G_T(e,e) &:= G_T(z,z) + G_T(z',z') - G_T(z,z') - G_T(z',z). \end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

Step 2. Proof of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} G_T(x,e) \;&=\; -G_T(e,e) G_T(x,e), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} G_T(e,y) \;&=\; -G_T(e,e) G_T(e,y). \end{aligned} \tag{4.73}$$

This is a consequence of (2.15) for $y = z, z'$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)}\big(G_T(x,z) - G_T(x,z')\big) \\ & \quad = \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} G_T(x,z) - \frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} G_T(x,z') \\ & \quad \overset{(2.15)}{=} \quad -\big(G_T(x,z) - G_T(x,z')\big)\big(G_T(z,z) - G_T(z',z)\big) \\ & \qquad\qquad +\big(G_T(x,z) - G_T(x,z')\big)\big(G_T(z,z') - G_T(z',z')\big) \\ & \quad = \quad -\big(G_T(z,z) + G_T(z',z') - G_T(z,z') - G_T(z,z')\big)\,\big(G_T(x,z) - G_T(x,z')\big), \end{aligned}$$

and for $x = z, z'$, respectively.

Step 3. Conclusion.
Note that Corollary 2 implies

$$|G_T(e,e)| \lesssim 1. \tag{4.74}$$

The combination of (4.73) with (4.74) yields

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} G_T(x,e)\right| \lesssim |G_T(x,e)|, \qquad \left|\frac{\partial}{\partial a(e)} G_T(e,y)\right| \lesssim |G_T(e,y)|.$$

Since $a(e)$ is bounded, this also yields

$$\sup_{a(e)} |G_T(x,e)| \sim |G_T(x,e)|, \qquad \sup_{a(e)} |G_T(e,y)| \sim |G_T(e,y)|,$$

which is nothing but (2.16).

4.7. **Proof of Lemma 7.** We first sketch the proof in the continuous case, that is, with $\mathbb{Z}^d$ replaced by $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Step 1. Continuous version.
Starting point is the defining equation (2.3) of the corrector ϕ_T in its continuous version, i. e.

$$T^{-1}\phi_T - \nabla\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi) \;=\; 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4.75}$$

We multiply (4.75) with ϕ_T^{n+1} and obtain by Leibniz' rule:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \;&=\; T^{-1}\phi_T^{n+2} + (-\nabla\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi))\;\phi_T^{n+1} \\
&=\; T^{-1}\phi_T^{n+2} - \nabla\cdot(\phi_T^{n+1}\,A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)) \;+\; \nabla\phi_T^{n+1}\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi) \\
&=\; T^{-1}\phi_T^{n+2} - \nabla\cdot(\phi_T^{n+1}\,A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)) \;+\; (n+1)\,\phi_T^{n}\,\nabla\phi_T\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.76}$$

We then take the expected value. Since the random fields A and ϕ_T are stationary, and thus also $\phi_T^{n+1}\,A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)$, we obtain

$$\left\langle T^{-1}\phi_T^{n+2}\right\rangle + (n+1)\,\langle\phi_T^{n}\,\nabla\phi_T\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\rangle \;=\; 0,$$

and therefore

$$\langle\phi_T^{n}\,\nabla\phi_T\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)\rangle \;\le\; 0$$

since $n+2$ is even. By the uniform ellipticity of A and since $\phi_T^n\geq 0$ (n is even) and $|\xi|=1$, this yields the estimate

$$\langle\phi_T^n|\nabla\phi_T|^2\rangle \;\lesssim\; \langle\phi_T^n|\nabla\phi_T|\rangle.$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality in probability on the r. h. s. of this inequality yields the continuum version of (2.17), that is,

$$\langle\phi_T^n|\nabla\phi_T|^2\rangle \;\lesssim\; \langle\phi_T^n\rangle.$$

We now turn to our discrete case.

Step 2. Discrete version.
We need a discrete version of the Leibniz rule $\nabla\cdot(fg) \;=\; f\,\nabla\cdot g+\nabla f\cdot g$ used in (4.76). Let $f\in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $g\in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{Z}^d,\mathbb{R}^d)$, then this formula is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^*\cdot(fg)(z) \;&=\; \sum_{j=1}^d \big(f(z)[g(z)]_j - f(z-\mathbf{e}_j)[g(z-\mathbf{e}_j)]_j\big) \\
&=\; f(z)\nabla^*\cdot g(z) + \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla_j^* f(z)[g(z-\mathbf{e}_j)]_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.77}$$

We also need a substitute for the identity $\nabla\phi_T^{n+1}=(n+1)\phi_T^n\,\nabla\phi_T$ used in (4.76). This substitute is provided by the two calculus estimates

$$(\tilde\phi^{n+1}-\phi^{n+1})\,(\tilde\phi-\phi) \;\gtrsim\; (\tilde\phi^n+\phi^n)\,(\tilde\phi-\phi)^2, \tag{4.78}$$

$$|\tilde\phi^{n+1}-\phi^{n+1}| \;\lesssim\; (\tilde\phi^n+\phi^n)\,|\tilde\phi-\phi|. \tag{4.79}$$

