

PDE estimates for multi-dimensional KPZ equation.

Jérémie Unterberger^b

^bInstitut Elie Cartan,¹ Université de Lorraine,
B.P. 239, F – 54506 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy Cedex, France
jeremie.unterberger@univ-lorraine.fr

We study in this series of articles the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) equation

$$\partial_t h(t, x) = \nu \Delta h(t, x) + \lambda V(|\nabla h(t, x)|) + \sqrt{D} \eta(t, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

in $d \geq 1$ dimensions. The forcing term η in the right-hand side is a regularized white noise. The deposition rate V is assumed to be isotropic and convex. Assuming $V(0) \geq 0$, one finds $V(|\nabla h|) \asymp |\nabla h|^2$ for small gradients, yielding the equation which is most commonly used in the literature.

The present article is dedicated to existence results and PDE estimates for the solution. Our results extend in a non-trivial way those previously obtained for the noiseless equation. We prove in particular a comparison principle for sub- and supersolutions of the KPZ equation in new functional spaces containing unbounded functions, implying existence and uniqueness. These new functional spaces made up of functions with "locally bounded averages", generically called \mathcal{W} -spaces thereafter, and which may be of interest for the study of parabolic equations in general, allow *local* or *pointwise* estimates. The comparison to the linear heat equation through a Cole-Hopf transform is an essential ingredient in the proofs, and our results are accordingly valid only for a function V with at most quadratic growth at infinity.

Keywords: KPZ equation, viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations, maximum principle, renormalization, multi-scale analysis.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 35B50, 35B51, 35D40, 35K55, 35R60, 35Q82, 60H15, 81T08, 81T16, 81T18, 82C41.

¹Laboratoire associé au CNRS UMR 7502

Contents

0	General introduction	2
1	Model and notations	7
2	Bounds for the homogeneous equation: the case of a bounded initial condition	8
2.1	Comparison to the linear heat equation	9
2.2	Time-decay of solutions of viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations	10
2.3	Bounds through integral representation of mild solutions	12
2.4	An explicit example: decay of a 'bump' for the quadratic KPZ equation	17
3	Bound for the homogeneous equation: the case of unbounded initial conditions	19
3.1	The functional spaces \mathcal{H}_α^0	19
3.2	The comparison principle	25
3.3	Bounds for the solution	29
3.4	Bounds for the gradient	31
4	Bounds for the infra-red cut-off inhomogeneous equation	34
4.1	General philosophy of scale decompositions	34
4.2	Functional spaces of scale j	36
4.3	Bounds	37
5	Scale decompositions	42
6	Appendix. Large deviations estimates for the single-scale noisy equation	45
6.1	Introduction	45
6.2	A first preliminary result: large deviations for the noise	49
6.3	Large deviations for the exponential of the noise	52
6.3.1	Log-normal large deviations	52
6.3.2	Mayer expansion	55
6.3.3	Proof of Theorem 6.2	58
6.4	Proof of Theorem 6.1	62

0 General introduction

The KPZ equation [40] is a stochastic partial differential equation describing the growth by normal deposition of an interface in $(d + 1)$ space dimensions, see e.g. [6, 17]. By definition the time evolution of the height $h(t, x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, is given by

$$\partial_t h(t, x) = \nu \Delta h(t, x) + 2\lambda \left(\sqrt{1 + |\nabla h(t, x)|^2} - 1 \right) + \sqrt{D} \eta(t, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (0.1)$$

where ν (*diffusion constant*), λ (*coupling constant*) are positive constants, and $\eta(t, x)$ is some (possibly regularized) white noise. The gradient $|\nabla h|$ (the slope of the interface) is assumed to remain throughout small so that the evolution makes physically sense, precluding e.g. any overhang, so that the non-linear term $\sqrt{1 + |\nabla h(t, x)|^2} - 1 \simeq \frac{1}{2} |\nabla h(t, x)|^2$ is essentially quadratic; using this approximation gives the most common form of this equation in the literature, thereafter called *quadratic KPZ equation*,

$$\partial_t h(t, x) = \nu \Delta h(t, x) + \lambda |\nabla h(t, x)|^2 + \sqrt{D} \eta(t, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (0.2)$$

Following these preliminary remarks, we shall call KPZ equation any equation of the type

$$\partial_t h(t, x) = \nu \Delta h(t, x) + \lambda V(\nabla h(t, x)) + \sqrt{D} \eta(t, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (0.3)$$

where the *deposition rate* V is isotropic and convex (hence $V(\nabla h(t, x)) = a + b|\nabla h(t, x)|^2 + \dots$ around 0, with $b \geq 0$). The interest is generally in the large-scale limit of this equation, for t large. A well-known naive rescaling argument gives some ideas about the dependence on the dimension of this limit. Namely, the linearized equation, a stochastic heat equation which is a particular instance of *Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process*,

$$\partial_t \phi(t, x) = \nu \Delta \phi(t, x) + \sqrt{D} \eta(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad (0.4)$$

is invariant under the rescaling $\phi(t, x) \mapsto \phi^\varepsilon(t, x) := \varepsilon^{-d_\phi} \phi(\varepsilon^{-1}t, \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}x)$, where

$$d_\phi := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d}{2} - 1 \right) \quad (0.5)$$

is the *scaling dimension* of the field ϕ (or rather *half* the scaling dimension, in the physicists' convention); we used here the equality in distribution, $\eta(\varepsilon^{-1}t, \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}x) \stackrel{(d)}{=} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{d}{2})} \eta(t, x)$. Assuming that ϕ is a solution of the KPZ equation instead (say, with quadratic deposition rate $|\nabla \phi|^2$) yields after rescaling

$$\partial_t \phi^\varepsilon(t, x) = \nu \Delta \phi^\varepsilon(t, x) + \varepsilon^{d_\phi} \frac{\lambda}{2} |\nabla \phi^\varepsilon(t, x)|^2 + \sqrt{D} \eta^\varepsilon(t, x), \quad (0.6)$$

where $\eta^\varepsilon \stackrel{(d)}{=} \eta$. For $d > 2$, the scaling exponent d_ϕ is > 0 , and the non-linear term scaling coefficient, ε^{d_ϕ} , vanishes in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$; in other terms, the KPZ equation is sub-critical at large scales in ≥ 3 dimensions and believed to behave like the corresponding linearized equation up to a redefinition (called *renormalization*) of the *diffusion constant* ν and of the *noise strength* D . More precisely, according to the general scheme due to K. Wilson [70, 71], the fluctuations of the solution field at time scale of order $\varepsilon^{-1} \approx 2^j$ and space scale of order $\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \approx 2^{j/2}$ should be approximately governed for j large by a linearized equation with scale-dependent coefficients $\nu^{(j)}, D^{(j)}$ ($j \geq 0$), themselves solutions of a certain complicated but explicit discrete dynamical system. Ultimately our purpose is to confirm these predictions.

The present work contains some preliminary steps towards this goal, using *deterministic tools*. Since we cannot capture the large-scale behaviour of the equation without taking into account white noise fluctuations, we do not address the full equation (0.3) but either (i) the associated homogeneous equation ($D = 0$); or (ii) a KPZ-type equation with general, deterministic right-hand side g (possibly coming from a realization of white noise, which allows a connection to our original problem), exhibiting an extra scale-dependent linear damping, which is supposed to mimick the behaviour of the KPZ solution *at some given scale*. Because of the damping we do not see the dimension dependence, so our results actually hold for any $d \geq 1$. For both equations we provide estimates which are essentially optimal, reproducing the expected Ornstein-Uhlenbeck scaling in case (ii). Thus our renormalization scheme will ultimately be able to include some of these a priori estimates. The connection to the multi-scale analysis of KPZ equation is explained in some details in the end of the article (sections 5 and 6). One may however choose to disregard these matters, and see this article

as a purely deterministic PDE paper concerned about existence results and PDE estimates for inhomogeneous viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations of a certain type. Our original contribution in this respect is that we want to allow right-hand sides in functional spaces large enough to contain realizations of regularized white noise. Since the latter has unbounded fluctuations in full space, standard existence theory, mostly based on the maximum principle, cannot be applied. Thus we are led to solve KPZ equation in new *functional spaces, modeled on the space \mathcal{H}^0 of functions with locally bounded averages* (see below). Instead of the a priori bounds in supremum norm obtained from the maximum principle, one gets *pointwise* or *local* a priori bounds in *pointwise* or *local quasi-norms*, using some stronger and more versatile version of the maximum principle for parabolic equations, based on the comparison to the heat flow.

While we provide an outline of the article, we shall try to explain more concretely the above principles.

Section 2 is concerned with *bounded* solutions of the homogeneous KPZ equation, relying in particular on the comparison principle for non-linear parabolic PDE's. (Precise assumptions for the deposition rate V are listed in section 1). The titles of subsections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 reflect the three main arguments from which estimates can be derived; comparison to the linear heat equation (§2.1) is the main argument surviving in later sections when we consider unbounded solutions. Some results are derived with little effort from those already existing in the literature; on the other hand, the bounds on the gradient and on the higher derivatives of the solution, see Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, may not be found elsewhere.

