

HYDRODYNAMIC LIMIT FOR THE GINZBURG-LANDAU $\nabla\phi$ INTERFACE MODEL WITH A CONSERVATION LAW AND DIRICHLET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

TAKAO NISHIKAWA

ABSTRACT. Hydrodynamic limit for the Ginzburg-Landau $\nabla\phi$ interface model with a conservation law was established in [9] under periodic boundary conditions. This paper studies the same problem on a bounded domain imposing the Dirichlet boundary condition. A nonlinear partial equation of fourth order satisfying the boundary conditions is derived as the macroscopic equation. Its solution converges to the Wulff shape derived by [3] as the time $t \rightarrow \infty$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ginzburg-Landau $\nabla\phi$ interface model determines stochastic dynamics for a discretized hypersurface separating two microscopic phases embedded in the $d+1$ dimensional space. The position of the hypersurface is described by height variables $\phi = \{\phi(x); x \in \Gamma\}$ measured from a fixed d -dimensional discrete hyperplane Γ . We will take $\Gamma = \Gamma_N := (\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})^d$ when we consider the system on a discretized torus with periodic boundary condition, or $\Gamma = D_N \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ when we consider the system on a domain with some boundary condition. Here, D_N is a microscopic domain corresponding to a given macroscopic domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ which is bounded and has a smooth boundary; see Section 2 for the definition of D_N . We then admit an energy (Hamiltonian) for the interface ϕ by

$$H(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \Gamma, \\ |x-y|=1}} V(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) + \sum_{\substack{x \in \Gamma, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Gamma, \\ |x-y|=1}} V(\phi(x) - \phi(y))$$

with a potential $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$. Note that, when $\Gamma = D_N$, we need to give a boundary condition $\{\phi(x); x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N\}$ in order to define the Hamiltonian H . Once we introduce the Hamiltonian H , the dynamics of the interface can be introduced by means of the Langevin equation

$$d\phi_t(x) = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi(x)}(\phi_t) dt + \sqrt{2}dw_t(x), \quad x \in \Gamma, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\{w_t(x); x \in \Gamma\}$ is a family of independent copies of the one dimensional standard Brownian motion. The hydrodynamic scaling limit has been established for the dynamics governed by (1.1) with $\Gamma = \Gamma_N$ in [8], for the dynamics with $\Gamma = D_N$ and the Dirichlet boundary condition in [10]. In both cases, the macroscopic motion is described by the

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60K35, 82C24, 35K55.

Key words and phrases. Ginzburg-Landau model, effective interfaces, massless fields.

nonlinear partial differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(t, \theta) &= \operatorname{div} \left\{ (\nabla \sigma)(\nabla h(t, \theta)) \right\} \\ &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \left\{ \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u_i} (\nabla h(t, \theta)) \right\}, \quad \theta \in D, t > 0 \end{aligned}$$

with an appropriate boundary condition. Here, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function called ‘‘surface tension,’’ which gives the local energy of macroscopic interface with tilt $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, see [8] or [7] for precise definition.

The dynamics (1.1) can be regarded as the model corresponding to the Glauber dynamics in the particles’ systems. Let us introduce the model corresponding to the Kawasaki dynamics in the particles’ systems as follows:

$$d\phi_t(x) = -(-\Delta_\Gamma) \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi(\cdot)}(\phi_t)(x) dt + \sqrt{2} d\tilde{w}_t(x), \quad x \in \Gamma, \quad (1.2)$$

where Δ_Γ is the discrete Laplacian on Γ with the Neumann boundary condition when $\Gamma = D_N$ or periodic boundary condition when $\Gamma = \Gamma_N$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_\Gamma \psi)(x) &\equiv \sum_{y \in \Gamma} \Delta_\Gamma(x, y) \psi(y) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \Gamma, |x-y|=1} \{\psi(y) - \psi(x)\}, \quad \psi \in \mathbb{R}^\Gamma, x \in \Gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

and $\{\tilde{w}_t(x); x \in \Gamma\}$ is a family of Gaussian processes with mean zero and covariance structure

$$E[\tilde{w}_t(x) \tilde{w}_s(y)] = -\Delta_\Gamma(x, y) t \wedge s, \quad x, y \in \Gamma, t, s \geq 0.$$

We note that the dynamics (1.2) preserves the sum $\sum_{x \in \Gamma} \phi_t(x)$, which can be regarded as the volume of the phase located below the interface.

The main purposes of this paper are to establish the hydrodynamic scaling limit of ϕ_t determined by (1.2) with $\Gamma = D_N$ under the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\phi_t(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N, t \geq 0,$$

and to clarify the relationship between the macroscopic motion and ‘‘Wulff shape’’ studied by [3] under a static situation. The main result in this paper is that, under the scaling N^4 for time and N for space, the macroscopic motion corresponding to ϕ_t is described by the nonlinear partial differential equation with Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(t, \theta) &= -\Delta \operatorname{div} \left\{ (\nabla \sigma)(\nabla h(t, \theta)) \right\} \\ &\equiv - \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_j^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \left\{ \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u_i} (\nabla h(t, \theta)) \right\}, \quad \theta \in D, t > 0 \\ h(t, \theta) &= 0, \quad \theta \in D^c, t > 0. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (1.4)$$

We note that the equation (1.4) is the gradient flow in a certain affine subspace in $H^1(D)^*$ with respect to the energy functional

$$\Sigma_D(h) = \int_D \sigma(\nabla h(\theta)) d\theta$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition $h|_{D^c} = 0$, where $H^1(D)^*$ is the topological dual of $H^1(D)$, see Section 2.2 for details. Here, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function called “surface tension,” which gives the local energy of macroscopic interface with tilt $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, see [8] for precise definition. The functional Σ_D is called “total surface tension,” which gives the total energy of the interface h . We note that the total surface tension Σ_D coincides with the rate functional for the large deviation principle under the static situation, see [3]. Taking $\Gamma = \Gamma_N$ instead of D_N , the large scale hydrodynamic behavior has been studied by [9].

We should also mention the relationship between the equation (1.4) and the Wulff shape discussed in [3]. As an application of the large deviation principle, the macroscopic height variable h^N under the equilibrium state (Gibbs measure) conditioned on the total volume converges to the macroscopic interface so-called “Wulff shape,” which is characterized as the solution of the variational problem

$$\arg \inf \left\{ \Sigma_D(h); h \in H_0^1(D), \int_D h(\theta) d\theta = v \right\} \quad (1.5)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where v is the limit of the volume of h^N rescaled by N^{-d} . We emphasize that the solution $h(t)$ of (1.4) converges as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and the limit coincides with the unique solution of the variational problem (1.5). Indeed, the macroscopic motion described by (1.4) relaxes the total energy Σ_D and converges to its minimizer, that is, the Wulff shape as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Before closing the introduction, let us briefly give the organization of this paper. In Section 2, we formulate our problem more precisely and state the main result. In Section 3, we study several properties of the macroscopic equation (1.4) and its spatial discretization. In Section 4, we show that a translation-invariant stationary measure for the dynamics ϕ_t on the infinite lattice \mathbb{Z}^d need to be a canonical Gibbs measure corresponding to the Hamiltonian H . Combining the above with the known result in [9], we have the characterization of the family of translation-invariant stationary measures of the dynamics on \mathbb{Z}^d . In Section 5, we derive the macroscopic equation (1.4) from the stochastic dynamics (1.2) with $\Gamma = D_N$, after establishing several estimates on it.

2. MODEL AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Model. Let D be a bounded and connected domain in \mathbb{R}^d with a Lipschitz boundary. For convenience, we assume that D contains the origin of \mathbb{R}^d . Furthermore, we assume the following condition on D :

Assumption 2.1. Let $\tilde{D}_N = ND \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. We assume that there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of N such that

$$d_{\tilde{D}_N}(x, y) \leq C, \quad x, y \in \tilde{D}_N, |x - z| \leq 2, |y - z| \leq 2$$

for every $N \geq 1$ large enough and $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \tilde{D}_N$, where $d_{\tilde{D}_N}$ is the ordinary graph distance on \tilde{D}_N .

Remark 2.1. Assumption 2.1 is satisfied if the domain D is convex.

Let us introduce the discretized microscopic domain corresponding to D . To keep notation simple, we consider $D_N \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ defined by

$$D_N = \{x \in \tilde{D}_N; B(x/N, 5/N) \subset D\},$$

where $B(\alpha, l)$ stands for the hypercube in \mathbb{R}^d with center $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^d$ and side length $l > 0$, that is,

$$B(\alpha, l) = \prod_{i=1}^d [\alpha_i - l/2, \alpha_i + l/2).$$

On D_N we consider the dynamics governed by the following stochastic differential equations (SDEs)

$$d\phi_t(x) = -(-\Delta_{D_N})U(\phi_t)(x) dt + \sqrt{2}d\tilde{w}_t(x), \quad x \in D_N, \quad (2.1)$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\phi_t(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N \quad (2.2)$$

and an initial data $\phi_0 = \{\phi_0(x); x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ satisfying the condition (2.2) with $t = 0$, where $U_x(\phi)$ in the drift term is defined by

$$U_x(\phi) := \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi(x)}(\phi) \equiv \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d; |x-y|=1} V'(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) \quad (2.3)$$

for $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $x \in D_N$. Here, Δ_{D_N} is the Laplacian with the Neumann boundary condition on D_N , that is, Δ_{D_N} is defined by

$$\Delta_{D_N}\psi(x) = \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} (\psi(y) - \psi(x)) \quad (2.4)$$

for $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{D_N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The process $\tilde{w}_t = \{\tilde{w}_t(x); x \in D_N\}$ is a family of Gaussian processes with mean zero and covariance structure

$$E[\tilde{w}_t(x)\tilde{w}_s(y)] = (-\Delta_{D_N})(x, y)t \wedge s, \quad x, y \in D_N, t, s \geq 0,$$

where $\Delta_{D_N}(x, y)$ is the kernel of Δ_{D_N} , that is, $\Delta_{D_N}(x, y) = \Delta_{D_N}1_y(x)$. Note that a stochastic processes \tilde{w}_t satisfying the above can be constructed by

$$\tilde{w}_t(x) = \sqrt{-\Delta_{D_N}}w_t(x),$$

where $\sqrt{-\Delta_{D_N}}$ is the square root of $-\Delta_{D_N}$ and $\{w_t(x); x \in D_N\}$ is a family of independent one dimensional Brownian motions. For convenience, we extend \tilde{w}_t to the process on \mathbb{Z}^d by putting $\tilde{w}_t(x) = 0$ when $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$.

Through out this paper, we always assume the following conditions on V :

Assumption 2.2. The function $V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies following three conditions:

- (1) $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$.
- (2) V is symmetric, that is, $V(\eta) = V(-\eta)$ holds for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$.

(3) There exist constants $c_+, c_- > 0$ such that

$$c_- \leq V''(\eta) \leq c_+, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}$$

holds.

We regard (2.1) as the model describing the motion of microscopic interfaces and introduce the macroscopic height variable h^N by scaling N^4 for time while N for space:

$$h^N(t, \theta) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} N^{-1} \phi_{N^4 t}(x) 1_{B(x/N, 1/N)}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\phi_t = \{\phi_t(x); x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ is the solution of (2.1) with (2.2). We emphasize that the suitable scaling is not the diffusive one.

2.2. Main Result. The main result in this paper is that the macroscopic height variable defined by (2.5) converges to the solution of (1.4) as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We shall prepare settings to state the above precisely. We introduce the triplet

$$H^1(D) \subset L^2(D) \simeq L^2(D)^* \subset H^1(D)^*,$$

where $H^1(D)^*$ is the topological dual of $H^1(D)$. These spaces are equipped standard norms denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(D)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(D)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(D)^*}$, respectively. We denote the duality relation between $H^1(D)^*$ and $H^1(D)$ in this context by ${}_{H^1(D)^*} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1(D)}$, namely, ${}_{H^1(D)^*} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1(D)}$ denotes the duality relation satisfying

$${}_{H^1(D)^*} \langle f, g \rangle_{H^1(D)} = (f, g)_{L^2(D)}, \quad f, g \in L^2(D),$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2(D)}$ is the standard inner product of $L^2(D)$. To make notations simple, we denote ${}_{H^1(D)^*} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1(D)}$ by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ if no confusion arises.

Under these settings, our main result is the following:

Theorem 2.1. *We assume Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2. We furthermore assume that the sequence of initial data $\phi_0 = \phi_0^N$ for (2.1) satisfies*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E \|h^N(0) - h_0\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

with some $h_0 \in L^2(D)$, where $h^N(0)$ is the macroscopic height variable corresponding to ϕ_0^N . Then, for every $t > 0$, $h^N(t)$ converges as $N \rightarrow \infty$ to $h(t)$, which is the unique weak solution of the partial differential equation (1.4) with the initial data h_0 . More precisely, for every $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E \|h^N(t) - h(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 = 0 \quad (2.7)$$

holds.