For the convenience of the reader, we sketch their proof: By the well-known formula for $\tilde\phi^{n+1}-\phi^{n+1}$, they are equivalent to

$$\sum_{m=0}^{n}\phi^m\,\tilde\phi^{n-m}\quad\sim\quad\tilde\phi^n+\phi^n.$$

By homogeneity, we may assume $\tilde\phi=1$, so that the above turns into

$$\sum_{m=0}^{n}\phi^m\;\sim\;1+\phi^n.$$

The upper estimate is obvious by Hölder's inequality since n is even. Also for the lower bound, we use the evenness of n to rearrange the sum as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m=0}^{n}\phi^m\;&=\;\tfrac12 1\;+\;\tfrac12(1+2\phi+\phi^2)\;+\;\tfrac12\phi^2(1+2\phi+\phi^2)\;+\;\cdots\\&\quad+\tfrac12\phi^{n-2}(1+2\phi+\phi^2)\;+\;\tfrac12\phi^n\\&\ge\;\tfrac12(1+\phi^n).\end{aligned}$$

After these motivations and preparations, we turn to the proof of Lemma 7 proper. With $f(z):=\phi_T^{n+1}(z)$ and $g(z):=A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)(z)$, (4.77) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla^*\cdot\big(\phi_T^{n+1}(z)A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)(z)\big)\\&=\;\phi_T^{n+1}(z)\nabla^*\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)(z)+\sum_{j=1}^{d}\nabla_j^*\phi_T^{n+1}(z)\;\underbrace{[A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)(z-\mathbf{e}_j)]_j}_{\substack{=\;a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)(\nabla_j\phi_T(z-\mathbf{e}_j)+\xi_j)\\=\;a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)(\nabla_j^*\phi_T(z)+\xi_j).}}\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}-\phi_T^{n+1}(z)\nabla^*\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)(z)\quad&=\quad\sum_{j=1}^{d}\nabla_j^*\phi_T^{n+1}(z)a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)(\nabla_j^*\phi_T(z)+\xi_j)\\&\quad-\nabla^*\cdot\big(\phi_T^{n+1}(z)A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)(z)\big).\end{aligned}\tag{4.80}$$

Multiplying (2.3) with $\phi_T^{n+1}(z)$ and using (4.80) emulate (4.76) and yield

$$\begin{aligned}0\;&=\;T^{-1}\phi_T^{n+2}(z)-\nabla^*\cdot\big(\phi_T^{n+1}(z)A(\nabla\phi_T+\xi)(z)\big)\\&\quad+\sum_{j=1}^{d}\nabla_j^*\phi_T^{n+1}(z)a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)(\nabla_j^*\phi_T(z)+\xi_j).\end{aligned}\tag{4.81}$$

Taking the expectation of (4.81) and noting that $\phi_T^{n+2}\ge0$, we obtain as for the continuous case

$$\left\langle\sum_{j=1}^{d}a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)\nabla_j^*\phi_T^{n+1}(z)\nabla_j^*\phi_T(z)\right\rangle\lesssim\left\langle\sum_{j=1}^{d}a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)|\nabla_j^*\phi_T^{n+1}(z)|\right\rangle.\tag{4.82}$$

On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=1}^d a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)\nabla_j^*\phi_T^{n+1}(z)\nabla_j^*\phi_T(z) \\
&\quad= \sum_{j=1}^d a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)(\phi_T^{n+1}(z)-\phi_T^{n+1}(z-\mathbf{e}_j))(\phi_T(z)-\phi_T(z-\mathbf{e}_j)) \\
&\quad\overset{(4.78)}{\gtrsim} \sum_{j=1}^d (\phi_T^n(z)+\phi_T^n(z-\mathbf{e}_j))\,(\phi_T(z)-\phi_T(z-\mathbf{e}_j))^2. \qquad (4.83)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=1}^d a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)|\nabla_j^*\phi_T^{n+1}(z)| \\
&\quad= \sum_{j=1}^d a(z-\mathbf{e}_j,z)|\phi_T^{n+1}(z)-\phi_T^{n+1}(z-\mathbf{e}_j)| \\
&\quad\overset{(4.79)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d (\phi_T^n(z)+\phi_T^n(z-\mathbf{e}_j))\,|\phi_T(z)-\phi_T(z-\mathbf{e}_j)|. \qquad (4.84)
\end{aligned}$$