The really original material starts in section 3 with the search for solutions in new spaces of possibly unbounded functions with good averaging properties. There is a large variety of choice for such spaces, for which we therefore coin a generic term, " \mathcal{W} -spaces" for the discussion. Generally speaking all \mathcal{W} -spaces are modeled after

$$\mathcal{H}^0 := \{f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, f^*(x) < \infty\}, \quad f^*(x) := \sup_{\tau > 0} e^{\tau \Delta} |f|(x). \quad (0.7)$$

Since $e^{\tau \Delta} |f|(x)$ is some weighted average of $|f|$ centered at x , it makes sense to speak of elements of \mathcal{H}^0 as *functions with locally bounded averages*. Clearly, $L^\infty \subset \mathcal{H}^0$, but unbounded functions, with arbitrarily large but rare fluctuations, also belong to \mathcal{H}^0 , notably our regularized white noise, η , for which (as is well-known for the supremum of n essentially independent identically distributed Gaussian variables) $\sup_{|x| \leq n} |\eta(x)| = O(\sqrt{\log(n)})$. By construction, the solution f of the heat equation $(\partial_t - \Delta)f(t, x) = 0$ satisfies $|f(t, x)| \leq (f_0)^*(x)$, a *pointwise* version of the maximum principle which states that $\|f\|_\infty \leq \|f_0\|_\infty$. Clearly one also has $(f_t)^*(x) \leq (f_0)^*(x)$. Let now $h = h(t, x)$ be a solution of the *homogeneous* quadratic KPZ equation (0.2). Since Cole-Hopf transformation $h \mapsto e^{lh}$ maps solutions of (0.2) into solutions of the heat equation, we get $(e^{lh_t})^*(x) \leq (e^{lh_0})^*(x)$. With some extra work (see Lemma 3.11), letting

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) := \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \left((e^{\lambda f})^*(x) \right) \quad (0.8)$$

one proves:

$$\|h_t\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \leq \|h_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x). \quad (0.9)$$

We have thus defined a new space, $\mathcal{H}^\lambda := \{f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) < \infty\}$, together with what plays the rôle of a family of "*pointwise quasi-norms*", $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x)$. The interplay between

these spaces is investigated in §3.2, where we show in particular satisfactory collective properties of the family (0.8) with respect to convex operations, justifying the term of "quasi-norms" for lack of a better term.

Then the rest of section 3, resp. section 4, are dedicated to existence theorem and bounds of the homogeneous, resp. inhomogeneous KPZ equation in \mathcal{W} -spaces. Let us first discuss the *homogeneous* case. We say that $h = h(t, x)$ solves the *homogeneous KPZ equation* if

$$(\partial_t - \nu\Delta)h(t, x) = \lambda V(\nabla h). \quad (0.10)$$

We prove a *comparison principle* for sub- and supersolutions of the homogeneous KPZ equation in these spaces, implying existence and unicity for viscosity solutions, which are proved to be classical. The statement is as follows (see Theorem 3.1):

Theorem 1 (comparison principle). *Let $\underline{U} \in USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$ (resp. $\bar{U} \in LSC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$) be a viscosity sub-solution (resp. super-solution) of the homogeneous KPZ equation (1.1). Then $\underline{U} \leq \bar{U}$ in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Bounding the gradient of the solution turns out to be more challenging than getting the almost trivial bound (0.9). One possibility (see §3.3 for a discussion) is to introduce *local \mathcal{W} -spaces*, $\mathcal{W}_j^{1, \infty; \lambda}$, for which one replaces the various \mathcal{W} -"pointwise quasi-norms" by stronger \mathcal{W} -"local quasi-norms", $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1, \infty; \lambda}}(x)$, obtained by substituting to $|f(x)|$ its local supremum $\sup_{B(x, 1)} |f|$ or more generally (in consistence with section 4, see below) $\sup_{B(x, 2^j)} |f|$, where j is some scale. As shown in §3.3, the finiteness of the *local* quasi-norm implies a polynomial bound at infinity of a precise order (which holds for η and even for $e^{\lambda|\eta|}$!) We emphasize that we do also get bounds in *local* quasi-norms for the solution in terms of the *local* quasi-norm of the initial condition (see discussion in §3.3 and after the proof of Lemma 3.13 in §3.4), so using *local* quasi-norms (here and also in the non-homogeneous case treated below) only shortens the statements, to the great happiness of the reader, while restraining the generality. Our main result is :

Lemma 3.13 (bound for the homogeneous KPZ equation) *Let h be the solution of the homogeneous KPZ equation (0.10) with $h_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{1, \infty; 2\lambda} \cap C^2$. Then $h_t \in \mathcal{W}^{1, \infty; 2\lambda/5}$ and*

$$\|\| 2^{j/2} \text{loc sup}^j |\nabla h_t| \|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda/5}} \leq 5 \|\| h_0 \|\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1, \infty; 2\lambda}}(x). \quad (0.11)$$

An intelligent study of the *full inhomogeneous* equation (0.3) for large time is a much more difficult problem, since it relies in an essential way on the averaging properties of the noise. However, essentially optimal bounds can be obtained for the *scale j infra-red cut-off equation*,

$$\partial_t \psi = \nu \Delta \psi - 2^{-j} \psi + \lambda V(\nabla \psi) + g, \quad (0.12)$$

where g is some adequate, regular right-hand side. This equation is meant to select the fluctuations of the solution on time ranges of order 2^j and space ranges of order $2^{j/2}$. Thus g should enjoy the same scaling properties as the " j -th scale projected" regularized white noise η . Scalings are discussed in details in section 5; let us just mention at this point (see Remark at the very end of section 5) that only smaller scale components $j' = 0, \dots, j-1$ of the right-hand side need to be

discarded to get a correct scaling. Then we show in section 4 how to solve and bound (0.12) along essentially the same lines as in section 3. In the course of the computations we are led to introduce new \mathcal{W} -spaces, which take into account both the scaling, and the time-dependence (for the right-hand side). The main result (see Lemma 4.4 and ensuing discussion) is (see §4.2 for the definition of the family of time-dependent \mathcal{W} -spaces $\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}([0, t])$ and the associated "local quasi-norms" $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}([0, t])}(x) = \|\cdot\|_{\lambda, j}([0, T], x)$).

Theorem 2 (a priori bounds for the KPZ equation) *Let ψ be the (viscosity) solution of (0.12) with initial condition $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda'} \cap C^2$ with $\lambda' > \lambda$, and forcing term $g \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}([0, T]) \cap C([0, T], C^3(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then*

$$\|\text{locsup}^j \psi_t\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \leq e^{-2^{-j}t} \|\text{locsup}^j \psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\lambda'}}(x) + \|\text{locsup}^j g\|_{\lambda, j}([0, t], x) \quad (0.13)$$

and

$$\|2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla \psi_t|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda/5}}(x) \leq 5 \left(\|g\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}([0, t])}(x) + e^{-2^{-j}t} \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda'}}(x) \right). \quad (0.14)$$

The reader may easily check that, *without the damping term*, (0.13, 0.14) hold with some modifications on the time interval $[0, 2^j]$,

$$\|\text{locsup}^j \psi_t\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \leq C \left(\|\text{locsup}^j \psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{C\lambda}}(x) + \|\text{locsup}^j g\|_{C\lambda, j}([0, t], x) \right) \quad (0.15)$$

and

$$\|2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla \psi_t|\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \leq C \left(\|g\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;C\lambda}([0, t])}(x) + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;C\lambda}}(x) \right) \quad (0.16)$$

for C large enough. Composing these estimates on the successive time intervals $[n2^j, (n+1)2^j]$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, one may easily prove a bound for the solution and its gradient in $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda}}$ "quasi-norms" for any $a \geq 1$, provided $\psi_0 \in \cup_{a \geq 1} \mathcal{H}^{a\lambda}$ and $g \in \cup_{a \geq 1} \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;a\lambda}$, implying in particular *global existence of the solutions of the full inhomogeneous KPZ equation (0.3) in \mathcal{W} -spaces*. However, because of the "loss of regularity" in λ , bounds increase exponentially in time and become extremely bad for t large.

Finally sections 5 and 6 are appendices containing multi-scale decompositions of the propagator $(\partial_t - \nu\Delta)^{-1}$ and the white noise η , and large-deviation estimates for η , implying the applicability of the general arguments developed in section 4 to the case of the noisy KPZ equation (0.3). The proof of large-deviation estimates in itself is far from trivial because we need to bound the \mathcal{H}^λ "quasi-norm" of η (see (0.8)), which involves its *exponential*. Since exponentiated Gaussian variables do not admit any exponential moment, we must turn to non-standard (and not that well-known) deviation estimates found in the Soviet literature of the 60es (see section 6). Though section 5 is really helpful to motivate the scaling issues related to (0.12), the reader who is not particularly interested in stochastic PDEs may safely skip section 6, which is quite involved and of a very different nature with respect to the previous ones.

In a companion article [67], we tackle the problem of getting existence/uniquity and estimates in \mathcal{W} -quasi norms for solutions of the scale j infra-red cut-off equation (0.12), but with totally different techniques, using the *Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman formalism*; recall this formalism allows to represent the solution ψ as the maximum over an admissible class of random paths X driven by Brownian

motion of a functional $\int_0^t F(s, X_s) ds$. Controlling the random characteristics allows *less precise* but *much more flexible* estimates, extending in particular to the case of deposition rates V growing faster than quadratically at infinity. It is interesting to compare the results obtained by the two methods. The two articles are largely dependent one from the other, though the present article may be read independently from the other *except* for a technical point in the proofs: the *unicity statement* in Theorem 2, which we could *not* prove by the techniques developed here.