3. THE MACROSCOPIC EQUATION AND ITS DISCRETIZATION

In this section, we shall focus our attention on the limit equation (1.4) and its discretized version. The arguments in this section highly depend on the properties of the surface tension σ established in [3] and [8].

3.1. A subspace of $H^1(D)^*$. As we will see, our consideration is on a subspace of $H^1(D)^*$. Before starting discussions, we introduce it with a suitable norm.

We first note that the solution of (1.4) should satisfy

$$\int_D h(t, \theta) d\theta = \int_D h_0(\theta) d\theta, \quad t \geq 0,$$

which means that the actual state space for (1.4) is not the whole of $H^1(D)^*$. For convenience, let us mainly consider the time evolution on the tangential space. Indeed, the equation (1.4) will be solved at

$$H := \{h \in H^1(D)^*; \langle h, 1 \rangle = 0\}.$$

On H defined above, we shall introduce another norm which is equivalent to the standard norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(D)^*}$ similarly to [2]. To do so, we at first introduce the Green operator G for the Laplacian with the Neumann boundary condition. For $f \in H$, we denote the unique solution $g \in H^1(D)$ of the elliptic equation

$$(\nabla g, \nabla J)_{L^2(D)^d} = \langle f, J \rangle, \quad J \in H^1(D), \quad (3.1)$$

$$(g, 1)_{L^2(D)} = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

by Gf , where $L^2(D)^d$ is the d -fold direct product of $L^2(D)$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2(D)^d}$ is its inner product. Here, the existence of Gf follows from the Lax-Milgram theorem and the Poincaré inequality of the following form: there exists a constant $c_D > 0$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \leq c_D \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2, \quad f \in H^1(D), \quad (f, 1)_{L^2(D)} = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

see Section 5.8.1 of [5] for details. We remark that the operator $G : H \rightarrow H^{1, \text{zm}}(D)$ is bounded and bijective, where $H^{1, \text{zm}}(D)$ is defined by

$$H^{1, \text{zm}}(D) := \{h \in H^1(D); (h, 1)_{L^2(D)} = 0\}.$$

We also remark that the inverse of G coincides with the Laplacian $-\Delta$ restricted to $H^{1, \text{zm}}(D)$.

Let us define the bilinear form $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$ on H by

$$(h_1, h_2)_H = (\nabla G h_1, \nabla G h_2)_{L^2(D)^d}, \quad h_1, h_2 \in H.$$

The following proposition tells us that $\|f\|_H := (f, f)_H^{1/2}$ on H is equivalent to $\|f\|_{H^1(D)^*}$ restricted to the closed subspace H of $H^1(D)^*$, and therefore H is a Hilbert space with the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$.

Proposition 3.1. *There exist two constant $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$C_1 \|f\|_{H^1(D)^*} \leq \|f\|_H \leq C_2 \|f\|_{H^1(D)^*}, \quad f \in H.$$

Proof. We shall at first find a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$C_1 \|f\|_{H^1(D)^*} \leq \|f\|_H, \quad f \in H. \quad (3.4)$$

By the definition of the Green operator G , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, J \rangle| &= |(\nabla G f, \nabla J)_{L^2(D)^d}| \\ &\leq \|\nabla G f\|_{L^2(D)^d} \|\nabla J\|_{L^2(D)^d} \\ &\leq (f, f)_H^{1/2} \|J\|_{H^1(D)} \end{aligned}$$

for every $J \in H^1(D)$, by using the Schwarz inequality. This implies that (3.4) with $C_1 = 1$ holds.

We shall next show

$$\|f\|_H \leq C_2 \|f\|_{H^1(D)^*}, \quad f \in H \quad (3.5)$$

with some constant $C_2 > 0$. Since (3.5) trivially holds with any constant $C_2 > 0$ when $\|f\|_H = 0$, we assume $\|f\|_H > 0$. Since $\|Gf\|_{H^1(D)} \geq \|f\|_H$ by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_H$, we have $\|Gf\|_{H^1(D)} > 0$. Taking $J = Gf/\|Gf\|_{H^1(D)}$, we obtain

$$\langle f, J \rangle = \frac{\|f\|_H^2}{\|Gf\|_{H^1(D)}}$$

by (3.1). Since we have

$$\|Gf\|_{H^1(D)} \leq \sqrt{1 + c_D} \|\nabla Gf\|_{L^2(D)^d} = \sqrt{1 + c_D} \|f\|_H$$

by the Poincaré inequality (3.3), we get

$$\langle f, J \rangle \geq (1 + c_D)^{-1/2} \|f\|_H.$$

By the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(D)^*}$, we conclude

$$\|f\|_{H^1(D)^*} \geq (1 + c_D)^{-1/2} \|f\|_H,$$

which implies (3.5) with $C_2 = (1 + c_D)^{1/2}$. \square

3.2. Precise formulation for the macroscopic equation. We give the precise meaning of the solution of (1.4). Let us introduce a triplet $V \subset H \simeq H^* \subset V^*$ with H introduced in Section 3.1,

$$V = \left\{ h \in H_0^1(D); \int_D h(\theta) d\theta = 0 \right\}$$

and the topological dual V^* . We remark that V is a Hilbert space with the restriction of the inner product of $H_0^1(D)$ to V . We denote the restriction of the standard norm of $H_0^1(D)$ to V and the dual norm on V^* by $\|\cdot\|_V$ and $\|\cdot\|_{V^*}$, respectively. We denote the duality relation between V^* and V by ${}_{V^*}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V$, which satisfies

$${}_{V^*}\langle f, g \rangle_V = (f, g)_H$$

for $f \in H$ and $g \in V$. Under these settings, we obtain

$${}_{V^*}\langle -\Delta f, g \rangle_V = (-\Delta f, g)_H = (f, g)_{L^2(D)} = {}_{H^1(D)^*}\langle f, g \rangle_{H^1(D)}$$

for $f \in H^{1, \text{zm}}(D)$ and $g \in V$, which indicates that $-\Delta$ can be extended to a bounded operator from H to V^* . Furthermore, we obtain

$${}_{V^*}\langle -\Delta f, g \rangle_V = -(u, \nabla g)_{L^2(D)^d}$$

for $g \in H_0^1(D)$ and $f \in C^\infty(D) \cap H$ such that $f = \text{div } u - (\text{div } u, 1)_{L^2(D)}$ with $u \in C^\infty(D)^d$, where $C^\infty(D)^d$ is the d -fold direct product of $C^\infty(D)$. Since we have $-\Delta f = -\Delta \text{div } u$, we finally obtain

$${}_{V^*}\langle -\Delta \text{div } u, g \rangle_V = -(u, \nabla g)_{L^2(D)^d} \quad (3.6)$$

for $g \in H_0^1(D)$ and $u \in C^\infty(D)^d$. We can therefore regard the map $u \mapsto -\Delta \text{div } u$ as a bounded operator from $L^2(D)^d$ to V^* and the identity (3.6) is still valid for $u \in L^2(D)^d$.

Noting these facts, let us introduce the nonlinear fourth order differential operator $A_f : V \rightarrow V^*$ by

$$A_f(h) := -\Delta \operatorname{div}((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h + \nabla f)), \quad h \in V$$

for a given $f \in H_0^1(D)$. We recall that the surface tension $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C^1 -class and it satisfies

$$c_-|u - v|^2 \leq (\nabla\sigma(u) - \nabla\sigma(v)) \cdot (u - v) \leq c_+|u - v|^2, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (3.7)$$

with c_\pm appearing in Assumption 2.2; see [7].

Definition 3.2. A function $h = h(t, \theta)$ is called the solution of (1.4) with initial data $h_0 \in H^1(D)^*$ if there exists a function $f \in H_0^1(D)$ with

$$\langle h_0, 1 \rangle = \langle f, 1 \rangle \quad (3.8)$$

such that the function $h_f := h - f$ satisfies the following three conditions:

- (1) $h_f : [0, T] \rightarrow V^*$ is absolutely continuous and

$$h_f \in C([0, T], H) \cap L^2([0, T], V) \cap W^{1,2}([0, T], V^*).$$

- (2) $h_f(0) = h_0 - f$.

- (3) h_f satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}h_f = A_f(h_f(t))$$

in V^* for almost every $t \in [0, T]$.

Remark 3.1. (1) We adopt the weak formulation for (1.4). For the solution h of (1.4), the choice of V corresponds to the Dirichlet boundary condition of h . Furthermore, $\operatorname{div}((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h))$ is formally given by $G\partial h/\partial t$, and therefore $\operatorname{div}((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h + \nabla f))$ should satisfy the Neumann boundary condition.

- (2) The third condition is equivalent to

$$h_f(t) = h_f(0) + \int_0^t A_f(h_f(s)) ds$$

in V^* for almost every $t \in [0, T]$. The above indicates that a solution h itself satisfies

$$h(t) - f = h(0) - f + \int_0^t A(h(s)) ds$$

in V^* . Here, A is the nonlinear fourth order differential operator defined by

$$A(h) := -\Delta \operatorname{div}((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h)),$$

which is appearing in the right hand side of (1.4).

The first aim of this section is to show the existence and uniqueness for our equation.

Theorem 3.3. *For every initial data $h_0 \in H^1(D)^*$, there exists a unique solution of (1.4).*

In order to apply a general theory of nonlinear partial differential equations, let us prepare the following lemma:

Lemma 3.4. *For every $f \in H_0^1(D)$, the nonlinear operator $A_f : V \rightarrow V^*$ satisfies the following:*

(1) A_f is monotone, that is,

$${}_{V^*}\langle A_f(h_1) - A_f(h_2), h_1 - h_2 \rangle_V \leq 0, \quad h_1, h_2 \in V.$$

holds.

(2) A_f is demicontinuous, that is, the map $A_f : V \rightarrow V^*$ is continuous under the weak topology of V^* .

(3) There exist constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that

$${}_{V^*}\langle A_f(h), h \rangle_V \leq -C_1 \|h\|_V^2 + C_2, \quad h \in V, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\|A_f(h)\|_{V^*} \leq C_3(\|h\|_V + 1), \quad h \in V \quad (3.10)$$

holds.

Proof. Using (3.6), we obtain

$${}_{V^*}\langle A_f(h), g \rangle_V = -((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h + \nabla f), \nabla g)_{L^2(D)^d} \quad (3.11)$$

for $h, g \in V$, and also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & {}_{V^*}\langle A_f(h_1) - A_f(h_2), g \rangle_V \\ &= -((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h_1 + \nabla f) - (\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h_2 + \nabla f), \nabla g)_{L^2(D)^d} \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

for $h_1, h_2, g \in V$. It is easy to see (1), by applying (3.12) with $g = h_1 - h_2$ and using the convexity of σ , see (3.7). We can also obtain (2), since we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |{}_{V^*}\langle A_f(h_1) - A_f(h_2), g \rangle_V| \\ & \leq c_+ \|\nabla h_1 - \nabla h_2\|_{L^2(D)^d} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2(D)^d}, \quad h_1, h_2, g \in V \end{aligned}$$

from (3.7) and (3.12) again. Moreover, we obtain (3.10) of (3), because the relationship (3.11) implies

$$\|A_f(h)\|_{V^*} \leq \|((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h + \nabla f))\|_{L^2(D)^d} \leq c_+ \|h\|_V + c_+ \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}$$

for $h \in V$.

As the final step, we shall show (3.9) of (3). Using (3.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & {}_{V^*}\langle A_f(h), h \rangle_V = -((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h + \nabla f), \nabla h + \nabla f)_{L^2(D)^d} \\ & \quad + ((\nabla\sigma)(\nabla h + \nabla f), \nabla f)_{L^2(D)^d} \\ & \leq -c_- \|\nabla h + \nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 + c_+ \|\nabla h + \nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d} \\ & \leq -\frac{1}{2}c_- \|\nabla h\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 + (c_+ + c_-) \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 \\ & \quad + c_+ \|\nabla h\|_{L^2(D)^d} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d} \end{aligned}$$

from (3.7). Here, noting

$$\|\nabla h\|_{L^2(D)^d} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d} \leq \frac{c_-}{4c_+} \|\nabla h\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 + \frac{c_+}{c_-} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2,$$

we obtain

$$v^* \langle A_f(h), h \rangle_V \leq -\frac{1}{4}c_- \|\nabla h\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 + \left(\frac{c_+^2}{c_-} + c_+ + c_- \right) \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2.$$

Since we have

$$\|h\|_V^2 \leq (1 + c_D) \|\nabla h\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2$$

from (3.3), we conclude the desired bound (3.9). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Using Theorem 4.10 of [1] and Lemma 3.4, for every initial data $h_0 \in H^1(D)^*$ and every auxiliary function $f \in H_0^1(D)$ satisfying (3.8), we obtain the existence and uniqueness of h_f satisfying conditions (1)-(3) in Definition 3.2. Especially, this shows the existence of the solution of (1.4) in the sense of Definition 3.2.