Now (4.82), (4.83) & (4.84) combine to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \sum_{j=1}^d (\phi_T^n(z)+\phi_T^n(z-\mathbf{e}_j))\,(\phi_T(z)-\phi_T(z-\mathbf{e}_j))^2 \right\rangle \\
&\quad\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \langle (\phi_T^n(z)+\phi_T^n(z-\mathbf{e}_j))\,|\phi_T(z)-\phi_T(z-\mathbf{e}_j)|\rangle\,.
\end{aligned}$$

By stochastic homogeneity, this reduces to

$$\left\langle \sum_{j=1}^d (\phi_T^n(\mathbf{e}_j)+\phi_T^n(0))\,(\phi_T(\mathbf{e}_j)-\phi_T(0))^2 \right\rangle \lesssim \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^d (\phi_T^n(\mathbf{e}_j)+\phi_T^n(0))\,|\phi_T(\mathbf{e}_j)-\phi_T(0)| \right\rangle.$$

An application of Cauchy Schwarz' inequality yields

$$\left\langle \sum_{j=1}^d (\phi_T^n(\mathbf{e}_j)+\phi_T^n(0))\,(\phi_T(\mathbf{e}_j)-\phi_T(0))^2 \right\rangle \lesssim \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^d (\phi_T^n(\mathbf{e}_j)+\phi_T^n(0)) \right\rangle.$$

A last application of stochastic homogeneity gives as desired

$$\left\langle \phi_T^n(0)\sum_{j=1}^d \left((\phi_T(\mathbf{e}_j)-\phi_T(0))^2+(\phi_T(0)-\phi_T(-\mathbf{e}_j))^2\right) \right\rangle \lesssim \langle \phi_T^n(0)\rangle\,.$$

4.8. **Proof of Lemma 4.** We recall that $e=[z,z']$, $z'=z+\mathbf{e}_i$.

Step 1. Proof of (2.12).
We first give a heuristic argument for (2.12) based on the defining equation

$$T^{-1}\phi_T(x)-(\nabla^*\cdot A(\nabla\phi_T(x)+\xi))(x)\;=\;0. \tag{4.85}$$

Differentiating (4.85) w. r. t. $a(e)$ yields as in Step 1 of the proof of Lemma 5

$$T^{-1}\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}(x)-\Big(\nabla^*\cdot A\nabla\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\Big)(x)-(\nabla_i\phi_T(z)+\xi_i)(\delta(x-z)-\delta(x-z'))\;=\;0. \tag{4.86}$$

Provided we have $\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, this yields by definition of G_T

$$\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}(x)\;=\;-(\nabla_i\phi_T(z)+\xi_i)(G_T(x,z')-G_T(x,z)),$$

which is (2.12).

In order to turn the above into a rigorous argument, we need to argue that $\phi_T(x)$ is differentiable w. r. t. $a(e)$ and that $\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Starting point is the representation formula from Step 2 of the proof of Lemma 6, i. e.

$$\phi_T(x)\;=\;\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}G_T(x,y)\nabla^*\cdot(A(y)\xi)\,dy. \tag{4.87}$$

Combined with Corollary 1, (4.87) and (2.15) in Lemma 5 show that $\phi_T(x)$ is differentiable w. r. t. $a(e)$. We may now switch the order of the differentiation and the sum as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}(x)\;&=\;-\nabla_{z_i}G_T(x,z)\xi_i-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_{z_i}G_T(x,z)\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,y)\nabla^*\cdot(A(y)\xi)\,dy\\&=\;-\underbrace{\nabla_{z_i}G_T(x,z)}_{\in L^2_x(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\Big(\xi_i+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\underbrace{\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,y)}_{\in L^1_y(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\underbrace{\nabla^*\cdot(A(y)\xi)}_{\in L^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\,dy\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{4.88}$$

since $G_T(\cdot,z)\in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ by definition of the Green's function, $G_T(z,\cdot)\in L^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ by Corollary 1 and A is bounded. This proves that $\frac{\partial\phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Step 2. Proof of

$$\sup_{a(e)}|\phi_T(x)|\;\lesssim\;|\phi_T(x)|+(|\nabla_i\phi_T(z)|+1)\,|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x)|\,, \tag{4.89}$$

$$\sup_{a(e)}\left|\frac{\partial\phi_T(x)}{\partial a(e)}\right|\;\lesssim\;(|\nabla_i\phi_T(z)|+1)\,|\nabla_{z_i}G_T(z,x)|\,. \tag{4.90}$$