1 Model and notations

We consider throughout the present article either the *homogeneous* (or *noiseless*) equation

$$\partial_t h = \nu \Delta h + \lambda V(\nabla h) \quad (1.1)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a fixed, arbitrary constant, or the *infra-red cut-off, inhomogeneous* equation,

$$\partial_t \psi = \nu \Delta \psi - \varepsilon \psi + \lambda V(\nabla \psi) + g, \quad (1.2)$$

where the constant $\varepsilon = 2^{-j}$ ($j \geq 0$) is an infra-red cut-off of scale j . Bounds for the homogeneous equation (1.1), resp. inhomogeneous equation (1.2) turn out to be quite different in the end, though they are based of course on the same principles, so – in order to avoid any confusion – we keep throughout the article to the following convention: **solutions of the *homogeneous* equation are denoted by h , solutions of the *inhomogeneous* equation by ψ .**

The assumptions on V are the following:

Assumption 1.1 The deposition rate V satisfies the following assumptions,

- (1) V is C^2 ;
- (2) V is isotropic, i.e. $V(\nabla h)$ is a function of $y = |\nabla h|$; by abuse of notation we shall consider V either as a function of ∇h or of y ;
- (3) V is convex;
- (4) $V(0) = 0$ and $V(y) \geq 0$ for all $y \geq 0$;
- (5) (quadratic growth at infinity) $V(y) \leq y^2$ for all $y \geq 0$.

It follows immediately from Assumptions (1), (2) and (4) that $V(y) = O(y^2)$ near $y = 0$. Assumption (5) is thus equivalent (up to a redefinition of the constant λ) to requiring that V has at most quadratic growth at infinity.

As for the force term g , it is assumed to be regular enough and have good averaging properties, depending on the cut-off scale $j \approx -\log \varepsilon$; the regularized white noise η (as shown in section 6) satisfies these properties.

Assumption (3) is a key assumption to get a time decay of the gradient of the solution, and is also used in the proof of the comparison theorem for unbounded solutions; Proposition 2.3 (ii), (iii) hold under a stronger assumption. Assumption (5) allows a comparison of the solutions to those of the usual KPZ equation corresponding to $V(y) = y^2$, which is linearizable.

Notations. The notation: $f(u) \lesssim g(u)$, resp. $f(u) \gtrsim g(u)$ means: $|f(u)| \leq C|g(u)|$, resp. $|f(u)| \geq C|g(u)|$, where $C > 0$ is an unessential constant (depending only on the dimension d and on the coefficients of the linearized equation, ν and D). Similarly, $f(u) \approx g(u)$ means: $f(u) \lesssim g(u)$ and $g(u) \lesssim f(u)$. We denote by L^p , $p \in [1, \infty]$ the usual Lebesgue spaces with associated norm $\|\cdot\|_p$, by $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}$ the Sobolev space of bounded functions with bounded generalized derivative, and by $C^{1,2}$ the space of functions which are C^1 in time and C^2 in space. The positive, resp. negative part of a function f is denoted by f_+ , resp. f_- ; by definition, $f^+, f^- \geq 0$, $f = f^+ - f^-$ and $f^+ f^- = 0$. The *oscillation* $\text{osc}_\Omega f$ of a continuous function f on a domain Ω is defined as $\sup_\Omega f - \inf_\Omega f$; the *average* $\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega f$ of f on a bounded domain Ω is denoted by \bar{f}_Ω . The space of lower, resp. upper semicontinuous functions on a domain Ω is denoted by $LSC(\Omega)$, resp. $USC(\Omega)$.

2 Bounds for the homogeneous equation: the case of a bounded initial condition

We consider in this section the homogeneous equation,

$$\partial_t h = \nu \Delta h + \lambda V(|\Delta h|) \quad (2.1)$$

with initial condition $h_0(x) = h(0, x)$ in $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}$. One finds in the literature a detailed study of the particular case $V(y) = y^q$, $q > 1$. Most basic results (including existence), based on the principle of maximum or on a short-time series expansion of the mild solution, depend very little on the precise form of V , provided it is regular enough and, say, polynomially bounded. We quickly review them now and leave it to the reader to check that they extend to a rate V satisfying Assumptions 1.1 (1), (2), (4).

By [5] and [10], the Cauchy problem has a unique, global solution u which is classical for positive times, that is, $u \in C([0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1,2}((0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. The comparison principle, in the form proved by Kaplan [38] for classical, bounded solutions of non-linear parabolic equations on unbounded spatial domains, implies that $h_t \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ (resp. $h_t \leq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$) if $h_0 \geq 0$ (resp. $h_0 \leq 0$) and yields the a priori estimates

$$\|h_t\|_\infty \leq \|h_0\|_\infty, \quad \|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty \quad (t \geq 0). \quad (2.2)$$

We now prove time-decay estimates of the solution for various norms, emphasizing those which are not a straightforward extension of previously known results for $V(y) = y^q$. Such estimates come roughly from three different sources, and are correspondingly split into 3 paragraphs (§2.1, §2.2 and §2.3). Generally speaking, constants appearing in the inequalities deteriorate when $\nu \rightarrow 0$ whenever parabolic estimates are involved (see below); Proposition 2.3 (ii), (iii) is an outstanding exception.

We recall here briefly for non-specialists the *maximum principle* and the *comparison principle* for parabolic PDE's, in a weak form which is sufficient for section 2. Standard references on the subject are e.g. [26], [21], [7].

Proposition 2.1 (maximum and comparison principle) *Let $u(t, x)$, $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be a classical solution of the parabolic PDE $\partial_t u(t, x) = \nu \Delta u(t, x) + W(t, x, \nabla u(t, x))$, where W is a smooth function, bounded in any subset of the form $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times K$, $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ compact. Assume that $\sup_{[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} |u| < \infty$ and $\sup_{[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u| < \infty$. Then:*

(i) (weak maximum principle) $\forall t \in [0, T]$, $\|u_t\|_\infty \leq \|u_0\|_\infty$.

(ii) (weak comparison principle) let \bar{U} , resp. \underline{U} be a super-, resp. sub-solution of the above PDE, namely, $\bar{U}, \underline{U} \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\partial_t \bar{U}(t, x) \geq \nu \Delta \bar{U}(t, x) + W(t, x, \nabla \bar{U}(t, x)), \quad \partial_t \underline{U}(t, x) \leq \nu \Delta \underline{U}(t, x) + W(t, x, \nabla \underline{U}(t, x)). \quad (2.3)$$

Assume $\bar{U}_0 \geq \underline{U}_0$. Then $\bar{U}_t \geq \underline{U}_t$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Note that the above proposition extends under appropriate monotonicity hypotheses to parabolic PDE's of the form $\partial_t u(t, x) = \nu \Delta u(t, x) + W(t, x, u(t, x), \nabla u(t, x))$. However, it is precisely the absence of dependence of W on $u(t, x)$ that makes two-sided a priori estimates like (2.2) so easy.

2.1 Comparison to the linear heat equation

Assumptions 1.1 (4)-(5), $0 \leq V(y) \leq y^2$, allows (as we shall presently see) a direct *comparison with the linear heat equation* if either $h_0 \geq 0$ or $h_0 \leq 0$. Bounds for signed initial conditions follow then from the comparison principle: namely, letting \bar{h} , resp. \underline{h} be the solution of (2.1) with initial condition h_0^+ , resp. $-h_0^-$, one has

$$\underline{h} \leq 0, \bar{h} \geq 0; \quad \underline{h} \leq h \leq \bar{h}. \quad (2.4)$$

Also, $t \mapsto \|\bar{h}_t\|_1$ is increasing, while $t \mapsto \|\underline{h}_t\|_1$ is decreasing.

Considering first \underline{h} , the comparison principle allows one to bound the solution of (2.1) by the solution of the linear heat equation with same initial condition, namely,

$$|\underline{h}(t)| \leq e^{t\nu\Delta} h_0^-. \quad (2.5)$$

We now turn to \bar{h} and bound similarly the solution of (2.1) with positive initial condition by the solution u of the standard KPZ equation, $\partial_t u = \nu \Delta u + \lambda |\nabla u|^2$ with the same initial condition. The exponential transformation $w := e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu} u} - 1$ turns it into the linear equation $\partial_t w = \nu \Delta w$, with positive initial condition $w_0 = e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu} h_0^+} - 1$. The inequality $x \leq \frac{\nu}{\lambda} (e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu} x} - 1)$, $x \geq 0$ yields

$$\|\bar{h}_t\|_\infty \leq \|u_t\|_\infty \leq \frac{\nu}{\lambda} \|w_t\|_\infty. \quad (2.6)$$

To go further, we assume $w_0 \in L^1$ and use the following standard parabolic estimates [62] for $q = 1$.