Let us show the uniqueness of the solution of (1.4) in the sense of Definition 3.2. Take a two solution $h^{(1)}$ and $h^{(2)}$ with a common initial data h_0 , and let f_1 and f_2 be auxiliary functions associated to $h^{(1)}$ and $h^{(2)}$, respectively. Noting

$$A_{f_1}(h) = A_{f_2}(h - f_2 + f_1), \quad h \in V,$$

$h^{(2)} - f_1 = h^{(2)} - f_2 + f_2 - f_1$ satisfies conditions (1)-(3) in Definition 3.2 with f_1 . The uniqueness of h_f for given f implies $h^{(2)} - f_1 = h^{(1)} - f_1$, which shows $h^{(1)} = h^{(2)}$. \square

We can also obtain the following by a similar argument to the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Proposition 3.5. *If $h(t)$ is the solution of (1.4) with initial data h_0 , then $h_f = h - f$ satisfies conditions (1)-(3) in Definition 3.2 for every $f \in H_0^1(D)$ with (3.8). In other words, we can choose an auxiliary function $f \in H_0^1(D)$ arbitrarily as long as it satisfies (3.8).*

3.3. Regularization for the macroscopic equation. We shall introduce the regularization of σ and the coefficient of the corresponding partial differential equation (1.4), which plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Note that such regularization becomes unnecessary once one can show C^2 -regularity of σ , which remains open at present.

Let $\rho \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a non-negative and symmetric function such that its support is in $\{u \in \mathbb{R}^d; |u| < 1\}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(u) du = 1$. For $0 < \delta \leq 1$, we define ρ_δ by

$$\rho_\delta = \delta^{-d} \rho(\delta^{-1}u), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

and the regularized surface tension σ^δ by the mollification of σ :

$$\sigma^\delta(u) = \sigma * \rho_\delta(u), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Note that the regularized surface tension σ^δ again satisfies the bound (3.7), that is,

$$c_- |u - v|^2 \leq (\nabla \sigma^\delta(u) - \nabla \sigma^\delta(v)) \cdot (u - v) \leq c_+ |u - v|^2, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (3.13)$$

holds for every $0 < \delta \leq 1$. Moreover, since $\nabla \sigma$ is Lipschitz continuous, σ^δ approximates σ in the following sense:

$$|\nabla \sigma^\delta(u) - \nabla \sigma(u)| \leq c_+ \delta, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d, \delta > 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Using σ^δ defined above, let us consider the nonlinear fourth order differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h^\delta(t, \theta) = -\Delta \operatorname{div} \left\{ (\nabla \sigma^\delta)(\nabla h(t, \theta)) \right\}, & \theta \in D, t > 0 \\ h^\delta(t, \theta) = 0, & \theta \in D^c, t > 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

The equation (3.15) can be formulated in a similar way to Definition 3.2, and the solution of (3.15) exists uniquely. Note that the proof is quite parallel with that of Theorem 3.3 since we have (3.13). Furthermore, we get the following proposition, which tells us that the solution of (1.4) can be approximated by the solution of (3.15).

Proposition 3.6. *Let h and h^δ be the solutions of (1.4) and (3.15), respectively. If their initial data are common, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|h(t) - h^\delta(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*} = 0.$$

Proof. Let $h_0 \in H^1(D)^*$ be the initial data of h and h^δ . We take $f \in H_0^1(D)$ satisfying $\langle f, 1 \rangle = \langle h_0, 1 \rangle$. By Definition 3.2 and Proposition 3.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|h^\delta(t) - f\|_H^2 &= \|h_0 - f\|_H^2 \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t (\nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla h^\delta(s)) - \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla f), \nabla h^\delta(s) - \nabla f)_{L^2(D)^d} ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t (\nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla f), \nabla h^\delta(s) - \nabla f)_{L^2(D)^d} ds \\ &\leq \|h_0 - f\|_H^2 - 2c_- \int_0^t \|\nabla h^\delta(s) - \nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla f)\|_{L^2(D)^d} \|\nabla h^\delta(s) - \nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d} ds \\ &\leq \|h_0 - f\|_H^2 - c_- \int_0^t \|\nabla h^\delta(s) - \nabla f\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 ds \\ &\quad + c_-^{-1} \int_0^t \|\nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla f)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

from (3.11) with $g = h^\delta - f$ and σ replaced by σ^δ and (3.13). This shows

$$\sup_{\delta > 0} \int_0^t \|h^\delta(s)\|_{H^1(D)}^2 ds < \infty. \quad (3.16)$$

By a similar calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|h(t) - h^\delta(t)\|_H^2 \\ &= -2 \int_0^t (\nabla \sigma(\nabla h(s) + \nabla f) - \nabla \sigma(\nabla h^\delta(s) + \nabla f), \nabla h(s) - \nabla h^\delta(s))_{L^2(D)^d} ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t (\nabla \sigma(\nabla h^\delta(s) + \nabla f) - \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla h^\delta(s) + \nabla f), \nabla h(s) - \nabla h^\delta(s))_{L^2(D)^d} ds \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^t c_+ \delta \int_D |\nabla h(s, \theta) - \nabla h^\delta(s, \theta)| d\theta ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have used (3.14) in the last inequality. Combining the above with (3.16) and $h - f \in L^2([0, T], V)$, we get the conclusion. \square

We can show the following proposition by a similar argument to the proof of Proposition 3.6 noting Lemma 3.4-(1).

Proposition 3.7. *Let h and \hat{h} be two solutions of (1.4). We then have*

$$\|h(t) - \hat{h}(t)\|_H \leq \|h(0) - \hat{h}(0)\|_H, \quad t \geq 0.$$

3.4. The discretization for the macroscopic equation. In order to introduce the discretized equation corresponding to the regularized macroscopic equation (3.15), let us introduce several notations. We define the finite difference operators by

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i^N f(\theta) &= N(f(\theta + e_i/N) - f(\theta)), \\ \nabla_i^{N,*} f(\theta) &= -N(f(\theta) - f(\theta - e_i/N)), \\ \nabla^N f(\theta) &= (\nabla_1^N f(\theta), \dots, \nabla_d^N f(\theta)), \\ \operatorname{div}_N g(\theta) &= - \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_i^{N,*} g_i(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

for $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g = (g_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $e_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is the i -th unit vector given by $(e_i)_j = \delta_{ij}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. We also define the discretized Laplacian with the Neumann boundary condition by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_N f(\theta) &= N \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\nabla_i^N f(\theta) 1_{\theta \in \tilde{D}_N} 1_{\theta + e_i/N \in \tilde{D}_N} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \nabla_i^N f(\theta - e_i/N) 1_{\theta \in \tilde{D}_N} 1_{\theta - e_i/N \in \tilde{D}_N} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where the domain \tilde{D}_N is defined by

$$\tilde{D}_N = \bigcup_{x \in D_N} B(x/N, 1/N).$$

Note that indicator functions appearing above are corresponding to the range of y 's where the sum (2.4) is taken. With these notations the discretized PDE for (3.15) reads a system of ordinary differential equations for $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, \theta)$:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, \theta) &= -\Delta_N k^{N,\delta} \\ k^{N,\delta} &= A^{N,\delta}(\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t))(\theta) \\ &:= \operatorname{div}_N \{ (\nabla \sigma^\delta)(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)) \}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \tilde{D}_N, \\ \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, \theta) &= 0, \quad \theta \notin \tilde{D}_N. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (3.17)$$

We recall that $\sigma^\delta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and it satisfies (3.13). The equation (3.17) will be solved with the initial data given by

$$\bar{h}_0^N(\theta) = N^d \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} h_0(\theta') d\theta', \quad \theta \in B(x/N, 1/N) \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (3.18)$$

where $h_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since the initial data h_0^N is a step function, the solution $\bar{h}^N(t, \theta)$ is also a step function, that is,

$$\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, \theta) = \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N), \quad \theta \in B(x/N, 1/N), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

3.5. The discrete analog of the space H . We shall analogously define the discrete version of the Hilbert space H introduced in Section 3.1. For a step function $f^N : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with mesh size $1/N$, that is, f^N having the following representation

$$f^N(\theta) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} N^{-1} \psi^N(x) 1_{B(x/N, 1/N)}(\theta) \quad (3.19)$$

with $\psi^N \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that $\psi^N(x) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$, we define $\|f^N\|_{-1,N}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 &= N^{-d-4} \sum_{x \in D_N} (\psi^N(x) - \langle \psi^N \rangle) (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} (\psi^N(x) - \langle \psi^N \rangle) \\ &\quad + N^{-2d-2} \langle \psi^N \rangle^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\langle \psi^N \rangle = N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \psi^N(x).$$

Note that the inverse of the Laplacian $(-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1}$ can be defined as the linear operator from

$$\mathcal{A}_N = \left\{ \phi \in \mathbb{R}^{D_N}; \sum_{x \in D_N} \phi(x) = 0 \right\}$$

to itself, by regarding $-\Delta_{D_N}$ as a bijection from \mathcal{A}_N to itself. It is verified by the summation-by-parts formula for $-\Delta_{D_N}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{x \in D_N} (-\Delta_{D_N}) \psi(x) \phi(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} (\psi(y) - \psi(x)) (\phi(y) - \phi(x)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in D_N \cap (D_N - e_i)} (\psi(x + e_i) - \psi(x)) (\phi(x + e_i) - \phi(x)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

holds for every $\phi, \psi \in \mathbb{R}^{D_N}$.

Under these settings, for $\psi^N \in \mathcal{A}_N$, $\zeta^N := (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} \psi^N$ is defined only on D_N . Let us extend ζ^N to outside of D_N for convenience. We define $\partial_i D_N$ by

$$\partial_i D_N = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N; \text{dist}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(x, D_N) = i\}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

where $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is the graph distance on \mathbb{Z}^d . We define the value of ξ on $\partial_i D_N$ inductively, by

$$\zeta^N(x) = (\#\{y \in D_N; |x - y| = 1\})^{-1} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} \zeta^N(y)$$

for $x \in \partial_1 D_N$ and

$$\zeta^N(x) = (\#\{y \in \partial_{i-1} D_N; |x - y| = 1\})^{-1} \sum_{y \in \partial_{i-1} D_N; |x-y|=1} \zeta^N(y)$$

for $x \in \partial_i D_N$. Let us take $K > 0$ independent of N such that

$$D \subset \bigcup_{x \in D_N \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^K \partial_i D_N} B(x/N, 1/N).$$

Extending ζ^N to $D_N \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{K+1} \partial_i D_N$, we can introduce the macroscopic function g^N on D by

$$G_N f^N(\theta) = \sum_{x \in D_N \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^K \partial_i D_N} N^{-1} \zeta^N(x) 1_{B(x/N, 1/N)}(\theta), \quad \theta \in D. \quad (3.21)$$

We note that $k^{N, \delta}$ in the equation (3.17) can be extended to the function on D by the same way. We also note that we can choose a constant $C > 0$ independent of N such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{x \in D_N \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^K \partial_i D_N} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d; |x-y|=1} (\zeta^N(x) - \zeta^N(y))^2 \\ & \leq C \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} (\zeta^N(x) - \zeta^N(y))^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

by Assumption 2.1.

As a preparation for calculations, we shall show the following proposition, which means that $\|f^N\|_{-1, N}$ dominates $\|f^N\|_{H^1(D)^*}$ if f^N is a step function.

Proposition 3.8. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of N such that*

$$\|f^N\|_{H^1(D)^*} \leq C \|f^N\|_{-1, N} \quad (3.23)$$

holds for every step function f^N with mesh size $1/N$ satisfying $\langle f^N, 1 \rangle = 0$ and $f^N(x/N) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$.

Before starting the proof of Proposition 3.8, we prepare a small lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *For $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_N$ and $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{D_N}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{x \in D_N} \psi(x) \phi(x) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} ((-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} \psi(y) - (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} \psi(x)) (\phi(y) - \phi(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Especially, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|f^N\|_{-1, N}^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{2} N^{-d-4} \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} ((-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} \psi(y) - (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} \psi(x))^2 \end{aligned}$$

for every the step function f^N represented by (3.19) with $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_N$.