We argue that it is enough to prove (2.14). Indeed, the combination of (2.12), (2.16), and (2.14) with the boundedness of a implies (4.89) and (4.90). In order to prove (2.14), we proceed as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\Big(\nabla_i \frac{\partial \phi_T}{\partial a(e)}\Big)(z) &= \frac{\partial \phi_T}{\partial a(e)}(z) - \frac{\partial \phi_T}{\partial a(e)}(z') \\
&\overset{(2.12)}{=} (\nabla_i \phi_T(z) + \xi_i)(G_T(z,z) - G_T(z,z')) \\
&\qquad -(\nabla_i \phi_T(z) + \xi_i)(G_T(z',z) - G_T(z',z')) \\
&= (\nabla_i \phi_T(z) + \xi_i)(G_T(z,z) - G_T(z,z') - G_T(z',z) + G_T(z',z')) \\
&= (\nabla_i \phi_T(z) + \xi_i) G_T(e,e), \qquad (4.91)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used the abbreviation

$$G_T(e,e) = G_T(z,z) - G_T(z,z') - G_T(z',z) + G_T(z',z').$$

Recalling that Corollary 2 implies

$$G_T(e,e) \lesssim 1,$$

inequality (2.14) follows now from (4.91) and the boundedness of a.

Step 3. Proof of (2.13).
For $n \geq 0$, the chain rule yields

$$\frac{\partial \phi_T(x)^{n+1}}{\partial a(e)} = (n+1)\phi_T(x)^n \frac{\partial \phi_T(x)}{\partial a(e)}.$$

Using (4.89) and (4.90), this implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{a(e)} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_T(x)^{n+1}}{\partial a(e)} \right| &\lesssim \Big(|\phi_T(x)| + (|\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| + 1) \, |\nabla_{z_i} G_T(z,x)| \Big)^n \\
&\qquad \Big((|\nabla_i \phi_T(z)| + 1) \, |\nabla_{z_i} G_T(z,x)| \Big),
\end{aligned}
$$

which turns into (2.13) using Young's inequality.

4.9. **Proof of Lemma 10.** The proof relies on a doubly dyadic decomposition of space. First note that by symmetry,

$$\int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dz = \int_{|z|\ge|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dz \geq \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dz.$$

Hence, it is enough to consider

$$\int_{|x|\le R}\int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx.$$

In the three first steps, we treat the case $d > 2$. We then sketch the modification for $d = 2$ in the last step. Let $\tilde{R} \sim 1$ be such that (2.28) holds with a constant independent of R for all $R \geq \tilde{R}/2$.

Step 1. Proof of

$$\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \lesssim R^2, \qquad \text{for } R \geq 2\tilde{R}. \qquad (4.92)$$

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\tilde{R} \le 2^{-N}R \le 2\tilde{R}$. We then decompose the sum over $|z| \le |z-x|$ into three contributions: $R/2 < |z|$, a dyadic decomposition for $\tilde{R} < |z| \le R/2$ and a remainder on $|z| \le \tilde{R}$. More precisely:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \\
&= \int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{R/2<|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \\
&\quad +\sum_{n=1}^{N}\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{\{2^{-(n+1)}R<|z|\le 2^{-n}R\}\cap\{|z|\le|z-x|\}} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \\
&\quad +\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{\{|z|\le 2^{-(N+1)}R\}\cap\{|z|\le|z-x|\}} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \\
&\le \int_{|x|\le 2R}\underbrace{\int_{R/2<|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dz\, dx}_{=I_1} \\
&\quad +\sum_{n=1}^{N}\underbrace{\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{2^{-(n+1)}R<|z|\le 2^{-n}R} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx}_{=I_2(n)} \\
&\quad +\underbrace{\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le\tilde{R}} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx}_{=I_3(N)}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

We use Young's inequality, a dyadic decomposition of $\{|z| > R/2\}$, and the assumption (2.28) to bound I_1:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\le \frac{1}{2}\Big(\int_{R/2<|z|} h_T(z)^2\,dz + \int_{R/2<|z-x|} h_T(z-x)^2\,dz\Big) \\
&= \sum_{k=-1}^{\infty}\int_{2^kR<|z|\le 2^{k+1}R} h_T^2(z)dz \\
&\overset{(2.28)}{\lesssim} \sum_{k=-1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{2^{d-2}}\right)^k R^{2-d} \\
&\lesssim R^{2-d}.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to bound $I_2(n)$, we will use the following fact

$$\Big(|x| > R \quad\text{and}\quad |z| \le \frac{1}{2}R\Big) \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \Big(|z-x| > \frac{1}{2}R\Big). \tag{4.93}$$

We have by Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_2(n)&\\
\le&\ \left(\int_{|x|\le 2R}\int_{2^{-(n+1)}R<|z|\le 2^{-n}R} h_T(z)^2 dzdx \int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le 2^{-n}R} h_T(z-x)^2 dzdx\right)^{1/2}\\
\lesssim&\ \Big(R^d \underbrace{\int_{2^{-(n+1)}R<|z|\le 2^{-n}R} h_T(z)^2 dz}_{\overset{(2.28)}{\lesssim}\ (2^{-n}R)^{2-d}} \quad \underbrace{\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le 2^{-n}R} h_T(z-x)^2 dzdx}_{\overset{(4.93)}{\lesssim}\ \underbrace{\int_{|z|\le 2^{-n}R}\int_{R/2<|z-x|\le 5R/2} h_T(z-x)^2 dxdz}_{\overset{(2.28)}{\lesssim}\ \int_{|z|\le 2^{-n}R} R^{2-d}\,dz = (2^{-n}R)^d R^{2-d}}} \Big)^{1/2}\\
\lesssim&\ 2^{-n}R^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