Proposition 2.2 (parabolic estimates) *There exist constants C_k , $k = 0, 1, \dots$ depending only on d such that, for every regular enough function $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $p \geq q \geq 1$,*

$$\|\nabla^k e^{t\nu\Delta} f_0\|_p \leq C_k (vt)^{-\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}) - \frac{k}{2}} \|f_0\|_q, \quad k \geq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Let μ be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . The well-known identity $\int f(u(x)) dx = \int_0^{+\infty} \mu(u > a) f'(a) da$, valid for $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ measurable and $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth such that $f(0) = 0$, yields for

$$f(u) = \frac{\nu}{\lambda}(e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu}u} - 1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{h}_t\|_1 &\leq \frac{\nu}{\lambda}\|w_t\|_1 \leq \frac{\nu}{\lambda}\|w_0\|_1 \\ &\lesssim \int h_0^+(x)\mathbf{1}_{h_0^+(x)\leq\nu/\lambda}dx + \int_{\nu/\lambda}^{+\infty} \mu(h_0^+ > a)e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu}a}da \\ &\lesssim \|h_0^+\|_1 \left(1 + \int_{\nu/\lambda}^{\|h_0^+\|_\infty} \frac{e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu}a}}{a} da\right) \\ &\lesssim \|h_0^+\|_1 e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu}\|h_0^+\|_\infty} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

so

$$\bar{I}_\infty := \|h_0^+\|_1 e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu}\|h_0^+\|_\infty} \quad (2.9)$$

is an upper bound for $\sup_{t\geq 0} \|\bar{h}_t\|_1$ (see [42], Proposition 2 (iii)); at the same time, one gets

$$\|\bar{h}_t\|_\infty \leq \frac{\nu}{\lambda}\|w_t\|_\infty \lesssim \frac{\nu}{\lambda}\|w_0\|_1(\nu t)^{-d/2} \lesssim \bar{I}_\infty t^{-d/2}. \quad (2.10)$$

On the other hand, (2.5) gives immediately if $h_0^- \in L^1$

$$\|\underline{h}_t\|_\infty \lesssim \|h_0^-\|_1 t^{-d/2}. \quad (2.11)$$

Thus one has shown a global bound for the L^1 -norm, and a time-decay in $O(t^{-d/2})$ for the sup-norm of solutions of (2.1) with arbitrary integrable initial condition $h_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{1,\infty} \cap L^1$.

2.2 Time-decay of solutions of viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations

A second series of results is a particular case of the more general *time-decay of the gradients of solutions of viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, which can itself be seen as (1) an extension to non-linear equations of the standard parabolic estimates; (2) or a multi-dimensional extension of the decay of solutions of scalar conservation laws, see [31], [10], [8], or [9], section 3 for further results concerning in particular single-sided bounds on the Hessian. Generally speaking, such results rely on convexity assumptions on V . Here we shall only state the following estimate, which is an extension of [10], Theorem 1. In Proposition 2.3, by exception, constants, explicit and implicit (i.e. hidden by the sign \lesssim) are ν -independent.

Proposition 2.3 (time-decay of the gradient) (i) *If $yV'(y) - V(y) \geq 0$, then*

$$\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \|h_0\|_\infty (\nu t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.12)$$

(ii) *Under the stronger assumption*

$$yV'(y) - V(y) \geq C \min(y^2, y^q), \quad y \geq 0 \quad (2.13)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and some exponent $q \in (1, 2]$, one has

$$\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \left(\frac{\|h_0\|_\infty/\lambda}{t}\right)^{1/q}, \quad t \leq \frac{\|h_0\|_\infty}{\lambda} \quad (2.14)$$

$$\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \left(\frac{\|h_0\|_\infty/\lambda}{t}\right)^{1/2}, \quad t \geq \frac{\|h_0\|_\infty}{\lambda} \quad (2.15)$$

(iii) Under the even stronger assumption

$$yV'(y) - V(y) \geq Cy^2, \quad (2.16)$$

one has for all $t \geq 0$

$$|\nabla h_t(x)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|h_t(x)\|/\lambda}{t} \right)^{1/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2.17)$$

Hence in particular

$$\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \left(\frac{\|h_0\|_\infty/\lambda}{t} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.18)$$

Note that condition (i), $yV'(y) - V(y) \geq 0$ is a consequence of the convexity of V (see Assumption 1.1 (3)). On the other hand, the hypothesis (2.13) in (ii) holds true for functions $V(y)$ that behave like y^2 for y small, and like y^q , $1 < q \leq 2$ for y large; the stronger hypothesis (2.16) in (iii) for functions that behave like y^2 both for y small and y large. Note that the decay in (2.12) is produced by the diffusion term $\nu\Delta$ in the equation, so it might be called a generalized parabolic estimate; while (2.14,2.15) or (2.18) are diffusion-independent effects of the non-linear term in the equation, and would also hold true for viscosity solutions of the first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equation obtained by letting $\nu \rightarrow 0^+$.

Proof. We first rescale h and x by letting $x \rightarrow x' = \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}x$, $h \rightarrow u = \frac{\lambda}{\nu}h$ so that $\nabla_x h = \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla_{x'} u$, and $W(y) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\nu} V\left(\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\right)$, so that the equation for u

$$\partial_t u = \Delta u + W(|\nabla u|) \quad (2.19)$$

is independent of the parameters ν, λ .

- (i) Referring to the proof of Lemma 3 in [31], from which [31], Theorem 2 follows immediately, and letting directly $\varepsilon = 0$, we see that $\frac{|\nabla u|^2}{\theta^2(u)}$ is a super-solution for the parabolic operator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(w) := \Delta w + b \cdot \nabla w + cw^2 + ew - \partial_t w, \quad (2.20)$$

where $c := 2\theta(u)\theta''(u)$, $e = -2(W(\nabla u) - \nabla u \cdot W'(\nabla u))$ (note that for V homogeneous, $V(|\nabla u|) = |\nabla u|^q$, $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{|\nabla u|^2}{\theta^2(u)}\right) = \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{|\nabla u|^2}{\theta^2(u)}\right)$ where \mathcal{N} [31] has instead of ew a sum of two terms, $2(q-1)\theta^{q-1}(u)\theta'(u)w^{1+q/2} - 2\frac{\theta'(u)}{\theta(u)}H(\nabla u)w$, with $H(\xi) = W(\xi) - \xi \cdot \nabla W(\xi) + (q-1)|\xi|^q$, the first term $2(q-1)\theta^{q-1}(u)\theta'(u)w^{1+q/2}$ compensating the last term $(q-1)|\xi|^q$ in H). Choose $\theta = \theta_1$ as in [31], eq. (24), so that $c = -1$. Now, for V isotropic, $e = -2\frac{\theta'(u)}{\theta(u)}(W(y) - yW'(y))$, $y = |\nabla u|$; this is ≤ 0 under the assumptions (1.1). Hence t^{-1} is a sub-solution of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$, and the comparison principle yields $|\nabla u_t(x)|^2 \leq \frac{\theta_1^2(u_0(x))}{t}$. Now $\|\theta_1\|_\infty \leq 2\|u_0\|_\infty$. Scaling back to the original variables h, x yields the first bound, $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \|h_0\|_\infty(\nu t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

- (ii) The second bound is an extension of [10]. Exactly as in (i), one may assume that $u_0 \leq 0$. Up to an overall change of sign, $u \mapsto -u$, we are in the conditions of [10], Theorem 1, with $p = 2$, except that V is not necessarily a power function. Letting again $\varepsilon = 0$, the function Θ in eq. (20) p. 2005 is here $\Theta(r) = \Theta(y^2) = 2y^2 \frac{d}{dy^2} W(y) - W(y) = yW'(y) - W(y)$; by assumption,

$$\Theta(r) \gtrsim \min\left(r, \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{\nu}\right)^{1-\frac{q}{2}} r^{q/2}\right) = r \mathbf{1}_{r \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{\nu}} + \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{\nu}\right)^{1-\frac{q}{2}} r^{\frac{q}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{r > \frac{\lambda^2}{\nu}}. \quad (2.21)$$

Eq. (14) p. 2003 implies

$$\mathcal{L}w + Cv^{-2}\Theta(v^2w)w \leq 0 \quad (2.22)$$

with $\mathcal{L} = \partial_t - \Delta$ up to some gradient term vanishing on functions h which are independent of x (see eq. (10) p. 2002 for a precise definition), $v := \sqrt{u}$, $w = |\nabla v|^2$. Now $v \leq \|u_0\|_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} v^{-2}\Theta(v^2w)w &\geq w^2 & (w \lesssim \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{-1}), \\ v^{-2}\Theta(v^2w)w &\geq \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} w^{1+\frac{q}{2}} & (w \gtrsim \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

so $\mathcal{N}w \leq 0$, where \mathcal{N} is the parabolic differential operator

$$\mathcal{N} : h \mapsto \mathcal{L}h + CN(h), \quad N(h) = h^2 \mathbf{1}_{h \leq \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{-1}} + \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} h^{1+\frac{q}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{h > \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{-1}}. \quad (2.23)$$

Note that N is an increasing function. The comparison principle thus implies that $w \leq h$ if $\mathcal{N}h \geq 0$. Such a function $h = h(t)$ is easily constructed by solving the ordinary differential equations $\partial_t h = -\left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} h^{1+\frac{q}{2}}$ for $h \leq \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{-1}$, $\partial_t h = -h^2$ for $h \geq \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{-1}$, yielding up to unimportant constants $h(t) = \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{q}-1} t^{-\frac{2}{q}}$ ($t \leq \frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}$), $h(t) = \frac{1}{t}$ ($t \geq \frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}$). This gives bounds for $\|\nabla v_t\|_\infty$ by taking the square-root, and then bounds for $\|\nabla u_t\|_\infty$ by noting that $\nabla u = 2u^{1/2}\nabla v$ and $u_t^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \leq \|u_0\|_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (see [9], proof of Proposition 3.1), namely,

$$\|\nabla u_t\|_\infty \lesssim \left(\frac{v}{\lambda^2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2 t}\right)^{1/q}, \quad t \leq \frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}; \quad (2.24)$$

$$\|\nabla u_t\|_\infty \lesssim \left(\frac{\|u_0\|_\infty}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad t \geq \frac{v\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda^2}. \quad (2.25)$$

Hence (2.14,2.15) by rescaling.

(iii) Under the stronger assumption (2.16), the previous computations yields $h(t) = \frac{1}{t}$ for all $t > 0$.