Proof. Take $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_N$ and $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{D_N}$. By definition of $(-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in D_N} \psi(x)\phi(x) &= \sum_{x \in D_N} ((-\Delta_{D_N})(-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1}\psi)(x)\phi(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} ((-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1}\psi(y) - (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1}\psi(x)) \\ &\quad \times (\phi(y) - \phi(x)) \end{aligned}$$

which shows the conclusion. Here, we have used the summation-by-parts formula (3.20). \square

Proof of Proposition 3.8. We take ψ^N satisfying (3.19). We also take a function $J \in C^\infty(D)$ arbitrarily. Since $f^N(x/N) = 0$ holds for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$, we have

$$\langle f^N, J \rangle = \sum_{x \in D_N} \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} f^N(\theta) J(\theta) d\theta$$

by the definition of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Letting

$$\xi^N(x) = N^{d+1} \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} J(\theta) d\theta, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f^N, J \rangle &= N^{-d-2} \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} ((-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1}\psi^N(y) - (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1}\psi^N(x)) \\ &\quad \times (\xi^N(y) - \xi^N(x)) \end{aligned}$$

from Lemma 3.9. Using the Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3.9, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f^N, J \rangle| &\leq \|f^N\|_{-1, N} \left(N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{y \in D_N; |x-y|=1} (\xi^N(y) - \xi^N(x))^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &=: \|f^N\|_{-1, N} I(\xi^N)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Since we have

$$\bigcup_{x \in D_N} \bigcup_{y \in D_N; |x-y| \leq 1} B(y/N, 1/N) \subset D$$

by the definition of D_N and we have

$$(\xi^N(x \pm e_i) - \xi^N(x))^2 \leq N^{d+1} \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} \int_0^{1/N} \left(\frac{\partial J}{\partial \theta_i}(\theta + \pm t e_i) \right)^2 dt d\theta$$

for every $x \in D_N$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I(\xi^N) &\leq N \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} \int_0^{1/N} \left(\frac{\partial J}{\partial \theta_i}(\theta + te_i) \right)^2 dt d\theta \\ &\quad + N \sum_{x \in D_N} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} \int_0^{1/N} \left(\frac{\partial J}{\partial \theta_i}(\theta - te_i) \right)^2 dt d\theta \\ &\leq 2 \|\nabla J\|_{L^2(D)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above with (3.24), we obtain

$$|\langle f^N, J \rangle| \leq \sqrt{2} \|f^N\|_{-1, N} \|J\|_{H^1(D)}.$$

The above implies the conclusion, since $C^\infty(D)$ is dense in $H^1(D)$. \square

Furthermore, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{-1, N}$ converges to $\|\cdot\|_H$ in the following sense:

Proposition 3.10. *For $N \geq 1$, let f^N be a step function represented by (3.19). If the sequence $\{f^N\}$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \|f^N\|_{L^2(D)} < \infty \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|f^N - f\|_H = 0 \quad (3.26)$$

for some $f \in H$, we then have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|f^N\|_{-1, N} = \|f\|_H.$$

Proof. We first obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^N\|_{-1, N}^2 &= N^{-d-4} \sum_{x \in D_N} \psi^N(x) (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} \psi^N(x) \\ &= (f^N, G_N f^N)_{L^2(D)} \end{aligned}$$

by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{-1, N}$, where ψ^N is determined by (3.19). Here, we have used $\psi^N(x) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$ at the last identity. Since we also have

$$\|f\|_H^2 = \langle f, Gf \rangle,$$

we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^N\|_{-1, N}^2 - \|f\|_H^2 &= (f^N, G_N f^N)_{L^2(D)} - (f^N, Gf)_{L^2(D)} \\ &\quad + \langle f^N, Gf \rangle - \langle f, Gf \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\langle f^N, Gf \rangle - \langle f, Gf \rangle) = 0$$

from (3.26), it is sufficient for our goal to show

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} ((f^N, G_N f^N)_{L^2(D)} - (f^N, Gf)_{L^2(D)}) = 0. \quad (3.27)$$

Furthermore, once we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|G_N f^N - Gf\|_{L^2(D)} = 0, \quad (3.28)$$

we immediately obtain (3.27) by (3.25).

Let us show (3.28). We take $J \in C^\infty(D)$ arbitrarily and define ξ^N and J^N by

$$\xi^N(x) = N^{d+1} \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} J(\theta') d\theta'$$

for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $B(x/N, 1/N) \subset D$, and J^N is defined by

$$J^N(\theta) = N^d \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} J(\theta') d\theta'$$

for $\theta \in B(x/N, 1/N)$ with $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $B(x/N, 1/N) \subset D$, respectively. We note that Lemma 3.9 implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_D f^N(\theta) J(\theta) d\theta \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\tilde{D}_N} \nabla_i^N G_N f^N(\theta) \nabla_i^N J^N(\theta) d\theta \\ & \quad - N^{-d-4} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in D_N \cap (D_N - e_i)^c} (\zeta^N(x + e_i) - \zeta^N(x)) (\xi^N(x + e_i) - \xi^N(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

where ζ^N is the extension of $(-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} \psi^N$, see the beginning of this subsection.

Using (3.22) and Lemma 3.9, we can choose a subsequence $\{N'\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} G_N f^N &\rightarrow \bar{g} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(D), \\ \nabla_i^{N'} G_N f^N &\rightarrow h_i \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(D) \end{aligned}$$

as $N' \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\bar{g}, h_i \in L^2(D)$. Replacing N by N' at (3.29) and taking the limit $N' \rightarrow \infty$ at the both sides of (3.29), we obtain

$$\int_D f(\theta) J(\theta) d\theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_D h_i(\theta) \nabla_i J(\theta) d\theta.$$

Since the limit point \bar{g} satisfies

$$\int_D \bar{g}(\theta) d\theta = 0$$

and $\nabla_i \bar{g} = h_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, we conclude that every limit point \bar{g} satisfies (3.1) and (3.2). Because the solution of the elliptic equation (3.1) and (3.2) exists uniquely, the sequence $\{G_N f^N\}$ itself need to converge to $\bar{g} = Gf$ in $L^2(D)$. \square

3.6. A priori bound for the discretized equation. Let us establish a priori bound of the solution $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}$ of (3.17). To do so, we introduce an auxiliary function similarly to Definition 3.2. Let us take the function $g \in C_0^\infty(D)$ which satisfies the following:

- (1) $g(x) \geq 0$ holds for every $x \in D$.
- (2) $\int_D g(\theta) d\theta = 1$.

We can then take $N_0 \geq 1$ large enough such that $\text{supp } g \subset \tilde{D}_N$ for every $N \geq N_0$. Let us establish a priori bound for \bar{h}^N with $N \geq N_0$.

Using g introduced above, we define ζ^N by

$$\zeta^N(x) = N^{d+1} \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} g(\theta) d\theta, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

and g^N by

$$g^N(\theta) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} N^{-1} \zeta^N(x) 1_{B(x/N, 1/N)}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We then have the following bound:

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} \left\{ \|g^N\|_\infty + \|\nabla_i^N g^N\|_\infty + \|\nabla_i^N \nabla_j^N g^N\|_\infty \right\} \leq c_g, \quad (3.30)$$

where c_g is the constant defined by

$$c_g = \sup_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} \left\{ \|g\|_\infty + \left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_i} \right\|_\infty + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right\|_\infty + 1 \right\}.$$

Using ζ^N and g^N introduced above, we define ψ^N and f^N by

$$\psi^N(x) = v \zeta^N(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \quad (3.31)$$

and

$$f^N(x) = v g^N(\theta), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (3.32)$$

respectively, where v is the ‘‘volume’’ of h_0 , that is,

$$v = \int_D \bar{h}_0^N(\theta) d\theta = \langle h_0, 1 \rangle$$

for the initial datum \bar{h}_0^N for (3.17). Note that the right hand side of the above does not depend on the choice of δ . We then have that sequences $\{\psi^N\}$ and $\{f^N\}$ satisfy following properties:

- (1) For every N and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$, $\psi^N(x) = f^N(x/N) = 0$ holds.
- (2) For every N , the relationship

$$\sum_{x \in D_N} \psi^N(x) = N \int_D f^N(\theta) d\theta$$

holds.

- (3) The following bounds hold:

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} \left\{ \|f^N\|_\infty + \|\nabla_i^N f^N\|_\infty + \|\nabla_i^N \nabla_j^N f^N\|_\infty \right\} \leq c_g |v|. \quad (3.33)$$

Proposition 3.11. *There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of N, δ such that*

$$\|\bar{h}^{N, \delta}(t)\|_{-1, N}^2 + N^{-d} \int_0^t \|\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N, \delta}(s)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 ds \leq C_1 \|h^{N, \delta}(0)\|_{-1, N}^2 + C_2(1+t)$$

holds for every $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Differentiating $\|\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2$ in t , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{dt}\|\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 &= -2N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \cdot \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \\
 &\quad + 2N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N f^N(x/N) \cdot \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \\
 &\leq -2c_- N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2 \\
 &\quad + 2N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N f^N(x/N) \cdot \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)), \quad (3.34)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{D_N}$ is defined by

$$\overline{D_N} = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d; \text{there exists } y \in D_N \text{ such that } |x - y| \leq 1\}.$$

Here, we have used the summation-by-parts formula

$$\sum_{x \in D_N} \alpha(x/N) \operatorname{div}_N \beta(x/N) = - \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N \alpha(x/N) \cdot \beta(x/N), \quad (3.35)$$

where $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta = (\beta_i)_{i=1}^d : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are arbitrary functions such that α and β_i ($1 \leq i \leq d$) are step functions with mesh size $1/N$ and $\alpha(x/N) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$.

The second term in the right hand side can be estimated in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left| N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N f^N(x/N) \cdot \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \right| \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2} c_- N^d \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2 + CN^{-d} |v| |\overline{D_N}|,
 \end{aligned}$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of N . We have used the properties of f^N stated at the beginning of this subsection. Plugging the above into (3.34) and integrating in t , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(T) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 &\leq \|\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(0) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{2} c_- \int_0^T \|\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 dt + CN^{-d} |v| |\overline{D_N}| T
 \end{aligned}$$

for every $T > 0$, which implies the desired estimate, since $\|f^N\|_{-1,N}$ is bounded uniformly in N . \square

We can improve the bound for $\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}$ if the initial datum is smooth enough.

Proposition 3.12. *We assume that*

$$h_0 \in C_0^\infty(D). \quad (3.36)$$

We then have the following uniform bound:

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 < \infty$$

for every $T > 0$.

Proof. Differentiating $\sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N))$ in t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \nabla^N \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \\ &= \sum_{x \in D_N} \operatorname{div}_N \nabla \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \\ &= \sum_{x \in D_N} k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \Delta_N k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N). \end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

Here, we have used (3.8) in [10], since

$$\frac{\partial \bar{h}^N}{\partial t}(t, x/N) = 0, \quad x \in D_N^c$$

holds. Since $-\Delta_N$ is non-negative definite, we obtain that the right hand side is non-positive. Dropping the right hand side and integrating in t , we have

$$\sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \leq \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \sigma^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(0, x/N)),$$

which indicate the conclusion, since the function σ satisfies (3.7). \square

Let us establish the bound for k^N in (3.17), in order to apply the argument in Section 3.3 of [10].

Proposition 3.13. *We assume (3.36). We then have the following bound:*

$$\sup_N \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left\| \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t} \right\|_{-1,N}^2 + \int_0^T \left\| \nabla^N \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t} \right\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 dt \right\} < \infty.$$

Proof. Noting

$$\frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t^2}(t, x/N) = \sum_{i,j=1}^d \Delta_N \nabla_i^{N,*} \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma^\delta}{\partial u_i \partial u_j}(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}) \nabla_j^N \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)}{\partial t} \right\}$$

and

$$\sum_{x \in D_N} \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t}(t, x/N) = 0,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{dt} \left\| \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t} \right\|_{-1,N}^2 \\
 &= -2N^{-d} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla_i^N \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t}(t, x/N) \frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial u_i \partial u_j}(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}) \nabla_j^N \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t}(t) \\
 &\leq -2c_- N^{-d} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \left(\nabla_i^N \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t}(t, x/N) \right)^2
 \end{aligned}$$

by performing the summation-by-parts several times. Integrating the both sides in t , we obtain the conclusion. \square

Remark 3.2. By the definition of $k^{N,\delta}$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \bar{h}^{N,\delta}}{\partial t} \right\|_{-1,N}^2 = N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) (-\Delta_N k^{N,\delta})(t, x/N).$$

We therefore obtain

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) (-\Delta_N k^{N,\delta})(t, x/N) < \infty. \quad (3.38)$$

by Proposition 3.13.

Remark 3.3. We need the smoothness of σ^δ in order to obtain the uniform bound in N for

$$N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} k^{N,\delta}(0, x/N) (-\Delta_N k^{N,\delta})(0, x/N),$$

even if h_0 is smooth, for example, $h_0 \in C_0^\infty(D)$. We have C^1 -regularity of σ and the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla \sigma$, but such regularity is less than that we need. It is the reason why we consider the equation (3.17) with smooth σ^δ instead of the original surface tension σ .

As a direct consequence of Proposition 3.13, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.14. *We assume (3.36). There exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of N such that*

$$\sup_N \left\| \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t_1) - \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t_2) \right\|_{-1,N}^2 \leq C |t_1 - t_2|$$

holds for every $0 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq T$.