We proceed the same way to bound $I_3(N)$. Recalling that $R \ge 2\tilde R \sim 1$, it holds that $|z| \le \tilde R \implies |z| \le R/2$. Hence, we are in position to use (4.93) and we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_3(N) \le&\ \left(\int_{|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le \tilde R} h_T(z)^2 dzdx \int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le \tilde R} h_T(z-x)^2 dzdx\right)^{1/2}\\
\lesssim&\ \Big(R^d \underbrace{\int_{|z|\le \tilde R} h_T(z)^2 dz}_{\overset{(2.29)}{\lesssim}\ 1} \quad \underbrace{\int_{R<|x|\le 2R}\int_{|z|\le \tilde R} h_T(z-x)^2 dzdx}_{\overset{(4.93)}{\lesssim}\ \underbrace{\int_{|z|\le \tilde R}\int_{R/2<|z-x|\le 5R/2} h_T(z-x)^2 dxdz}_{\overset{(2.28)}{\lesssim}\ \int_{|z|\le \tilde R} R^{2-d}\,dz \sim R^{2-d}}} \Big)^{1/2}\\
\lesssim&\ R.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n}R^2 \sim R^2$ and $|\{|x| \le 2R\}|R^{2-d} \sim R^2$, the bounds on I_1, $I_2(n)$ and $I_3(N)$ imply the claim (4.92).

Step 2. Proof of

$$
\int_{|x|\le 4\tilde R}\int_{|z|\le |z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \lesssim 1. \tag{4.94}
$$

This time, we decompose the sum over $|z| \le |z-x|$ in two contributions only: $|z| \le \tilde{R}$ and $\tilde{R} < |z|$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|x|\le 4\tilde{R}} \int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \\
&= \underbrace{\int_{|x|\le 4\tilde{R}} \int_{\tilde{R}<|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dz\,dx}_{=I_1'} \\
&\qquad + \underbrace{\int_{|x|\le 4\tilde{R}} \int_{\{|z|\le\tilde{R}\}\cap\{|z|\le|z-x|\}} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx}_{=I_2'}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as for I_1 in Step 1 using (2.28) yields

$$I_1' \lesssim 1.$$

For I_2', we use Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality, (2.29), and $\tilde{R} \sim 1$:

$$I_2' \le \left(\int_{|x|\le 4\tilde{R}} \int_{|z|\le\tilde{R}} h_T^2(z)dzdx\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{|x|\le 4\tilde{R}} \int_{|z'|\le 5\tilde{R}} h_T^2(z')dz'dx\right)^{1/2} \lesssim 1.$$

This proves (4.94).

Step 3. Proof of (2.31).

It only remains to use a dyadic decomposition of the ball of radius R into the ball of radius $\tilde{R}$ and annuli of the form $2^{-k}R < |z| \le 2^{-k+1}R$, as follows. Taking M such that $2\tilde{R} \le 2^{-M}R \le 4\tilde{R}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|x|\le R} \int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx \\
&= \underbrace{\int_{|x|\le 2^{-M}R} \int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx}_{\overset{(4.94)}{\lesssim} 1} \\
&\qquad + \sum_{n=1}^{M} \underbrace{\int_{2^{n-M-1}R<|x|\le 2^{n-M}R} \int_{|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dzdx}_{\overset{(4.92)}{\lesssim} (2^{n-M}R)^2} \\
&\lesssim 1 + R^2 \sum_{n=1}^{M} 4^{-n} \sim R^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (2.31).

Step 4. Proof of (2.30).

For the case $d = 2$, we use the same strategy as for $d > 2$. The bounds on $I_2(n)$ and $I_3(N)$ are the same as for $d > 2$. However the estimate for I_1 is slightly worse. Indeed, we split the dyadic sums $2^k R < |z| \le 2^{k+1}R$ into two categories in order to take advantage of the fast decay in (2.27): The first class is for k such that $2^kR \le \sqrt{T}$ and the other class for k such that $2^kR > \sqrt{T}$. More precisely, setting $\mathcal{I}(R,T) := \{k \in \mathbb{N} : 2^{k-1}R \le \sqrt{T}\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_{R/2<|z|\le|z-x|} h_T(z)h_T(z-x)dz \\
&\overset{\text{Young}}{\le} \int_{R/2<|z|} h_T(z)^2 dz \\
&= \sum_{k=-1}^{\infty} \int_{2^kR<|z|\le 2^{k+1}R} h_T(z)^2 dz \\
&= \underbrace{\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}(R,T)} \int_{2^{k-1}R<|z|\le 2^kR} h_T^2(z)dz}_{\overset{(2.27)}{\lesssim} \max\{0,\ln(\sqrt{T}R^{-1})\}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\mathcal{I}(R,T)} \int_{2^{k-1}R<|z|\le 2^kR} h_T^2(z)dz}_{\overset{(2.27)}{\lesssim} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 2^{-2k} \lesssim 1} \\
&\lesssim \max\{1,\ln(\sqrt{T}R^{-1})\},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the extra factor in (2.30).