Hence $|\nabla u_t(x)| \lesssim \left(\frac{|u_t(x)|}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Eq. (2.17), and then (2.18), follow by rescaling and using the a priori bound $\|h_t\|_\infty \leq \|h_0\|_\infty$.

□

2.3 Bounds through integral representation of mild solutions

The third source of results is the integral form of the equation,

$$h_t = e^{t\nu\Delta}h_0 + \lambda \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta}V(\nabla h_s)ds, \quad (2.26)$$

the solutions of which, traditionally called *mild solutions*, are not necessary twice differentiable in space. (2.26) is used to prove local-in-time well-posedness of the equation, while the a priori estimates (2.2) imply global existence [5]. We shall not come back to this; instead, we give an

application to the proof of various bounds for the gradient and for higher derivatives of the solution. Generally speaking, ν -dependent constants (throughout denoted by C and possibly varying from line to line) come out of the computations everywhere. From [5], the solution obtained by iterating (2.26),

$$h_t^{(0)} = h_0, \quad h_t^{(k+1)} = e^{t\nu\Delta}h_0^{(k)} + \lambda \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta}V(\nabla h_s^{(k)})ds \quad (k \geq 0) \quad (2.27)$$

in search for a fixed point is obtained as a converging series for $t < T_1^*$,

$$T_1^* = C(\lambda\|\nabla h_0\|_\infty)^{-2} \quad (2.28)$$

for some constant C , and shown to be uniformly smooth: namely, for every $k \geq 0$, $\|\nabla^k h_t\|_\infty \leq C_k\|\nabla^k h_0\|_\infty$, $0 \leq t \leq T_1^*$ provided the initial solution has bounded derivatives of order $\leq k$. By an appropriate choice of C one may assume that $C_2 = C_3 = 2$. This, in turn, shows, using the a priori bound, $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty$, that the solution at any later time also has bounded derivatives of arbitrary order. We are interested here in quantitative bounds that can be shown to be close to optimal in some case where explicit computations are possible (see next paragraph).

We shall give two different results. Recall $\bar{I}_\infty = \|h_0^+\|_1 e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu}\|h_0^+\|_\infty}$ (see (2.9)). Our first result uses hypothesis (2.16), $yV'(y) - V(y) \geq Cy^2$ (see Proposition 2.3 (iii)).

Theorem 2.1 (decay in L^1 -norm of the gradient) *Assume $h_0 \in W^{1,\infty} \cap L^1$ and let h_t be the solution of the KPZ equation (2.1), with V satisfying the hypothesis (2.16). Then*

$$\|\nabla h_t\|_1 \lesssim \max(J_\infty, J_\infty^{1+\frac{1}{d}})(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad J_\infty = \sup\left(1, \frac{\|\nabla h_0\|_1}{\|h_0\|_1}, \lambda\|\nabla h_0\|_\infty(1 + O(\lambda\|h_0\|_\infty))\right)\|h_0\|_1 e^{C\lambda\|h_0\|_\infty}. \quad (2.29)$$

The time-decay in $O(t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ of $\|\nabla h_t\|_1$ is shown in [9] for $V(y) = y^2$, but with a constant J_∞ which is roughly $e^{\bar{I}_\infty}$ and thus far from optimal (see p. 1290 and 1291). The emphasis there was on the asymptotic convergence for $t \rightarrow \infty$ of the solution to a multiple of the heat-kernel (see Theorem 2.3 (a)), an interesting result in itself to which we do not come back here.

Proof.

Our proof, based on intuition derived from the explicit computations of the next paragraph, shows that there are different time regimes for $\|\nabla h_t\|_1$. Initially (i) the L^1 -norm of the gradient may increase (as is the case for the L^1 -norm of the solution when the initial condition is positive); for later times (iii) it decreases like the square-root of time. There also appears a regime (ii) for intermediate times, during which the L^1 -norm of the gradient is shown to be essentially constant.

These three regimes come from the three essentially different bounds one has on $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty$; namely, (i) $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty$ by the comparison principle; (ii) $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\|h_0\|_\infty}{\lambda}}t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ by Proposition 2.3 (iii); (iii)

$$\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \|h_{t/2}\|_\infty t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim I_\infty t^{-(d+1)/2}, \quad (2.30)$$

as follows from a combination of Proposition 2.3 (i) and of the parabolic estimates developed in the lines following eq. (2.9), where

$$I_\infty = \|h_0\|_1 e^{C\lambda\|h_0\|_\infty} \quad (2.31)$$

is an upper bound for $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|h_t\|_1$ (in order to get not too complicated formulas, we avoid the unpleasant task of optimizing the constants, and choose C large enough).

- (i) For t small one uses the trivial bound (i), $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty$, and applies the iterative scheme (2.27) in uniform time slices $[T_0^*, T_1^*] = [0, T_1^*]$, $[T_1^*, T_2^*] = [T_1^*, 2T_1^*]$, \dots , $[T_{n_0-1}^*, T_{n_0}^*] = [(n_0 - 1)T_1^*, n_0 T_1^*]$ where $n_0 \approx \lambda \|h_0\|_\infty$, so that $\|\nabla h_0\|_\infty \approx \sqrt{\frac{\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda}} (T_{n_0}^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. At some time comparable with $T_{n_0}^*$, the bound (ii) on $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty$ becomes better. We let $M_n^{(k)} := \sup_{[T_n^*, T_{n+1}^*]} \|\nabla u_t^{(k)}\|_1$ and $M_n := \sup_{[T_n^*, T_{n+1}^*]} \|\nabla u_t\|_1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M_n^{(k)}$. By (2.27) and the parabolic estimates recalled in (2.7),

$$M_n^{(k+1)} \lesssim \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1 + \lambda \sup_{t \in [T_n^*, T_{n+1}^*]} \int_{T_n^*}^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\nabla h^{(k-1)}(s))^2\|_1 ds, \quad (2.32)$$

together with the interpolation inequality,

$$\|(\nabla h^{(k-1)}(s))^2\|_1 = \|\nabla h^{(k-1)}(s)\|_2^2 \leq \|\nabla h^{(k-1)}(s)\|_1 \|\nabla h^{(k-1)}(s)\|_\infty, \quad (2.33)$$

one obtains

$$M_n^{(k+1)} \lesssim \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1 + C^{-1} M_n^{(k)} \quad (2.34)$$

where C^{-1} is proportional to the inverse of the constant C in the definition of T_1^* . For C large enough, this yields $\sup_k M_n^{(k)} \leq 2M_{n-1}$ and $M_n \leq 2M_{n-1}$. Thus

$$M_{n_0} \leq \|\nabla h_0\|_1 e^{C\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty} \lesssim \frac{\|\nabla h_0\|_1}{\|h_0\|_1} I_\infty \quad (2.35)$$

with an appropriate definition of the constant in (2.31).

- (ii) For $n \geq n_0$ one defines inductively T_n^* by $T_{n+1}^* - T_n^* = C(\lambda \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty)^{-2}$. Note that $T_{n_0}^* \approx \frac{\|h_0\|_\infty}{\|\nabla h_0\|_\infty^2}$; by the second estimate (ii) on $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty$, $T_{n+1}^* - T_n^* \gtrsim \frac{T_n^*}{\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty}$, so

$$T_n^* \geq \frac{\|h_0\|_\infty}{\|\nabla h_0\|_\infty^2} \left(1 + \frac{C}{\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty}\right)^{n-n_0}, \quad n \geq n_0. \quad (2.36)$$

Instead of the bound $\|\nabla e^{(t-T_n^*)\nu\Delta} h_{T_n^*}\|_1 \leq \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1$ used in (2.32), it is more clever for n and $t - T_n^*$ large enough to use the parabolic estimate $\|\nabla e^{(t-T_n^*)\nu\Delta} h_{T_n^*}\|_1 \lesssim (t - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} I_\infty$ if the latter expression is $\leq \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1$. Thus one gets the improved estimate

$$M_n^{(k+1)} \lesssim \sup_{t \in [T_n^*, T_{n+1}^*]} \left(\inf(\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1, I_\infty (t - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \lambda \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty M_n^{(k)} (t - T_n^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \quad (2.37)$$

If $\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1 \gtrsim I_\infty (T_{n+1}^* - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \approx \lambda I_\infty \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty$, the improved estimate (2.37) is better than (2.32) and yields

$$M_n^{(k+1)} \lesssim \sup \left(\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1 + \lambda \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty M_n^{(k)} \frac{\|h_{T_n^*}\|_1}{\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1}, \right. \\ \left. \sup_{T_{n+1}^* - T_n^* \geq t - T_n^* \geq (\|h_{T_n^*}\|_1 / \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1)^2} \left(I_\infty (t - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty M_n^{(k)} (t - T_n^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right) \quad (2.38)$$

The function $x \mapsto \frac{a}{x} + bx$, here $x = \sqrt{t - T_n^*}$, is bounded on any interval of \mathbb{R}_+ by the max of its values at the two ends of the interval. Hence

$$M_n^{(k+1)} \lesssim \sup \left(\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1 + \lambda \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty M_n^{(k)} \frac{I_\infty}{\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1}, I_\infty (T_{n+1}^* - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C^{-1} M_n^{(k)} \right) \quad (2.39)$$

with $C^{-1} < 1$. Iterating these affine inequalities yields either

$$M_n \lesssim I_\infty (T_{n+1}^* - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \approx \lambda I_\infty \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty \leq I_\infty \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty; \quad (2.40)$$

or, assuming on the contrary that $\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_1 \gtrsim I_\infty (T_{n+1}^* - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$M_n \lesssim \frac{\|\nabla u_{T_n^*}\|_1}{1 - \lambda I_\infty \frac{\|\nabla u_{T_n^*}\|_\infty}{\|\nabla u_{T_n^*}\|_1}}. \quad (2.41)$$