3.7. Uniform L^2 -bound for $k^{N,\delta}$. In this subsection, let us establish the uniform L^2 -bound for $k^{N,\delta}$. Noting (3.38), we can obtain the desired bound once we show the following:

Proposition 3.15. *Under the assumption (3.36), we obtain*

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |k^{N,\delta}(t)| < \infty \quad (3.39)$$

for every $T > 0$, where

$$\langle k^{N,\delta}(t) \rangle = N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N).$$

In order to prove the above, we shall use the same argument as in Section 3.3 of [10] and reduce our problem to that for solutions of elliptic equations whose main term is linear. Repeating the argument in Section 3.3 of [10], we have the following decomposition for $\nabla\sigma$:

$$\nabla\sigma(u) = A(u)u + a(u), \quad (3.40)$$

where $A(u) = (A_{ij}(u))$ is the $d \times d$ diagonal matrix for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $a(u) = (a_i(u)) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. We remark that the matrix $A(u)$ satisfies

$$c_- \mathbb{I} \leq A(u) \leq c_+ \mathbb{I} \quad (3.41)$$

uniformly in u , where \mathbb{I} is the $d \times d$ identity matrix and c_{\pm} is same as in Assumption 2.2. Furthermore, we also remark that the vector a satisfies

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq d} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d} |a_i(u)| \leq C_a$$

with some constant $C_a > 0$. By (3.40) and the definition of σ^δ , we also obtain the decomposition for $\nabla\sigma^\delta$ as follows:

$$\nabla\sigma^\delta(u) = A^\delta(u)u + a^\delta(u),$$

where

$$A_{ij}^\delta(u) = A_{ij} * \rho_\delta(u), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d$$

and

$$a_i^\delta(u) = a_{ij} * \rho_\delta(u) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} A_{ii}(u-v)v_i \rho_\delta(v) dv, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

We note that A^δ is diagonal and satisfies (3.41) again, and that a^δ satisfies

$$\sup_{\delta > 0} \sup_{1 \leq i \leq d} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d} |a_i^\delta(u)| < C'_a$$

with some constant $C'_a > 0$. Putting

$$\begin{aligned} A^{N,\delta}(t, \theta) &= A^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, \theta)), \\ a^{N,\delta}(t, \theta) &= a^\delta(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, \theta)), \end{aligned}$$

we see that $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)$ satisfies

$$k^{N,\delta}(t) = \operatorname{div}_N (A^{N,\delta}(t) \nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)) + \operatorname{div}_N a^{N,\delta}(t), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.42)$$

Let us regard (3.42) as the elliptic equation for given $A^{N,\delta}(t)$, $a^{N,\delta}(t)$ and $k^{N,\delta}$, which has a unique solution. Since the main term of (3.42) is linear, we can use the principle of superposition. For $t > 0$, let $\bar{h}_1^{N,\delta}(t)$ be the unique solution of

$$\tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t) = \operatorname{div}_N (A^{N,\delta}(t) \nabla^N \bar{h}_1^{N,\delta}(t)) + \operatorname{div}_N a^{N,\delta}(t) \quad (3.43)$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\bar{h}_1^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N,$$

where $\tilde{u}^{N,\delta}(t)$ is defined by

$$\tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t) := k^{N,\delta}(t) - \langle k^{N,\delta}(t) \rangle.$$

Furthermore, we let $\bar{h}_2^{N,\delta}(t)$ be the unique solution of

$$\langle k^{N,\delta}(t) \rangle = \operatorname{div}_N(A^{N,\delta}(t)\nabla^N \bar{h}_2^{N,\delta}(t)) \quad (3.44)$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition similarly to $\bar{h}_1^{N,\delta}$. Note that the original $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)$ can be expressed as

$$\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t) = \bar{h}_1^{N,\delta}(t) + \bar{h}_2^{N,\delta}(t). \quad (3.45)$$

We will establish (3.39) via the bounds for $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)$, $\bar{h}_1^{N,\delta}(t)$ and $\bar{h}_2^{N,\delta}(t)$. Let us take $\delta > 0$ arbitrarily and we sometimes omit the parameter δ throughout this subsection in order to keep notations simple.

We shall at first show the bound for \bar{h}_1^N .

Proposition 3.16. *There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of N and t such that*

$$\|\nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 + \|\bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \leq C_1 \|\tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + C_2$$

holds for every $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Multiplying the both side of (3.43) by $\bar{h}_1^N(t)$ and taking the sum over D_N , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in D_N} \tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) &= \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) \operatorname{div}_N(A^N(t)\nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t))(x/N) \\ &\quad + \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) \operatorname{div}_N a^N(t)(x/N). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing the both side by N^d and performing the summation-by-parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) &= N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) \cdot A^N(t) \nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) \\ &\quad + N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) a^N(t, x/N) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} c_- \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N)|^2 + \frac{8C_a}{c_-} N^d |D_N|. \end{aligned}$$

We have used (3.41) and $\bar{h}_1^N(t, x/N) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N$. Using the Poincaré inequality

$$\|\bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \leq C \|\nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 \quad (3.46)$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent in N , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}c_- \|\nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 \\ & \leq 2\gamma \|\tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + 2\gamma^{-1} \|\bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + \frac{8C_a}{c_-} N^d |D_N| \\ & \leq 2\gamma \|\tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + 2\gamma^{-1} C \|\nabla \bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 + \frac{8C_a}{c_-} N^d |D_N| \end{aligned}$$

for every $\gamma > 0$. Choosing $\gamma = 4C/c_-$, we conclude

$$\frac{1}{4}c_- \|\nabla^N \bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 \leq \frac{8C}{c_-} \|\tilde{k}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + \frac{8C_a}{c_-} N^d |D_N|.$$

Applying the Poincaré inequality (3.46) to the above, we also obtain the bound for $\|\bar{h}_1^N(t)\|_{L^2}^2$. \square

Since we now have the nice bounds for $\bar{h}_1^N(t)$ and $\bar{h}^N(t)$, we have one for $\bar{h}_2^N(t)$ also. We shall show the following proposition which says that the bound for $\bar{h}_2^N(t)$ implies the bound for $\langle k^{N,\delta}(t) \rangle$.

Proposition 3.17. *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t)$ be the solution of*

$$\alpha = \operatorname{div}_N(A^N(t)\nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t)) \quad (3.47)$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition. We then have

$$\alpha^2 \leq C \|\nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2. \quad (3.48)$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of N, t and α .

Proof. Multiplying (3.47) by $h_{2,\alpha}^N$ and taking sum over D_N , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N) \\ & = N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N) \operatorname{div}_N(A^N(t)\nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N)). \end{aligned}$$

Performing the summation-by-parts at the right hand side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N) \\ & = -N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N) \cdot A^N(t)\nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N). \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

We have used $\bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t)$ satisfies the Dirichlet boundary condition. Noting that $h_{2,\alpha}^N$ can be expressed by

$$h_{2,\alpha}^N = \alpha h_{2,1}^N$$

because the right hand side of (3.47) is linear, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \alpha^2 N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_{2,1}^N(t, x/N) \right| \\
 &= N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N) \cdot A^N(t) \nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N) \\
 &\leq c_+ N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,\alpha}^N(t, x/N)|^2
 \end{aligned}$$

from (3.41). Here, once we have

$$\inf_N \left| N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_{2,1}^N(t, x/N) \right| > c \quad (3.50)$$

with a constant $c > 0$ independent of N and t , we immediately obtain the conclusion. We shall therefore show (3.50). Using (3.49) and (3.41), we get

$$\left| N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_{2,1}^N(t, x/N) \right| \geq c_- \|\nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,1}^N\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2. \quad (3.51)$$

For the function g^N introduced at the beginning of Section 3.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 &= N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} g^N(x/N) \\
 &= N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla^N g^N(x/N) \cdot A^N(t) \nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,1}^N(t, x/N) \\
 &\leq C' \|\nabla^N g^N\|_{L^2(D)^d} \|\nabla^N \bar{h}_{2,1}^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}.
 \end{aligned}$$

with a constant $C' > 0$ by using (3.41). Combining the above with (3.30) and (3.51), we get

$$\left| N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} \bar{h}_{2,1}^N(t, x/N) \right| \geq \frac{c_-}{C'^2 c_g^2},$$

which shows (3.50). \square

Once we obtain Proposition 3.16 and Proposition 3.17, we can easily show Proposition 3.15. Noting

$$\|\nabla^N h_2^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 \leq 2\|\nabla^N h^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 + 2\|\nabla^N h_1^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2,$$

we have

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla^N h_2^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d} < \infty$$

by using Proposition 3.12 and Proposition 3.16. On the other hand, since we have

$$|\langle k^{N,\delta}(t) \rangle|^2 \leq C \|\nabla^N h_2^N(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2$$

from Proposition 3.17, we obtain (3.39) and therefore Proposition 3.15.

Corollary 3.18. *Under the assumption (3.36), we have the following bound:*

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|k^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)} + \|\nabla^N k^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}) < \infty. \quad (3.52)$$

Proof. From Assumption 2.1 and the definition of $k^{N,\delta}$ as in Section 3.4, we can easily see

$$\|k^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C_1 \sum_{x \in D_N} |k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2$$

and

$$\|\nabla^N k^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \leq C_2 N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) (-\Delta_N k^{N,\delta})(t, x/N)$$

with constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of N . These inequalities and Proposition 3.15 imply (3.52). \square

Once we have Corollary 3.18, we can also obtain uniform L^p -bound for $\nabla^N \bar{h}^N$. This uniform bound plays the key role in the derivation of PDE (1.4) from the height variable h^N .

Proposition 3.19. *We assume (3.36). We then have the following bounds:*

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|k^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^p(D)}^p < \infty$$

and

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^p(D)^d}^p < \infty$$

for some $p > 2$.

Proof. Combining Corollary 3.18 with the similar argument to the proof of Proposition I.4 in [8], we obtain the first assertion. Applying the argument in Section 3.3 of [10] to (3.43), we also obtain the second assertion. \square

As an application of Proposition 3.19, we can obtain the following identity corresponding to the oscillation inequality in [3]. This also plays the key role in the derivation of PDE (1.4) from the height variable h^N .

Proposition 3.20. *We assume (3.36). For the solution $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}$ of (3.17) and $e \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $|e| = 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-d} \int_0^T \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N + e/N) - \nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2 dt = 0. \quad (3.53)$$

Proof. Take $1 \leq i \leq d$ arbitrary. From (3.17), we can split

$$F_0^N(t) := N^{-d-2} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \nabla_i^N k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \nabla_i^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)$$

into three terms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_0^N(t) &= N^{-d-2} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla_i^N \nabla \sigma(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \nabla_i^N \nabla_j^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \\
 &\quad - N^{-d-2} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N} \cap (D_N - e_i)^c} \nabla_i^N \operatorname{div}_N \nabla \sigma(\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)) \\
 &\quad \quad \quad \times \nabla_i^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \\
 &\quad + N^{-d-2} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N} \cap (D_N - e_i)^c} \nabla_i^N k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \nabla_i^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) \\
 &=: F_1^N(t) + F_2^N(t) + F_3^N(t),
 \end{aligned}$$

where the set $\overline{D_N}$ is defined by $\overline{D_N} = \overline{(D_N)}$. Here, we have used

$$\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \overline{D_N}.$$

Using (3.7), we have for $F_1^N(t)$

$$F_1^N(t) \leq -c_- N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N + e_i/N) - \nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2,$$

which is nothing but our target. From now on, we shall show the remaining terms vanish when $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For $F_0^N(t)$, since we have

$$|F_0^N(t)| \leq 2N^{-2} \int_0^T \|\nabla^N k^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 dt + 2N^{-2} \int_0^T \|\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{L^2(D)^d}^2 dt,$$

by the Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T |F_0^N(t)| dt = 0$$

from Proposition 3.12.

We shall next establish the bound for F_2^N and F_3^N . To do so, we shall at first make an L^2 bound for $\nabla^N \bar{h}^N$ on $B_N = \overline{D_N} \setminus D_N$. Choosing $r, q > 1$ such that $r = p/2, 1/r + 1/q = 1$ and applying the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{B_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2 \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{r} \left(N^{-d} |\overline{B_N}| \right)^{r/2q} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^p + \frac{1}{q} \left(N^{-d} |\overline{B_N}| \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.54)
 \end{aligned}$$

For $F_2^N(t)$, since we have

$$|F_2^N(t)| \leq N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{B_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2,$$

we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T |F_2^N(t)| dt = 0$$

from Proposition 3.19. Also for $F_3^N(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F_3^N(t)| &\leq 2\alpha(N)N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{B_N}} |\nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\alpha(N)^{-1}N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} |\nabla^N k^{N,\delta}(t, x/N)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for an arbitrary sequence $\{\alpha(N)\}$ of positive numbers. Choosing $\alpha(N) = N^\epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T |F_3^N(t)| dt = 0.$$

from Proposition 3.19. Summarizing above, we conclude (3.53). \square

3.8. Convergence of the solution for the discretized equation. We shall show that the solution $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}$ of the discretized equation (3.17) converges to the solution h^δ for the regularized equation (3.15), when the initial data is smooth enough. The goal is the following:

Theorem 3.21. *Assume $h_0 \in C_0^\infty(D)$. Then, the sequence of solutions $\{\bar{h}^{N,\delta}\}$ for the discretized equation (3.17) with initial datum h_0^N converges as $N \rightarrow \infty$ to the unique solution $h^\delta(t)$ of (3.15) with initial data h_0 in the following sense:*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t) - h^\delta(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*} = 0$$

holds for every $t > 0$.