Acknowledgments

A. Gloria acknowledges full support and F. Otto acknowledges partial support of the Hausdorff Center for Mathematics, Bonn, Germany.

References

[1] Jöran Bergh and Jörgen Löfström. *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223.

[2] A. Bourgeat and A. Piatnitski. Approximations of effective coefficients in stochastic homogenization. *Ann. I. H. Poincaré*, 40:153–165, 2005.

[3] T. Delmotte. Inégalité de Harnack elliptique sur les graphes. *Colloq. Math.*, 72(1):19–37, 1997.

[4] G. Dolzmann, N. Hungerbühler, and S. Müller. Uniqueness and maximal regularity for nonlinear elliptic systems of n-Laplace type with measure valued right hand side. *J. reine angew. Math.*, 520:1–35, 2000.

[5] W. E, P.B. Ming, and P.W. Zhang. Analysis of the heterogeneous multiscale method for elliptic homogenization problems. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18:121–156, 2005.

[6] M. Grüter and K.-O. Widman. The Green function for uniformly elliptic equations. *Manuscripta Math.*, 37:303–342, 1982.

[7] Q. Han and F. Lin. *Elliptic partial differential equations*. Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York, 1997.

[8] C. Kipnis and S.R.S. Varadhan. Central limit theorem for additive functional of reversible Markov processes and applications to simple exclusion. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 104:1–19, 1986.

[9] K. Klenke. *Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg-Berlin, 2006. English version appeared as: Probability theory. A comprehensive course, Universitext, Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2008.

[10] S.M. Kozlov. The averaging of random operators. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 109(151)(2):188–202, 327, 1979.

[11] S.M. Kozlov. Averaging of difference schemes. *Math. USSR Sbornik*, 57(2):351–369, 1987.

[12] R. Künnemann. The diffusion limit for reversible jump processes on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with ergodic random bond conductivities. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 90:27–68, 1983.

[13] M. Ledoux. Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for unbounded spin systems revisited. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXV*, volume 1755 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 167–194. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
[14] N. Meyers. An L^p-estimate for the gradient of solutions of second order elliptic divergence equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)*, 17(3):189–206, 1963.
[15] A. Naddaf and T. Spencer. Estimates on the variance of some homogenization problems. Preprint, 1998.
[16] G.C. Papanicolaou and S.R.S. Varadhan. Boundary value problems with rapidly oscillating random coefficients. In *Random fields, Vol. I, II (Esztergom, 1979)*, volume 27 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, pages 835–873. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.
[17] V.V. Yurinskii. Averaging of symmetric diffusion in random medium. *Sibirskii Matematicheskii Zhurnal*, 27(4):167–180, 1986.

Appendix A. Heuristics for (1.13) & (1.14)

Let $\bar\phi_i$ and $\bar\phi_{T,i}$ denote for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ the solutions of (1.11) and (1.12) respectively, with ξ replaced by the i-th unit vector $\mathbf{e}_i$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$. We claim that

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \mathrm{var}\left[\sum \left(\mathbf{e}_j \cdot (A - \langle A\rangle)\mathbf{e}_i + 2\mathbf{e}_j \cdot \nabla\bar\phi_i\right)\eta_L\right] \; = \; d\,\mathrm{var}\,[a] \sum \eta_L^2, \tag{A.1}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \langle |\nabla\bar\phi_{T,i} - \nabla\bar\phi_i|^2\rangle \; = \; \mathrm{var}\,[a]\; T^{-2} \sum \bar G_T^2, \tag{A.2}$$

where $\bar G_T$ denotes the fundamental solution of the constant coefficient operator $T^{-1} - \triangle$. We also denote by $\bar G$ the fundamental solution of the Laplacian. Since

$$\sum \bar G_T^2 \; \sim \; \begin{cases} T^{2-d/2} & \text{for} \quad d < 4, \\ \ln T & \text{for} \quad d = 4, \\ 1 & \text{for} \quad d > 4, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sum \eta_L^2 \; \sim \; L^{-d},$$

(1.13) & (1.14) follow from (A.1) & (A.2), that we prove now.