Since the sequence $n \mapsto \lambda I_\infty \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty$ is exponentially decreasing (as follows from the bound (ii) and the fact that the sequence (T_n^*) is exponentially increasing, see (2.36)), the recursive sequence

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n}{1 - \lambda I_\infty \frac{\|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty}{x_n}} \approx x_n + \lambda I_\infty \|\nabla h_{T_n^*}\|_\infty \quad (2.42)$$

starting from $x_{n_1} \approx I_\infty (T_{n+1}^* - T_n^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \lambda \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty I_\infty$, converges to

$$x_\infty \lesssim \lambda \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty I_\infty \left(1 + \frac{1}{1 - (1 + \frac{C}{\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty})^{-1/2}} \right) \lesssim \lambda \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty I_\infty (1 + O(\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty)). \quad (2.43)$$

This gives a global bound for $M_n, n \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} M_n \leq \tilde{I}_\infty := \sup \left(\frac{\|\nabla h_0\|_1}{\|h_0\|_1}, \lambda \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty (1 + O(\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty)) \right) I_\infty, \quad (2.44)$$

but no time decay yet in general.

- (iii) For $t \gtrsim I_\infty^{2/d}$ we use the estimate (iii), $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim I_\infty t^{-(d+1)/2}$ and prove the time decay in $O(t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$. Let $\tilde{M}_n := \sup_{t \in [2^{n-1}, 2^n]} \|\nabla h_t\|_1$ for $n \geq n_2 := 1 + \log_2 I_\infty^{2/d}$. For all $t \in [2^n, 2^{n+1})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla h_t\|_1 &\lesssim 2^{-n/2} \|h_{t-2^{n-1}}\|_1 + \lambda \int_{t-2^{n-1}}^t ds (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla h_s\|_1 \|\nabla h_s\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim 2^{-n/2} I_\infty + \lambda 2^{n/2} (\tilde{M}_n + \tilde{M}_{n+1}) I_\infty (2^{-n})^{(d+1)/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

hence

$$\tilde{M}_{n+1} \lesssim 2^{-n/2} I_\infty + \lambda I_\infty 2^{-nd/2} \tilde{M}_n + \lambda I_\infty 2^{-nd/2} \tilde{M}_{n+1}. \quad (2.46)$$

For $n \geq n_2$ one has by definition $I_\infty 2^{-nd/2} \leq 1$, so

$$\tilde{M}_{n+1} \lesssim (1 + O(\lambda)) (2^{-n/2} I_\infty + \lambda \tilde{M}_n), \quad (2.47)$$

while $\tilde{M}_{n_2} \lesssim \tilde{I}_\infty$ by (ii), implying by a straightforward induction

$$\tilde{M}_n \lesssim 2^{-n/2} I_\infty + \tilde{I}_\infty \lesssim 2^{-n/2} (I_\infty + I_\infty^{1/d} \tilde{I}_\infty) \quad (2.48)$$

and finally

$$\sup_{t \geq I_\infty^{2/d}} \sqrt{t} \|\nabla h_t\|_1 \lesssim I_\infty + I_\infty^{1/d} \tilde{I}_\infty. \quad (2.49)$$

Finally,

$$\sup_{t \leq I_\infty^{2/d}} \sqrt{t} \|\nabla h_t\|_1 \lesssim I_\infty^{1/d} \tilde{I}_\infty. \quad (2.50)$$

Hence the result. \square

Remark. If V does not satisfy (2.16), then the beginning of the proof is modified as follows: substituting to (ii) the bound $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty \lesssim \|h_0\|_\infty t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, see Proposition 2.3 (i), leads to n_0 defined such as to satisfy $\|\nabla h_0\|_\infty \approx \|h_0\|_\infty (T_{n_0}^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, namely, $n_0 \approx (\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty)^2$, and (compare with (2.35)) $M_{n_0} \lesssim \|\nabla h_0\|_1 e^{C(\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty)^2}$. A bound comparable to (2.29) probably holds with the quadratic exponential $e^{C(\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty)^2}$ substituting $e^{C\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty}$, which is clearly not optimal for the quadratic KPZ equation (see next paragraph).

Our second result is valid under our general assumptions on V stated in section 1.

Theorem 2.2 (bounds on higher derivatives) *Let h be the solution of eq. (2.1) with initial condition $h_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{3,\infty}$. Then:*

$$\|\nabla^2 h_t\|_\infty \lesssim P_1(\|h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla^2 h_0\|_\infty) \frac{\ln(1+t)}{t} \quad (2.51)$$

$$\|\nabla^3 h_t\|_\infty \lesssim P_2(\|h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla^2 h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla^3 h_0\|_\infty) \left(\frac{\ln^2(1+t)}{t^{3/2}} \right) \quad (2.52)$$

where P_1, P_2 are polynomials.

Proof.

We already know that $\sup_{[0, T_1^*]} \|\nabla^k h_t\|_\infty \leq 2\|\nabla^k h_0\|_\infty$, $k = 2, 3$ for $T_1^* \approx (\lambda \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty)^{-2}$. For $t \geq T_1^*$, $\nabla^2 h_t$ is the solution of an integral equation,

$$\nabla^2 h_t = e^{tv\Delta} \nabla^2 h_0 + \lambda \left[\int_{(1-\varepsilon)t}^t ds (\nabla e^{(t-s)v\Delta}) \nabla (V(\nabla h_s)) + \int_0^{(1-\varepsilon)t} ds (\nabla^2 e^{(t-s)v\Delta}) V(\nabla h_s) \right]. \quad (2.53)$$

The idea is to commute the gradient with the heat operator $e^{(t-s)v\Delta}$ in order to make the most of parabolic estimates; the implied decay may be put to good use only for $t-s$ large enough, and we shall choose the parameter ε accordingly. First, $\|e^{tv\Delta} \nabla^2 h_0\|_\infty = \|\nabla^2 e^{tv\Delta} h_0\|_\infty \lesssim \|h_0\|_\infty t^{-1}$. Then, using $\nabla(V(\nabla h_s)) = V'(\nabla h_s) \cdot \nabla^2 h_s$ and Proposition 2.3 (i), together with the inequality $V'(y) \lesssim y$, consequence of Assumption (1.1) (3), (4) (namely, $(2y)^2 \geq V(2y) \geq V(y) + yV'(y)$)

$$\lambda \left| \int_{(1-\varepsilon)t}^t ds (\nabla e^{(t-s)v\Delta}) \nabla (V(\nabla h_s)) \right| \lesssim \lambda \int_{(1-\varepsilon)t}^t \frac{ds}{\sqrt{t-s}} \|\nabla h_s\|_\infty \sup_{[(1-\varepsilon)t, t]} \|\nabla^2 h_s\|_\infty \lesssim \lambda \|h_0\|_\infty \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sup_{[(1-\varepsilon)t, t]} \|\nabla^2 h_s\|_\infty$$

provided $(1-\varepsilon)t \gtrsim t$. To get a useful inequality we choose ε so that $\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, namely, $\varepsilon \approx \min(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{(\lambda \|h_0\|_\infty)^2})$. Finally (if $t \geq 1$) we split the second integral, $\int_0^{(1-\varepsilon)t}$, into several pieces:

$$\lambda \int_{t/2}^{(1-\varepsilon)t} ds (\nabla^2 e^{(t-s)v\Delta}) V(\nabla h_s) \lesssim \lambda \int_{t/2}^{(1-\varepsilon)t} \frac{ds}{t-s} \left(\frac{\|h_0\|_\infty}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^2 \lesssim \lambda \ln(\varepsilon^{-1}) \|h_0\|_\infty^2 t^{-1}; \quad (2.54)$$

$$\lambda \int_1^{t/2} ds (\nabla^2 e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta}) V(\nabla h_s) \lesssim \lambda t^{-1} \int_1^{t/2} \frac{ds}{s} \|h_0\|_\infty^2 \lesssim \lambda \frac{\ln t}{t} \|h_0\|_\infty^2; \quad (2.55)$$

$$\lambda \int_0^1 ds (\nabla^2 e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta}) V(\nabla h_s) \lesssim \lambda t^{-1} \int_0^1 ds \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty^2 = \lambda \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty^2 t^{-1}. \quad (2.56)$$

If $t < 1$, we merge (2.55,2.56) into

$$\lambda \int_0^{t/2} ds (\nabla^2 e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta}) V(\nabla h_s) \lesssim \lambda t^{-1} \int_0^{t/2} ds \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty^2 = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty^2. \quad (2.57)$$

We finish as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 (iii), namely, letting $M_0 := \sup_{[0, T_1^*]} \|\nabla^2 h_t\|_\infty$ and $M_n := \sup_{[2^{n-1} T_1^*, 2^n T_1^*]} \|\nabla^2 h_t\|_\infty$ ($n \geq 1$), one has $M_0 \leq 2\|\nabla^2 h_0\|_\infty$ and

$$M_{n+1} \leq C^{-1} M_n + Q_1(\|h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty) 2^{-n} + \lambda \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty^2 \quad (2.58)$$

for $t < 1$,

$$M_{n+1} \leq C^{-1} M_n + Q_2(\|h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty) 2^{-n} + Q_3(\|h_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla h_0\|_\infty) n 2^{-n} \quad (2.59)$$

for $t \geq 1$. Hence (2.51).