Proof. To simplify notations, we omit the parameter δ when no confusion arises. We shall at first show that we can take a subsequence $\{N'\}$ such that $\bar{h}^{N'}$ converges to the solution of (3.15). We arbitrarily choose $f \in C_0^\infty(D)$ such that

$$\int_D h_0(\theta) d\theta = \int_D f(\theta) d\theta$$

and define f^N by

$$f^N(\theta) = N^d \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} f(\theta') d\theta', \quad \theta \in B(x/N, 1/N), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

We introduce the polilinear interpolation used in [3], that is, \hat{h}^N is defined by follows:

$$\hat{h}^N(t, \theta) = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^d} \left[\prod_{i=1}^d (\alpha_i \{N\theta_i\} + (1 - \alpha_i)(1 - \{N\theta_i\})) \right] \bar{h}^N \left(t, \frac{[N\theta] + \alpha}{N} \right), \quad (3.55)$$

where $[\cdot]$ and $\{\cdot\}$ denote the integral and the fractional parts, respectively. We also define \hat{k}^N by the similar manner. We then have

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{h}^N(t)\|_{H^1(D)} < \infty$$

and

$$\sup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{k}^N(t)\|_{H^1(D)} < \infty$$

by Proposition 3.12 and Corollary 3.18. Using Proposition 3.12, Corollary 3.14, Corollary 3.18 and the bounds stated above, we can choose a subsequence $\{N'\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}^{N'} - f^N &\rightarrow \bar{g} \quad \text{strongly in } C([0, T], H), \\ \hat{h}^N &\rightarrow \hat{h} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2([0, T], H_0^1(D)), \\ \bar{k}^N &\rightarrow \bar{k} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2([0, T] \times D), \\ \hat{k}^N &\rightarrow \hat{k} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2([0, T], H^1(D)) \end{aligned}$$

as $N' \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\bar{g}, \hat{h}, \bar{k}, \hat{k}$. Letting $\bar{h} = \bar{g} + f$, we can easily see that $\bar{h} = \hat{h}$ and $\bar{k} = \hat{k}$. Furthermore, in this setting, for every $t > 0$, $\|\bar{h}^{N'}(t) - f^N\|_{-1, N'}$ converges to $\|\bar{g}(t)\|_H$ as $N' \rightarrow \infty$, see Proposition 3.10. Applying the argument in Step 3 of Proposition I.2 in [8], we obtain that the limit \bar{h} is the solution of (3.15) with initial data \bar{h}_0 . Furthermore, the uniqueness for (3.15) implies that the sequence $\{\bar{h}^N; N \geq 1\}$ itself converges to \bar{h} strongly in $C([0, T], H^1(D)^*)$, which shows the conclusion. \square

4. IDENTIFICATION OF EQUILIBRIUM STATES

In this section, let us study the structure of the equilibrium states for the dynamics on $(\mathbb{Z}^d)^*$ corresponding to (2.1). We will focus our attention to the relationship between stationarity and Gibbs property, since we have already known that the family of extremal canonical Gibbs measures coincides with the family of extremal grand canonical Gibbs measures introduced by [8], see [9] for details.

4.1. Notations. In order to characterize the equilibrium states, we shall prepare several notations precisely. Note that we will follow the same manner as in [8] and [10].

Let $(\mathbb{Z}^d)^*$ be the set of all directed bonds $b = (x, y)$, $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $|x - y| = 1$ in \mathbb{Z}^d . We write $x_b = x$ and $y_b = y$ for $b = (x, y)$. We denote the bond $(e_i, 0)$ by e_i again if it doesn't cause any confusion. For every subset Λ of \mathbb{Z}^d , we denote the set of all directed bonds included Λ and touching Λ by Λ^* and $\bar{\Lambda}^*$, respectively. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^* &:= \{b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^*; x_b \in \Lambda \text{ and } y_b \in \Lambda\}, \\ \bar{\Lambda}^* &:= \{b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^*; x_b \in \Lambda \text{ or } y_b \in \Lambda\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\phi = \{\phi(x); x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, the gradient ∇ is defined by

$$\nabla\phi(b) := \phi(x) - \phi(y), \quad b = (x, y) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^*.$$

Now, let \mathcal{X} be the family of all gradient fields $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{Z}^d)^*}$ which satisfy the plaquette condition (2.1) in [8], i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \{\eta \equiv \nabla\phi; \phi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}\}$. Let \mathbb{L}_r^2 be the set of all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{Z}^d)^*}$ such that

$$|\eta|_r^2 := \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^*} |\eta(b)|^2 e^{-2r|x_b|} < \infty.$$

We denote $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathbb{L}_r^2$ equipped with the norm $|\cdot|_r$.

In this section, we study the properties of stationary measures for the dynamics $\eta_t \in \mathcal{X}$ governed by the SDEs

$$d\eta_t(b) = -\nabla U \cdot (\eta_t)(b) dt + \sqrt{2d} \nabla \tilde{w}_t^{\mathbb{Z}^d}(b), \quad b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^*, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\{w_t^{\mathbb{Z}^d}(x); x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ is the family of Gaussian processes with mean zero and covariance structure

$$E[\tilde{w}_t^{\mathbb{Z}^d}(x) \tilde{w}_s^{\mathbb{Z}^d}(y)] = -\Delta_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(x, y) t \wedge s, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t, s \geq 0.$$

Since the coefficients are Lipschitz continuous in \mathcal{X}_r , this equation has the unique strong solution in \mathcal{X}_r for every $r > 0$. Note that $\eta_t := \nabla \phi_t$ defined from the solution ϕ_t of the SDE (2.1) on D_N satisfies (4.1) for $b \in \overline{D_N^*}$ and boundary conditions $\eta_t(b) = \nabla \psi^N(b)$ for $b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^* \setminus \overline{D_N^*}$, when replacing $\tilde{w}_t^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ by \tilde{w}_t .

Let us introduce the infinitesimal generator associated with (4.1). For $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, we introduce the differential operator \mathcal{L}_Λ of second order by

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda = -4 \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \partial_x (\Delta_\Lambda \partial_x)(x) + 2 \sum_{x \in \Lambda} (\Delta_\Lambda U \cdot (\eta))(x) \partial_x,$$

where ∂_x is defined by

$$\partial_x := \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^*; x_b = x} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta(b)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

and Δ_Λ is the Laplacian on Λ defined by (1.3) with $\Gamma = \Lambda$. We note that the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is the infinitesimal generator associated with the dynamics η_t defined by (4.1). To make notations keep simple, we simply denote $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ by \mathcal{L} if it does not cause any confusion. We also note that \mathcal{L}_{D_N} is the infinitesimal generator associated with $\eta_t = \nabla \phi_t$, where ϕ_t is the solution of (2.1).

4.2. Gibbs measures. In this subsection, we state the definition of Gibbs measures with details. For a finite set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and fixed $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$, we define the affine space $\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda, \xi} \subset \mathcal{X}$ by

$$\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda^*, \xi} = \{\eta \in \mathcal{X}; \eta(b) = \xi(b), b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^* \setminus \overline{\Lambda^*}\}.$$

We define the finite volume Gibbs measure $\mu_{\Lambda, \xi}$ on $\overline{\Lambda^*}$ by

$$\mu_{\Lambda, \xi}(d\eta) = Z_{\Lambda, \xi}^{-1} \exp \left(- \sum_{b \in \overline{\Lambda^*}} V(\eta(b)) \right) d\eta_{\overline{\Lambda^*, \xi}},$$

where $d\eta_{\overline{\Lambda^*, \xi}}$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{X}_{\overline{\Lambda^*, \xi}}$ and $Z_{\Lambda, \xi}$ is the normalizing constant.

Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be the set of all probability measures on \mathcal{X} and let $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$ be those $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying $E^\mu[|\eta(b)|^2] < \infty$ for each $b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^*$. The measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$ is sometimes called tempered. Let \mathcal{G} be the family of translation invariant, tempered Gibbs measures $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$ introduced by [8], namely, the family of translation invariant $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying the Dobrushin-Lanford-Ruelle equation

$$\mu(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{(\mathbb{Z}^d)^* \setminus \overline{\Lambda^*}}) = \mu_{\Lambda, \xi}(\cdot), \quad \mu\text{-a.s. } \xi, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{(\mathbb{Z}^d)^* \setminus \overline{\Lambda^*}}$ is the σ -algebra generated by $\{\eta(b); b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^* \setminus \overline{\Lambda^*}\}$. Note that the dynamics η_t given by (4.1) is reversible under $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$. We denote the family of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$ with

ergodicity under spatial shifts by \mathcal{G}_{ext} . Properties of Gibbs measures are studied quite well, see [8] and [3] for details.

4.3. Relationship between stationary measures and Gibbs measures. It is not difficult to show that every Gibbs measure $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$ is stationary with respect to \mathcal{L} . Let us show that the converse is also true and therefore the stationarity is equivalent to the Gibbs property.

Theorem 4.1. *If $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$ is translation invariant and satisfies*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}F(\eta) d\mu = 0$$

for every $F \in C_{b,\text{loc}}^2(\mathcal{X})$, then $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is similar to [4], which is based on [6]. We at first introduce $\Phi_\lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_\lambda(u) = \frac{\lambda}{a} (1 + (\lambda u)^2)^{-m},$$

where

$$a = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + u^2)^{-m} du.$$

For $\Lambda_n := [-n, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define $\Phi_n^\lambda : \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda_n^*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_n^\lambda(\eta) = \prod_{x \in \Lambda_n} \Phi_\lambda(\phi^{n,0}(x)),$$

where $\phi^{n,c}$ is the height variable satisfying $\nabla \phi^{n,c} = \eta$ and $\phi^{n,c}(0) = c$. Note that $\phi^{n,c}$ is uniquely determined by η and c . We also define $p_n^\lambda(\eta)$ by

$$p_n^\lambda(\eta) = \int \Phi_n^\lambda(\eta - \xi) \mu(d\xi).$$

Let $\Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \xi) = \Phi_n^\lambda(\xi - \eta)$. Since $\Psi_n^\lambda(\cdot, \xi) \in C_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathcal{X})$, we have

$$\int \mathcal{L} \Psi_n^\lambda(\cdot, \xi)(\eta) \mu(d\eta) = 0.$$

Multiplying $F(\xi) \in C_{b,\text{loc}}^2(\mathcal{X})$ whose support is in Λ_n^* , and integrating in ξ by the uniform measure $d\xi_{\Lambda_n}$ on

$$\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda_n} = \{\nabla \phi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda_n^*}; \phi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda_n}\},$$

we obtain

$$\iint F(\xi) \mathcal{L} \Psi_n^\lambda(\cdot, \xi)(\eta) \mu(d\eta) d\xi_{\Lambda_n} = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Here, as in Lemma 3.2 in [4], if $f : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, local and the form $f(\phi) = F(\nabla \phi)$ for some $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we then have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi(x)} = 2 \sum_{b: x_b=x} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \eta(b)}(\nabla \phi).$$

Noting the above and the relationship

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \Psi_n^\lambda(\nabla \cdot, \nabla \psi)}{\partial \phi(x)}(\phi) &= -\frac{\partial \Phi_n^\lambda}{\partial \phi(x)}(\nabla \psi - \nabla \phi) = -\frac{\partial \Psi_n^\lambda(\nabla \phi, \nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(x)}(\psi) \\ \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_n^\lambda(\nabla \cdot, \nabla \psi)}{\partial \phi(x)^2}(\phi) &= \frac{\partial^2 \Phi_n^\lambda}{\partial \phi(x)^2}(\nabla \psi - \nabla \phi) = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_n^\lambda(\nabla \phi, \nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(x)^2}(\psi)\end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ by the symmetricity of Φ^λ , the left hand side of (4.3) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}& \iint F(\nabla \psi) \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(x) \partial \psi(y)} \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \mu(d\eta) \\ & + \iint F(\nabla \psi) \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (-\Delta)(x, y) U_y(\eta) \frac{\partial \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(x)} \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \mu(d\eta) \\ & =: I_1 + I_2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\nu_{\Lambda_n, p}$ is the measure on \mathbb{R}^{Λ_n} defined by

$$\nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) = p(\psi(0)) \prod_{x \in \Lambda_n} d\psi(x)$$

with a probability density p on \mathbb{R} . We have used that the image measure of $\nu_{\Lambda_n, p}$ by the discrete gradient ∇ coincides with $d\xi_{\Lambda_n}$. Performing the integration-by-parts for I_1 , we have We shall first calculate I_1 . Performing integration-by-parts in ψ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_1 &= - \iint \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \frac{\partial F(\nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(x)} \frac{\partial \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(y)} \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \mu(d\eta) \\ & - \iint \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) F(\nabla \psi) \frac{\partial \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(0)} p'(\psi(0)) \prod_{x \in \Lambda_n} d\psi(x) \mu(d\eta).\end{aligned}\quad (4.4)$$

Noting that integrands of I_1 and the first term in the right hand side of (4.4) are function of $\nabla \psi$, each integral does not depend on the choice of p and therefore the second term does not also. Taking a sequence p_n such that $p'_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that the second term must be zero.