Step 1. Argument for (A.2).
Since

$$-\triangle(\bar\phi_T - \bar\phi) = -T^{-1}\bar\phi_T, \tag{A.3}$$

one has

$$\left\langle |\nabla(\bar\phi_T - \bar\phi)|^2 \right\rangle = -T^{-1}\left\langle \bar\phi_T(\bar\phi_T - \bar\phi)\right\rangle. \tag{A.4}$$

Rewritting (A.3) in the form

$$T^{-1}(\bar\phi_T - \bar\phi) - \triangle(\bar\phi_T - \bar\phi) = -T^{-1}\bar\phi$$

yields the formula

$$(\bar\phi_T - \bar\phi)(0) = -T^{-1}\sum_x \bar G_T(x)\bar\phi(x). \tag{A.5}$$

Using (A.5), (A.4) turns into

$$\left\langle |\nabla(\bar\phi_T - \bar\phi)|^2 \right\rangle = -T^{-2}\sum_x \bar G_T(x)\left\langle \bar\phi_T(0)\bar\phi(x)\right\rangle. \tag{A.6}$$

Expressing now $\bar\phi_{T,i}(0)$ and $\bar\phi_i(x)$ in terms the Green's functions[2] $\bar G_T$ and $\bar G$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar\phi_{T,i}(0) &= \sum_{x'} \bar G_T(x')\nabla^*\cdot(A(x')\mathbf{e}_i)\\ &= -\sum_{x'} \nabla_i\bar G_T(x')(a_i(x')-\langle a\rangle)\\ \bar\phi_i(x) &= \sum_{x'} \bar G(x-x')\nabla^*\cdot(A(x')\mathbf{e}_i)\\ &= -\sum_{x''} \nabla_i\bar G(x-x'')(a_i(x'')-\langle a\rangle),\end{aligned}$$

and using the independence of $a_i(x')$ and $a_i(x'')$ for $x'\neq x''$, we get

$$\left\langle \bar\phi_{T,i}(0)\bar\phi_i(x)\right\rangle = \sum_{x'} \nabla_i\bar G_T(x')\nabla_i\bar G(x-x')\left\langle (a_i(x')-\langle a\rangle)^2\right\rangle.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^d \left\langle \bar\phi_{T,i}(0)\bar\phi_i(x)\right\rangle &= \operatorname{var}[a]\sum_{x'}\nabla\bar G_T(x')\cdot\nabla\bar G(x-x')\\ &= \operatorname{var}[a]\,\bar G_T(x),\end{aligned}$$

since $-\triangle\bar G(x)=\delta(x)$. Combined with (A.6), this proves (A.2).

Step 2. Argument for (A.1).
Using the Green's function, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\bar\phi_i(x) &= \sum_{x'} \bar G(x-x')\nabla^*\cdot((A-\langle A\rangle)\mathbf{e}_i)(x')\\ &= -\sum_{x'} \nabla_i\bar G(x-x')(a_i(x')-\langle a\rangle),\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\nabla\bar\phi_i(x) = -\sum_{x'} \nabla\nabla_i\bar G(x-x')(a_i(x')-\langle a\rangle).$$

Hence, denoting by $\mathcal{A}_{ij}$ the argument of the variance in (A.1), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{ij} &:= \sum_x \big(\mathbf{e}_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_i(a_i(x)-\langle a\rangle)+2\mathbf{e}_j\cdot\nabla\bar\phi_i(x)\big)\eta_L(x)\\ &= \sum_x\sum_{x'}(a_i(x')-\langle a\rangle)\mathbf{e}_j\cdot\big(\delta(x-x')\mathbf{e}_i-2\nabla\nabla_i\bar G(x-x')\big)\eta_L(x).\end{aligned}$$

Using the independence of the a_i, one obtains for the variance

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{var}[\mathcal{A}_{ij}] &= \operatorname{var}[a]\sum_x\sum_{x'}\sum_{x''}\mathbf{e}_j\cdot\big(\delta(x-x')\mathbf{e}_i-2\nabla\nabla_i\bar G(x-x')\big)\\ &\qquad \mathbf{e}_j\cdot\big(\delta(x''-x')\mathbf{e}_i-2\nabla\nabla_i\bar G(x''-x')\big)\eta_L(x)\eta_L(x'').\end{aligned}$$

[2]Attention should be paid here to turn this into a rigorous argument since $\bar G$ is not in $L^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Rearranging the terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}\,[\mathcal{A}_{ij}] &= \mathrm{var}\,[a]\sum_x\sum_{x'}\delta(j-i)\big(\delta(x-x')-4\nabla_i\nabla_i\bar{G}(x-x')\big)\eta_L(x)\eta_L(x') \\ &\quad+\mathrm{var}\,[a]\sum_x\sum_{x''}4\eta_L(x)\eta_L(x'')\underbrace{\sum_{x'}\nabla_j\nabla_i\bar{G}(x-x')\nabla_j\nabla_i\bar{G}(x''-x')}_{=-\nabla_i\nabla_i\sum_{x'}\bar{G}(x-x')\nabla_j\nabla_j\bar{G}(x''-x')}.\end{aligned}$$