This result is used as input to get similar a bound for $\|\nabla^3 h_t\|_\infty$. This time we must move around three gradients in the best way; this gives three integrals rewritten as

$$\int_{(1-\varepsilon)t}^t ds (\nabla e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta}) \nabla^2 (V(\nabla h_s)), \quad \int_{t/2}^{(1-\varepsilon)t} ds \nabla^2 e^{(t-s)\Delta} \nabla (V(\nabla h(s))), \quad \int_0^{t/2} ds \nabla^3 e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta} V(\nabla h_s).$$

One has $\nabla^2 (V(\nabla h_s)) = V'(\nabla h_s) \cdot \nabla^3 h_s + V''(\nabla h_s) (\nabla^2 h_s)^2$, yielding the same constraints on ε , plus a supplementary quadratic term in $\nabla^2 h_s$. The other terms are computed as before. Details are left to the reader. \square

2.4 An explicit example: decay of a 'bump' for the quadratic KPZ equation

We consider here the time-decay (pointwise and with respect to various norms) of the solution of the quadratic, homogeneous KPZ equation,

$$\partial_t h = \Delta h + |\nabla h|^2 \quad (2.60)$$

with initial "bump" condition $h_0(x) = A \mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq L}$, where $A, L > 0$. The coefficient λ in front of the nonlinearity has been disposed of by a simple rescaling. Note that, if $A = \|h_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$ (i.e. for a small initial condition), then the decay of the solution and of its derivatives in L^p -norms, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ follow the parabolic estimates as for the solutions of the linear heat equation; thus we may assume that $A \gg 1$. We want to compare the decays obtained by explicit computation to those obtained in much greater generality in the previous paragraphs.

Through the exponential transformation, $w = \exp h$, the equation becomes simply the heat equation,

$$\partial_t w = \Delta w, \quad w_0 = e^{h_0} \quad (2.61)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
h_t(x) &= \ln \left((2\pi t)^{-d/2} \int dy e^{-(x-y)^2/2t} w_0(y) \right) \\
&= \ln \left(1 + (e^A - 1) (2\pi t)^{-d/2} \int_{|y| \leq L} dy e^{-(x-y)^2/2t} \right) \\
&\approx \ln \left(1 + e^A t^{-d/2} \int_{|y| \leq L} dy e^{-(x-y)^2/2t} \right). \tag{2.62}
\end{aligned}$$

Though the initial data is not in $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}$, this defines a solution. We are interested in its behaviour for $t \gtrsim L^2$, corresponding to the approximate amount of time necessary for the solution to smoothen up. Then

$$h_t(x) \approx \ln \left(1 + e^A \left(\frac{L^2}{t} \right)^{d/2} e^{-x^2/2t} \right). \tag{2.63}$$

There are two regimes:

- (i) (initial regime) Assume $L^2 \lesssim t \lesssim L^2 e^{\frac{2}{d}A}$. Define $x_{\max}(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ as the solution of the equation $e^A \left(\frac{L^2}{t} \right)^{d/2} e^{-x_{\max}^2/2t} = 1$; explicitly, $x_{\max}(t) = \sqrt{2t(A - \frac{d}{2} \log(\frac{t}{L^2}))}$. If $|x| \gtrsim x_{\max}(t)$ then $h_t(x) \approx e^A \left(\frac{L^2}{t} \right)^{d/2} e^{-x^2/2t} \lesssim 1$. On the other hand, if $|x| \lesssim x_{\max}(t)$, then $h_t(x)$ is still large, $h_t(x) \approx A - \frac{d}{2} \log\left(\frac{t}{L^2}\right) - \frac{x^2}{2t}$. In particular,

$$\|h_t\|_\infty \approx A - \frac{d}{2} \log \frac{t}{L^2} \tag{2.64}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h_t\|_1 &\approx \|h_t\|_\infty \cdot \text{Vol}(B(0, x_{\max}(t))) + e^A L^d \int_{|x| > x_{\max}(t)} t^{-d/2} e^{-|x|^2/2t} dx \\
&\lesssim t^{d/2} \left(A - \frac{d}{2} \log \frac{t}{L^2} \right)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} + e^A L^d. \tag{2.65}
\end{aligned}$$

Both quantities $t \mapsto t^{d/2} \left(A - \frac{d}{2} \log \frac{t}{L^2} \right)$ and $t \mapsto t^{d/2} \left(A - \frac{d}{2} \log \frac{t}{L^2} \right)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}$ are easily checked to be maximal for $A - \frac{d}{2} \log \frac{t}{L^2} \approx 1$, yielding

$$\|h_t\|_\infty \lesssim e^A L^d t^{-d/2} \approx \|h_0\|_1 \frac{e^{\|h_0\|_\infty}}{\|h_0\|_\infty} t^{-d/2} \tag{2.66}$$

and

$$\|h_t\|_1 \lesssim e^A L^d \approx \|h_0\|_1 \frac{e^{\|h_0\|_\infty}}{\|h_0\|_\infty}. \tag{2.67}$$

- (ii) (final regime) Assume $t \gtrsim L^2 e^{\frac{2}{d}A}$. Then $h_t(x) \approx e^A \left(\frac{L^2}{t} \right)^{d/2} e^{-x^2/2t} \lesssim 1$; in other words, the bump has essentially disappeared. Furthermore,

$$\|h_t\|_\infty \approx e^A L^d t^{-d/2}, \quad \|h_t\|_1 \approx e^A L^d \tag{2.68}$$

saturation the bounds found in case (i).

In both cases, bounds for $\|\nabla^q h_t\|_\infty$ or $\|\nabla^q h_t\|_1$ are obtained by dividing by $t^{q/2}$. Details are left to the reader.

The above computations make it clear that the general bounds for $\|\nabla h_t\|_\infty$, see eq. (2.30), $\|\nabla h_t\|_1$ and $\|\nabla^q h_t\|_\infty$, $q = 2, 3$ obtained in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, are essentially optimal.

3 Bound for the homogeneous equation: the case of unbounded initial conditions

We now want to prove existence of, and bound, solutions of the homogeneous KPZ equation,

$$\partial_t h = \Delta h + \lambda V(\nabla h) \quad (3.1)$$

with *unbounded* initial condition h_0 (for simplicity we fix $\nu = 1$ from now on). We would typically like to consider a random initial condition which is a smoothed white noise (see Appendix A). This raises various problems. First (1), one would like to identify a functional space preserved by the linear heat equation, for which generalized parabolic estimates hold. Second (2), one would like to extend the comparison principle to such a functional space, in such a way as to prove existence of and bound the solution. Finally (3), one would like to identify the solution as the limit of solutions of (3.1) associated to a sequence of compactly supported (hence bounded) initial conditions converging to the original initial condition, so as to extend to the limit regularity results and estimates obtained in the previous section.

We provide in this section answers to questions (1), (2), (3). We first refer the reader to the Introduction for a short review. §3.1 is devoted to a detailed study of the space \mathcal{H}^0 of functions with locally bounded averages, and more generally of a family of spaces \mathcal{H}_α^0 , including $\mathcal{H}^0 \equiv \mathcal{H}_0^0$, which enjoy the same type of properties. The comparison principle (Theorem 1 in the Introduction) is proved in §3.2. Estimates for the solutions of (3.1) and their gradients are proved respectively in §3.3 and §3.4.

3.1 The functional spaces \mathcal{H}_α^0

For $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, one may define

$$f_\alpha^*(x) = \sup_{\tau > 0} (1 + \tau)^\alpha e^{\tau\Delta} |f|(x) \in [0, +\infty] \quad (3.2)$$

and in particular

$$f^*(x) := f_0^*(x) = \sup_{\tau > 0} e^{\tau\Delta} |f|(x) \in [0, +\infty]. \quad (3.3)$$

Note that $f^* \leq f_\alpha^* \leq f_\beta^*$ if $\alpha \leq \beta$. If f is bounded, then $f^*(x) \leq \|f\|_\infty$. On the other hand, the kind of random initial conditions we are interested in (see Appendix A) are a.s. unbounded, but satisfy a.s. $f^*(x) < \infty$ for every x (see Lemma 6.5 and discussion thereafter); compare with the standard parabolic estimates, $f_{d/2}^*(x) \lesssim \|f\|_1$ for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that, if $\alpha = 0$, the obvious *pointwise* estimates, making part of what we call *pointwise parabolic estimates* in Lemma 3.6,

$$|e^{t\Delta} f(x)| \leq f^*(x), \quad t \geq 0 \quad (3.4)$$

and, better still,

$$(e^{t\Delta} f)^*(x) \leq f^*(x), \quad t \geq 0 \quad (3.5)$$

generalizing to

$$(e^{t\Delta} f)_\alpha^*(x) \leq f_\alpha^*(x), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.6)$$

are improvements on the *global* estimate $\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty$ which is useless for unbounded functions. If $f_\alpha^*(x) < \infty$ for some $\alpha > 0$, then

$$|e^{t\Delta} f(x)| \leq (1+t)^{-\alpha} f_\alpha^*(x) \quad (3.7)$$

decays polynomially in time.

Definition 3.1 (\mathcal{H}^0 -spaces) *Let, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq d/2$,*

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha^0 := \{f \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_\alpha^*(x) < \infty\} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}^0 := \mathcal{H}_0^0 = \{f \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, f^*(x) < \infty\}. \quad (3.9)$$

For every $\alpha \leq d/2$, $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^0 \supset L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (actually, it is easy to prove that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^0 = \{0\}$ for $\alpha > d/2$).