Let us choose F as

$$F(\nabla \psi) = f\left(\frac{p_n^\lambda(\nabla \psi)}{q_n(\nabla \psi)}\right), \quad (4.5)$$

with some bounded smooth function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and

$$q_n(\eta) = \exp(-H^\Lambda(\eta)), \quad \eta \in \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda_n^*},$$

where Z_n is the normalizing constant. Noting

$$\frac{\partial p_n^\lambda(\nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(x)} = \int \frac{\partial \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla \cdot)}{\partial \psi(x)} \mu(d\eta)$$

and putting

$$r_n^\lambda(\eta) = \frac{p_n^\lambda(\eta)}{q_n(\eta)},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_1 = & - \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \int f' (r_n^\lambda(\nabla\psi)) \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda(\nabla\cdot)}{\partial\psi(x)} \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda(\nabla\cdot)}{\partial\psi(y)} q_n(\nabla\psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \\
 & + \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \int f' (r_n^\lambda(\nabla\psi)) U_y^\Lambda(\nabla\psi) p_n^\lambda(\nabla\psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi). \tag{4.6}
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we shall compute I_2 . Performing the integration-by-parts in $\psi(x)$ again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_2 = & \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \iint \frac{\partial F(\nabla\psi)}{\partial\psi(x)} U_y(\eta) \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla\psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \mu(d\eta) \\
 & - \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \iint \frac{\partial F(\nabla\psi)}{\partial\psi(x)} (U_y(\eta) - U_y^\Lambda(\eta)) \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \times \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla\psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \mu(d\eta) \\
 & - \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \iint \frac{\partial F(\nabla\psi)}{\partial\psi(x)} (U_y^\Lambda(\eta) - U_y^\Lambda(\nabla\psi)) \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \times \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla\psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \mu(d\eta) \\
 & - \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \iint \frac{\partial F(\nabla\psi)}{\partial\psi(x)} U_y^\Lambda(\nabla\psi) p_n^\lambda(\nabla\psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \\
 =: & R_1^\lambda(n, f) + R_2^\lambda(n, f) + R_3^\lambda(n, f) + R_4^\lambda(n, f). \tag{4.7}
 \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing (4.4) and (4.7), we obtain

$$F^\lambda(n, f) := \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \int f' (r_n^\lambda(\nabla\psi)) \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda(\nabla\cdot)}{\partial\psi(x)} \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda(\nabla\cdot)}{\partial\psi(y)} \tag{4.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \quad \quad \quad \times q_n(\nabla\psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \\
 = & R_1^\lambda(n, f) + R_2^\lambda(n, f) + R_3^\lambda(n, f) \tag{4.9}
 \end{aligned}$$

if we take F as in (4.5). Note that $F^\lambda(n, f)$ is finite when $f(x) = \log x$ by using $|\Delta(x, y)| \leq 2d$, see Lemma 3.3 of [4]. We denote $F^\lambda(n, f)$ with $f(x) = \log x$ simply by $F^\lambda(n)$.

From now on, we shall show that terms $R_i^\lambda(n, f)$ in the right hand side can be controlled by $F^\lambda(n)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that the function f satisfies $0 \leq uf'(u) \leq 1$ for every $u > 0$. We then have bounds for $R_1^\lambda(n, f)$, $R_2^\lambda(n, f)$ and $R_3^\lambda(n, f)$ in (4.7) as follows:*

$$|R_1^\lambda(n, f)| \leq KC(n)^{1/2} F^\lambda(n)^{1/2} \tag{4.10}$$

$$|R_2^\lambda(n, f)| \leq K\lambda^{-1} F^\lambda(n)^{1/2} \tag{4.11}$$

$$|R_3^\lambda(n, f)| \leq KC(n)^{1/2} F^\lambda(n)^{1/2} \tag{4.12}$$

with a constant $K > 0$ independent in n and λ , where $C_x(n)$ is defined by

$$C(n) = \sum_{x \in \Lambda_{n+1}} \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^* \setminus \Lambda^*: x_b = x} \int c_b^2(\xi, n, \mu) \mu(d\xi),$$

$$c_b(\xi, n, \mu) = \int V'(\eta(b)) \mu(d\eta | \mathcal{F}_{(\Lambda_n^*)^c}(\xi)).$$

Here, $\mathcal{F}_{(\Lambda_n^*)^c}$ is σ -algebra generated by $\{\eta(b); b \in (\Lambda_n^*)^c\}$.

Proof. We at first obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint f' \left(\frac{p_n^\lambda}{q_n} \right)^2 \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda}{\partial \psi(x)} \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda}{\partial \psi(y)} \Psi_n^\lambda(\eta, \nabla \psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \mu(d\eta) \\ & \leq \iint \left(\frac{p_n^\lambda}{q_n} \right)^{-2} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda}{\partial \psi(x)} \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda}{\partial \psi(y)} p_n^\lambda(\nabla \psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \\ & = \int \left(\frac{p_n^\lambda}{q_n} \right)^{-1} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_n} (-\Delta)(x, y) \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda}{\partial \psi(x)} \frac{\partial r_n^\lambda}{\partial \psi(y)} q_n(\nabla \psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) = F^\lambda(n) \end{aligned}$$

by assumption on f . Note that $(-\Delta)$ is nonnegative definite, indeed, we have

$$\sum_{x \in \Lambda_m} (-\Delta)(x, y) \phi(x) \phi(y) \geq 0$$

for every $m \geq 1$ and $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that $\phi(x) = 0$ on Λ_m^c . Furthermore, we have the Schwarz inequality of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (-\Delta)(x, y) \phi(x) \psi(y) \right| \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (-\Delta)(x, y) \phi(x) \phi(y) \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (-\Delta)(x, y) \psi(x) \psi(y) \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

for every $\phi, \psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ with $\phi(x) = \psi(x) = 0$ on Λ_m^c for some $m \geq 1$. Using the above, we obtain

$$|R_1^\lambda(n, f)| \leq C F^\lambda(n)^{1/2} C(n)^{1/2}$$

for some constant $C > 0$, which shows (4.10). We can also obtain (4.11) and (4.12) by the similar argument to the above. \square

Let us continue the calculation for $F^\lambda(n, f)$. Summarizing (4.9)-(4.12), we get

$$F^\lambda(n, f) \leq \frac{1}{2} F^\lambda(n) + K'(C(n) + \lambda^{-1} n^d)$$

with a constant $K' > 0$. Using Fatou's lemma, we conclude

$$\frac{1}{2} F^\lambda(n) \leq K'(C(n) + \lambda^{-1} n^d). \quad (4.14)$$

We shall next give a lower bound for the left hand side of (4.14). For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let us take $\tilde{\Lambda} \subset \Lambda_n$ by

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} \Lambda_\ell(x),$$

where $\Lambda_\ell(x) = \Lambda_\ell + x$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,\ell} = \{x \in ((2\ell + 3)\mathbb{Z})^d; \Lambda_\ell(x) \subset \Lambda_{n-1}\}.$$

Because boxes $\Lambda_\ell(x)$ appearing above are disjoint, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F^\lambda(n) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d; |x-y|=1} \left(\frac{\partial \sqrt{r_n^\lambda}}{\partial \psi(x)} - \frac{\partial \sqrt{r_n^\lambda}}{\partial \psi(y)} \right)^2 q_n(\nabla \psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int \sum_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_\ell(z)} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_\ell(z); |x-y|=1} \left(\frac{\partial \sqrt{r_n^\lambda}}{\partial \psi(x)} - \frac{\partial \sqrt{r_n^\lambda}}{\partial \psi(y)} \right)^2 \\ &\quad \times q_n(\nabla \psi) \nu_{\Lambda_n, p}(d\psi) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} I^{\Lambda_\ell(x)}(\mu_n^\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where I^Λ is the entropy production rate defined by

$$I^\Lambda(\tilde{\mu}) := \sup \left\{ \int \frac{-\mathcal{L}^\Lambda u}{u} d\tilde{\mu}; u \in C_b^2(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^*}\text{-measurable}, u \geq 1 \right\}$$

for a finite $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\tilde{\mu}$ on \mathcal{X} or \mathcal{X}_{Λ_n} with n large enough. Applying (4.14) and taking the limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} I^{\Lambda_\ell(x)}(\mu) \leq 4K'C(n)$$

by the lower semicontinuity of the entropy production rate. Since $I^{\Lambda_\ell(x)}(\mu_n)$ does not depend on x by the translation invariance of μ and $C(n) = O(n^{d-1})$, we get

$$I^{\Lambda_\ell}(\mu) \leq C\ell^d n^{-1} \tag{4.15}$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we finally conclude that

$$I^{\Lambda_\ell}(\mu) = 0 \tag{4.16}$$

for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Repeating the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.2 in [9], we obtain that μ is a canonical Gibbs measure introduced in [9]. Applying Theorem 3.1 in [9], we conclude $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

In this section, we shall give the proof of our main result, Theorem 2.1. Before that, we shall prepare several bounds, which play key role in the proof.

5.1. A priori bounds for stochastic processes. In this subsection, let us establish L^2 -bound for the stochastic interface h^N .

Proposition 5.1. *There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of N such that*

$$E\|h^N(t)\|_{-1,N}^2 + N^{-d}E \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N^*}} (\nabla \phi_s^N(x))^2 ds \leq C_1 E\|h^N(0)\|_{-1,N}^2 + C_2(1+t)$$

holds for every $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let us use the function g^N and ζ^N introduced at Section 3.6. We define ψ^N by

$$\psi^N(x) = \langle \phi_0^N \rangle \zeta^N(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

where $\langle \phi_0^N \rangle$ is defined by

$$\langle \phi_0^N \rangle = N^{-d-1} \sum_{y \in D_N} \phi_0^N(y).$$

We denote the macroscopic height variable associated with the microscopic height variable ψ^N by f^N , that is,

$$f^N(\theta) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} N^{-1} \psi^N(x) 1_{B(x/N, 1/N)}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Calculating $\|h^N(t) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2$ by Itô's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\|h^N(t) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 &= -2N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} (\nabla \phi_t^N(b) - \nabla \psi^N(b)) V'(\nabla \phi_t^N(b)) dt \\ &\quad + 2N^{-d} \sum_{x \in D_N} (-\Delta_{D_N})^{-1} (\phi_t^N - \psi^N)(x) d\tilde{w}_t(y) \\ &\quad + 2N^{-d} |D_N| dt. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, integrating in t and taking the expectation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E\|h^N(T) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 &= E\|h^N(0) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 \\ &\quad - 2E \int_0^T N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} \nabla \phi_t^N(b) V'(\nabla \phi_t^N(b)) dt \\ &\quad + 2E \int_0^T N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} \nabla \psi^N(b) V'(\nabla \phi_t^N(b)) dt \\ &\quad + 2N^{-d} |D_N| T. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Applying (3.30) to the third term in the right hand side, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| 2N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} \nabla \psi^N(b) V'(\nabla \phi_t^N(b)) \right| &\leq 2c_f |\langle \phi_0^N \rangle| \left(N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} (V'(\nabla \phi_t^N(b)))^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
 &\leq 2c_f |\langle \phi_0^N \rangle| c_+ \left(N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} (\nabla \phi_t^N(b))^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
 &\leq 2\gamma N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} (\nabla \phi_t^N(b))^2 \\
 &\quad + 8\gamma^{-1} c_f^2 |\langle \phi_0^N \rangle|^2 c_+^2
 \end{aligned}$$

for every $\gamma > 0$. Plugging the above with $\gamma = c_-/2$ into (5.1), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 E \|h^N(T) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 &\leq E \|h^N(0) - f^N\|_{-1,N}^2 \\
 &\quad - c_- E \int_0^T N^{-d} \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} (\nabla \phi_t^N(b))^2 dt \\
 &\quad + 2N^{-d} |D_N| T + 16c_-^{-1} c_+^2 c_f^2 |\langle \phi_0^N \rangle|^2 T.
 \end{aligned}$$

Noting $|\langle \phi_0^N \rangle|^2 \leq \|h^N(0)\|_{-1,N}^2$, we obtain the conclusion. \square

5.2. Coupled local equilibria. We shall introduce the coupled measure and identify its limit point, as in [8] and [10]. Let us denote the discrete gradient of the solution $\bar{h}^{N,\delta}$ of (3.17) by $u_s^{N,\delta}$, that is,

$$u_s^{N,\delta}(x) = \nabla^N \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(s, x/N), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

and the law of $\nabla \phi_s^N$ on \mathcal{X} by μ_s^N . Using these notations, we introduce the coupled measure $p^N(d\eta du)$ on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$p^{N,\delta}(d\eta du) = t^{-1} |\overline{D_N}|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N}} (\mu_s^N \circ \tau_x^{-1})(d\eta) \delta_{u_s^{N,\delta}(x)}(du) ds, \quad (5.2)$$

where τ_x is the spatial shift by $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We note that the sequence $\{p^N\}$ is tight as the probability measures on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ since we have Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 3.12.