Summing in j and using that $-\triangle G(x)=\delta(x)$, this turns into

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\mathrm{var}\,[\mathcal{A}_{ij}] &= \mathrm{var}\,[a]\sum_x\sum_{x'}\big(\delta(x-x')-4\nabla_i\nabla_i\bar{G}(x-x')\big)\eta_L(x)\eta_L(x') \\ &\quad+\mathrm{var}\,[a]\sum_x\sum_{x''}4\eta_L(x)\eta_L(x'')\nabla_i\nabla_i\bar{G}(x-x'') \\ &= \mathrm{var}\,[a]\sum_x\sum_{x'}\delta(x-x')\eta_L(x)\eta_L(x') \\ &= \mathrm{var}\,[a]\sum_x\eta_L(x)^2,\end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce (A.1).

(Antoine Gloria) Projet SIMPAF, INRIA Lille-Nord Europe, France
E-mail address: antoine.gloria@inria.fr

(Felix Otto) IAM, Universität Bonn, Germany
E-mail address: otto@iam.uni-bonn.de

Bestellungen nimmt entgegen:

Sonderforschungsbereich 611
der Universität Bonn
Poppelsdorfer Allee 82
D - 53115 Bonn

Telefon: 0228/73 4882
Telefax: 0228/73 7864
E-Mail: astrid.link@ins.uni-bonn.de http://www.sfb611.iam.uni-bonn.de/

Verzeichnis der erschienenen Preprints ab No. 430

430. Frehse, Jens; Málek, Josef; Ružička, Michael: Large Data Existence Result for Unsteady Flows of Inhomogeneous Heat-Conducting Incompressible Fluids

431. Croce, Roberto; Griebel, Michael; Schweitzer, Marc Alexander: Numerical Simulation of Bubble and Droplet Deformation by a Level Set Approach with Surface Tension in Three Dimensions

432. Frehse, Jens; Löbach, Dominique: Regularity Results for Three Dimensional Isotropic and Kinematic Hardening Including Boundary Differentiability

433. Arguin, Louis-Pierre; Kistler, Nicola: Small Perturbations of a Spin Glass System

434. Bolthausen, Erwin; Kistler, Nicola: On a Nonhierarchical Version of the Generalized Random Energy Model. II. Ultrametricity

435. Blum, Heribert; Frehse, Jens: Boundary Differentiability for the Solution to Hencky's Law of Elastic Plastic Plane Stress

436. Albeverio, Sergio; Ayupov, Shavkat A.; Kudaybergenov, Karim K.; Nurjanov, Berdach O.: Local Derivations on Algebras of Measurable Operators

437. Bartels, Sören; Dolzmann, Georg; Nochetto, Ricardo H.: A Finite Element Scheme for the Evolution of Orientational Order in Fluid Membranes

438. Bartels, Sören: Numerical Analysis of a Finite Element Scheme for the Approximation of Harmonic Maps into Surfaces

439. Bartels, Sören; Müller, Rüdiger: Error Controlled Local Resolution of Evolving Interfaces for Generalized Cahn-Hilliard Equations

440. Bock, Martin; Tyagi, Amit Kumar; Kreft, Jan-Ulrich; Alt, Wolfgang: Generalized Voronoi Tessellation as a Model of Two-dimensional Cell Tissue Dynamics

441. Frehse, Jens; Specovius-Neugebauer, Maria: Existence of Hölder Continuous Young Measure Solutions to Coercive Non-Monotone Parabolic Systems in Two Space Dimensions

442. Kurzke, Matthias; Spirn, Daniel: Quantitative Equipartition of the Ginzburg-Landau Energy with Applications

443. Bulíček, Miroslav; Frehse, Jens; Málek, Josef: On Boundary Regularity for the Stress in Problems of Linearized Elasto-Plasticity

444. Otto, Felix; Ramos, Fabio: Universal Bounds for the Littlewood-Paley First-Order Moments of the 3D Navier-Stokes Equations

445. Frehse, Jens; Specovius-Neugebauer, Maria: Existence of Regular Solutions to a Class of Parabolic Systems in Two Space Dimensions with Critical Growth Behaviour

446. Bartels, Sören; Müller, Rüdiger: Optimal and Robust A Posteriori Error Estimates in $L^{\infty}(L^2)$ for the Approximation of Allen-Cahn Equations Past Singularities

447. Bartels, Sören; Müller, Rüdiger; Ortner, Christoph: Robust A Priori and A Posteriori Error Analysis for the Approximation of Allen-Cahn and Ginzburg-Landau Equations Past Topological Changes

448. Gloria, Antoine; Otto, Felix: An Optimal Variance Estimate in Stochastic Homogenization of Discrete Elliptic Equations