Proposition 5.2. *For every limit point p of $\{p^{N,\delta}\}$, there exists a probability measure $\lambda(du dv)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the relationship*

$$p(d\eta du) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_v(d\eta) \lambda(du dv)$$

holds with ergodic Gibbs measures $\{\mu_u; u \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ introduced by [8].

Proof. To keep notation simple, let us omit the parameter δ when no confusion arises.

For $\varphi \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define the signed measure $p^N(d\eta, \varphi)$ on \mathcal{X} by

$$p^N(d\eta, \varphi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^N(d\eta du) \varphi(u).$$

It is sufficient to show that every limit point $p(d\eta, \varphi)$ of $\{p^N(d\eta, \varphi)\}$ is translation invariant and satisfies

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}F(\eta)p(d\eta, \varphi) = 0 \quad (5.3)$$

for every $F \in C_b^2(\mathcal{X})$ with a compact support, see Theorem 4.1 of [8].

We shall at first show the limit point $p(d\eta, \varphi)$ is translation invariant. For $F \in C_b^2(\mathcal{X})$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $|e| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} F(\eta)p^N(d\eta, \varphi) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} F(\eta)p^N(\cdot, \varphi) \circ \tau_e(d\eta) \right| \\ & \leq t^{-1}|\overline{D}_N|^{-1}\|F\|_\infty\|\varphi'\|_\infty \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D}_N} |u^N(s, x/N) - u^N(s, x/N - e/N)| ds \\ & \quad + |\overline{D}_N|^{-1}\|F\|_\infty\|\varphi\|_\infty \left(\left| \overline{D}_N \cap (\overline{D}_N + e) \right|^{\mathbb{G}} + \left| (\overline{D}_N + e) \cap \overline{D}_N \right|^{\mathbb{G}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the first term vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by Proposition 3.20, we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} F(\eta)p^N(d\eta, \varphi) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} F(\eta)p^N(\cdot, \varphi) \circ \tau_e(d\eta) \right| = 0,$$

which shows that the limit $p(d\eta, \varphi)$ is translation invariant.

Let us show (5.3). Fix $F \in C_b^2(\mathcal{X})$ with compact support, and take $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{supp}(F) \subset \Lambda_L^*$, where $\Lambda_L = [-L, L]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. We then obtain for N large enough

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}F(\eta)p^N(d\eta, \varphi) \\ & = t^{-1}|D_N|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D}_N} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) E^{\mu_s^N \circ \tau_x} [\mathcal{L}F(\eta)] ds \\ & = t^{-1}|D_N|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) E^{\mu_s^N} [\mathcal{L}_{D_N}(F \circ \tau_x^{-1})(\eta)] ds \\ & \quad + t^{-1}|D_N|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D}_N \setminus \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) E^{\mu_s^N} [\mathcal{L}_{D_N}(F \circ \tau_x^{-1})(\eta)] ds \\ & \quad + t^{-1}|D_N|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D}_N} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) E^{\mu_s^N \circ \tau_x} [\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N} F(\eta)] ds \\ & =: F_1^N + F_2^N + F_3^N, \end{aligned}$$

where the set $\mathcal{A}_{N,L}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_{N,L} = \overline{D}_N \cap \left(\bigcup_{z \in \partial D_N} (\Lambda_{2L} + z) \right)^{\mathbb{G}}.$$

Since $\text{supp}(F \circ \tau_x^{-1}) \subset \overline{D_N}$ if $x \in \mathcal{A}_{N,L}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^N &= t^{-1} |D_N|^{-1} N^{-4} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) E^{\mu_s^N} [(F \circ \tau_x^{-1})(\nabla \phi_t^N)] \\ &\quad - t^{-1} |D_N|^{-1} N^{-4} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) E^{\mu_s^N} [(F \circ \tau_x^{-1})(\nabla \phi_0^N)] \\ &\quad - t^{-1} |D_N|^{-1} N^{-4} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) E^{\mu_s^N} [(F \circ \tau_x^{-1})(\nabla \phi_s^N)] ds \end{aligned}$$

by Itô's formula. Since $F \in C_b^2(\mathcal{X})$, we obtain

$$|F_1^N| \leq C_1 N^{-4} + C_2 N^{-4} \int_0^t \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \varphi(u_s^N(x)) \right\|_{L^1} ds$$

with some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of N . Combining the above with Proposition 3.13, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} |F_1^N| = 0.$$

For F_2^N , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F_2^N| &\leq t^{-1} \|\varphi\|_\infty |D_N|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} E^{\mu_s^N} [|\mathcal{L}_{D_N}(F \circ \tau_x^{-1})(\eta)|] ds \\ &\leq t^{-1} \|\varphi\|_\infty |D_N|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_L + x} E^{\mu_s^N} [|\mathcal{L}_y(F \circ \tau_x^{-1})(\eta)|] ds \\ &\leq C_3 |D_N|^{-1} |\overline{D_N} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{N,L}| \\ &\quad + C_4 |D_N|^{-1} \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \overline{D_N} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{N,L}} \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^* : x_b \in \Lambda_{2L} + x} E^{\mu_s^N} [|\nabla \phi_s^N(b)|] ds \\ &=: F_{2,1}^N + F_{2,2}^N \end{aligned}$$

with some constants $C_3, C_4 > 0$ independent of N . We can easily see that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,1}^N = 0.$$

For $F_{2,2}^N$, applying the Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$F_{2,2}^N \leq C_5 N^{-1/2} |D_N|^{-1} E \int_0^t \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N}^*} |\nabla \phi_s^N(b)|^2 ds + C_6 N^{1/2} |D_N|^{-1} |\partial D_N|$$

with some constants $C_5, C_6 > 0$ independent of N , which indicates

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,2}^N = 0$$

from Proposition 5.1. We therefore conclude

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_2^N = 0.$$

Since we obtain

$$F_3^N \leq C_7 N^{-1/2} |D_N|^{-1} E \int_0^t \sum_{b \in \overline{D_N^*}} |\nabla \phi_s^N(b)|^2 ds + C_8 N^{1/2} |D_N|^{-1} |\partial D_N|,$$

with some constants $C_7, C_8 > 0$ independent of N by a similar argument to that for F_2^N , we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_3^N = 0.$$

Summarizing the above, the identity (5.3) is concluded. \square

5.3. Derivation of the macroscopic equation under (3.36). Let us first prove Theorem 2.1 under the following assumption: $h^N(0)$ is given by $h^N(0) = \bar{h}_0^N$, where \bar{h}_0^N is defined by (3.18) with $h_0 \in C_0^\infty(D)$. Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|h^N(t) - h(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*} &\leq \|h^N(t) - \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*} \\ &\quad + \|\bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t) - h^\delta(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*} \\ &\quad + \|h^\delta(t) - h(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}, \end{aligned}$$

it is sufficient for our goal to show

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} E \|h^N(t) - \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{-1,N}^2 = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

by using Proposition 3.8. Using Itô's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &E \|h^N(t) - \bar{h}^{N,\delta}(t)\|_{-1,N}^2 \\ &= -tN^{-d} |\overline{D_N}| \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d} \{ \eta(e_i) V'(\eta(e_i)) - u_i V'(\eta(e_i)) - \eta(e_i) \nabla_i \sigma^\delta(u) \\ &\quad + u_i \nabla_i \sigma^\delta(u) - 1 \} p^{N,\delta}(d\eta du) + tN^{-d} |\partial D_N|, \end{aligned}$$

where $p^{N,\delta}$ is the coupled measure introduced by (5.2). Applying the same argument as in the Section 6 of [8] with Propositions 3.19 and 5.1, we conclude (5.4).

5.4. Derivation of the macroscopic equation in general cases. Let us remove the assumption imposed at Section 5.3 and complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. For this aim, we prepare the following lemma:

Lemma 5.3. *Let ϕ_t and $\tilde{\phi}_t$ be the solution of (2.1) with common Gaussian processes $\{\tilde{w}_t(x); x \in D_N\}$ and let h^N and \tilde{h}^N be the macroscopic height variables corresponding to ϕ_t and $\tilde{\phi}_t$, respectively. Then, for every $t > 0$ and $N \geq 1$*

$$E \|h^N(t) - \tilde{h}^N(t)\|_{-1,N}^2 \leq E \|h^N(0) - \tilde{h}^N(0)\|_{-1,N}^2$$

holds.

Noting that ϕ_t and $\tilde{\phi}_t$ satisfy the same boundary condition, the quite same argument as in the proof of Proposition 5.1 can be applicable. We therefore omit the proof.

We shall approximate $h_0 \in L^2(D)$ by $h_0^\epsilon \in C_0^2(D)$ in the sense of

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|h_0^\epsilon - h_0\|_{H^1(D)^*} = 0.$$

Let ϕ_t^ϵ be the solution of (2.1) with common Gaussian processes $\{\tilde{w}_t(x); x \in D_N\}$ as ϕ_t and with initial data ϕ_0^ϵ which are defined by

$$\phi_0^\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} N^{d+1} \int_{B(x/N, 1/N)} h_0^\epsilon(\theta), & x \in D_N, \\ 0, & x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus D_N. \end{cases}$$

Letting $h^{N,\epsilon}$ be the macroscopic height variable corresponding to ϕ_t^ϵ and h^ϵ be the solution of (1.4) with the initial data h_0^ϵ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} E \|h^N(t) - h(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 &\leq 4E \|h^N(t) - h^{N,\epsilon}(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 + 4E \|h^{N,\epsilon}(t) - h^\epsilon(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 \\ &\quad + 8 \|h^\epsilon(t) - h(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 \\ &\leq 4E \|h^N(t) - h^{N,\epsilon}(t)\|_{-1,N}^2 + 4E \|h^{N,\epsilon}(t) - h^\epsilon(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 \\ &\quad + 8 \|h^\epsilon(t) - h(t)\|_{H^1(D)^*}^2 \end{aligned}$$

by (3.23). Here, applying the result in Section 5.3, Lemma 5.3 and Proposition 3.7, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.1.

REFERENCES

1. V. Barbu, *Nonlinear differential equations of monotone types in banach spaces*, Springer, 2010.
2. J. F. Blowey and C. M. Elliott, *The Cahn-Hilliard gradient theory for phase separation with non-smooth free energy. I. Mathematical analysis*, European J. Appl. Math. **2** (1991), no. 3, 233–280. MR 1123143 (93a:35025)
3. J.-D. Deuschel, G. Giacomin, and D. Ioffe, *Large deviations and concentration properties for $\nabla\phi$ interface models*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **117** (2000), 49–111.
4. J.-D. Deuschel, T. Nishikawa, and Y. Vignaud, *Hydrodynamic limit for the interface model with general potential*, in preparation, 2015.
5. Lawrence C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, American Mathematical Society, 1998.
6. J. Fritz, *Stationary measures of stochastic gradient systems, infinite lattice models*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete **59** (1982), no. 4, 479–490. MR MR656511 (83j:60108)
7. T. Funaki, *Stochastic interface models*, Lectures on probability theory and statistics, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1869, Springer, 2005, pp. 103–274.
8. T. Funaki and H. Spohn, *Motion by mean curvature from the Ginzburg-Landau $\nabla\phi$ interface model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **185** (1997), 1–36.
9. T. Nishikawa, *Hydrodynamic limit for the Ginzburg-Landau $\nabla\phi$ interface model with a conservation law*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **9** (2002), 481–519.
10. ———, *Hydrodynamic limit for the Ginzburg-Landau $\nabla\phi$ interface model with boundary conditions*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **127** (2003), 205–227.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, NIHON UNIVERSITY,,
1-8-14 KANDA-SURUGADAI, CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 101-8308, JAPAN

E-mail address: nisikawa@math.cst.nihon-u.ac.jp