It is easy to see that $f \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^0$ provided there *exists* some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f_\alpha^*(x) < \infty$. However the various "norms" $f \mapsto f_\alpha^*(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, are not comparable. In this sense $f_\alpha^*(x)$ should be understood as a *local, x-centered measure* of the size of f .

Another closely related definition is by averaging: if $f \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $r \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, one may define

$$f_\alpha^\#(x) = \sup_{\rho > 0} (1 + \rho^2)^\alpha \frac{\int_{B(x,\rho)} |f(y)| dy}{\text{Vol}(B(x,\rho))} \quad (3.10)$$

(called *maximal function* in real analysis for $\alpha = 0$, see the classical book by Stein [64]) where $B(x,\rho) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d; |y-x| < \rho\}$ is the Euclidean ball and $\text{Vol}(B(x,\rho))$ its volume. Here also, $f_0^\# \leq f_\alpha^\# \leq f_\beta^\#$ if $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta$. It is convenient to denote averages by barred integrals, so that, by definition, $\bar{f}_\Omega = \frac{\int_\Omega f}{\text{Vol}(\Omega)}$. A simple result is the following:

Lemma 3.2 *There exists constants $c, C > 0$ such that, for every $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $c f_\alpha^*(x) \leq f_\alpha^\#(x) \leq C f_\alpha^*(x)$.*

Proof. We must prove two inequalities. First,

$$\begin{aligned} \int dy \frac{e^{-(x-y)^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(y)| &= \int dr \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \int_{\partial B(x,r)} dy |f(y)| \\ &= \int dr \frac{r}{t} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \int_{B(x,r)} dy |f(y)| \\ &\leq f_0^\#(x) \int dr \frac{r}{t} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \int_{B(x,r)} dy \\ &= f_0^\#(x) \int dy \frac{e^{-|y|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} = f_0^\#(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Thus $f_0^* \leq f_0^\#$. If $\alpha > 0$ and $t \gtrsim 1$ then

$$(1+t)^\alpha \int dy \frac{e^{-(x-y)^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(y)| \lesssim f_\alpha^\# (1+t)^{-1-\frac{d}{2}+\alpha} \int dr (1+r)^{1+d-2\alpha} e^{-r^2/2t} \lesssim f_\alpha^\#(x), \quad (3.12)$$

so $f_\alpha^* \lesssim f_\alpha^\#$.

Conversely,

$$e^{r^2\Delta}|f|(x) = \int \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(|x-y|/r)^2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2} r^d} |f(y)| dy \geq C \int_{B(x,r)} |f|. \quad (3.13)$$

□

In particular, an equivalent definition for \mathcal{H}_α^0 is:

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha^0 = \{f \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_\alpha^\#(x) < \infty\}. \quad (3.14)$$

Note also that, if f is lower semicontinuous (in particular, if f is continuous), $f_\alpha^\#(x) \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B(x,r)} |f| \geq |f(x)|$, and similarly $f_\alpha^*(x) \geq |f(x)|$.

Example. The equivalence of the "pointwise quasi-norms" $f^*(x)$, $f^\#(x)$ makes it easy to construct unbounded functions $f \in \mathcal{H}^0$. The idea is to modify a bounded function on regions with small relative volume. Define for instance f to be identically equal to $c_1 > 0$ outside the union of annuli $\cup_{k \geq 0} B_k$, where $B_k := B(0, 2^k + 2^{k\gamma}) \setminus B(0, 2^k)$ for some $\gamma \in (-\infty, 1)$, and $f|_{B_k} := c_2 (2^k)^{d(1-\gamma')}$ with $c_2 > 0$ and $\gamma' \geq \gamma$. Then for k large, $\int_{B(x, 2^k)} |f| \approx c_1$ (corresponding to "rare enough" fluctuations) if $\gamma' > \gamma$, and $\int_{B(x, 2^k)} |f| \approx c_1 + c_2$ if $\gamma' = \gamma$ (corresponding to a border case where fluctuations are as important as the bulk behaviour). Hence $f^*(x) < \infty$. On the other hand, $f^*(x) = \infty$ if $\gamma' < \gamma$. One may also allow arbitrarily large fluctuations by letting $\gamma'_k = \gamma_k$ be a sequence which is unbounded below. Typical realizations of regularized white noise are more complicated, but large fluctuations do not contribute to the average on large balls (see section 6 for a more precise picture).

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\alpha \in [0, d/2]$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^0 \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

1. *The functions $f_\alpha^\#$ and f_α^* are continuous.*
2. *Let furthermore*

$$\beta := \sup\{\gamma \in [0, 1] \mid (x, y) \mapsto \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\gamma} \text{ in } L_{loc}^\infty\} \in [0, 1] \quad (3.15)$$

be the maximum local Hölder exponent of f , and assume $\beta > 0$. Then $f_\alpha^\#$ and f_α^ are Hölder continuous, with Hölder exponent $\frac{\beta}{1+\beta} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.*

In particular, $f_\alpha^\#, f_\alpha^*$ are $(\frac{1}{2})$ -Hölder continuous if $f \in C^1$.

Proof. For the sake of the proof we choose a bounded function $\phi : B(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\phi(u) = \phi(|u|)$ is strictly increasing, $\phi(0) = 0$, $\frac{\phi(u)}{u} > 2$ and $\frac{\phi(u)}{u} \rightarrow_{u \rightarrow 0} \infty$; we assume furthermore that $\phi(u) = o_{u \rightarrow 0}(u^{1/3})$, so that the function $\chi(u) = \chi(|u|) = \phi(u) \sqrt{\frac{\phi(u)}{u}}$ satisfies the same properties but $\frac{\chi(u)}{\phi(u)} \rightarrow_{u \rightarrow 0} \infty$. The core of the proof is a bound on the modulus of continuity of f_α^* , $f_\alpha^\#$ given in terms of these two functions. We assume in the following lines that $|y - x| \leq 1$.

- (i) Let us first prove that f_α^\sharp is locally bounded (from which it follows by Lemma 3.2 that f_α^* is also). Since $|y - x| \leq 1$, then

$$\int_{B(y,r)} |f| \leq \sup_{B(x,2)} |f|, \quad r \leq 1 \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$(1 + r^2)^\alpha \int_{B(y,r)} |f| \leq \left(\frac{r+1}{r}\right)^d (1 + r^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,r+1)} |f| \leq 2^d f_\alpha^\sharp(x), \quad r > 1. \quad (3.17)$$

So

$$\sup_{B(x,1)} f_\alpha^\sharp \leq 2^\alpha \max\left(\sup_{B(x,2)} |f|, 2^d f_\alpha^\sharp(x)\right). \quad (3.18)$$

- (ii) We now obtain a modulus of continuity for f_α^\sharp . Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let y vary in $B(x, 1)$. Consider first $r \leq \phi(x - y)$. Then, letting $\tau_{x-y}f(z) = f(z - (x - y))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B(x,r)} |f| - \int_{B(y,r)} |f| \right| &\leq \int_{B(x,r)} |f - \tau_{x-y}f| \\ &\leq \sup_{x' \in B(x, \phi(x-y)), y' \in B(y, \phi(x-y))} |f(x') - f(y')| \\ &\leq \text{osc}_{B(x, 2\phi(x-y))}(f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Since f is continuous in an neighbourhood of x this quantity goes to zero when $y \rightarrow x$.

Consider now $r > \phi(x - y)$. Letting $r' = r + |x - y|$ so that $B(x, r') \supset B(y, r)$,

$$\int_{B(x,r')} |f| \geq \frac{\text{Vol}(B(y, r))}{\text{Vol}(B(x, r'))} \int_{B(y,r)} |f| \quad (3.20)$$

hence

$$(1 + r'^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,r')} |f| - (1 + r^2)^\alpha \int_{B(y,r)} |f| \geq \left[\left(\frac{r}{r + |x - y|}\right)^d - 1 \right] f_\alpha^\sharp(y) \gtrsim - \left(\frac{|x - y|}{\phi(x - y)}\right) f_\alpha^\sharp(y). \quad (3.21)$$

Similarly, with $r'' = r - |x - y|$ (note that $r'' > |x - y|$ by hypothesis),

$$(1 + r^2)^\alpha \int_{B(y,r)} |f| - (1 + (r'')^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,r'')} |f| \gtrsim - \left(\frac{|x - y|}{\phi(x - y)}\right) f_\alpha^\sharp(x). \quad (3.22)$$

Thus, with $M = \sup_{B(x,1)} f_\alpha^\sharp$, $M < \infty$ by (i),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_r (1 + r^2)^\alpha \int_{B(y,r)} |f| - \sup_r (1 + r^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,r)} |f| &\leq \max\left\{ \sup_{r \leq \phi(x-y)} (1 + r^2)^\alpha \left\{ \int_{B(y,r)} |f| - \int_{B(x,r)} |f| \right\}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sup_{r > \phi(x-y)} \left\{ (1 + r^2)^\alpha \int_{B(y,r)} |f| - (1 + r'^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,r')} |f| \right\} \right\} \\ &\lesssim \max\left(\text{osc}_{B(x, \phi(x-y)) \cup B(y, \phi(x-y))}(f), M \frac{|x - y|}{\phi(x - y)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Exchanging x and y gives the same inequality. Hence we have shown that f_α^\sharp is continuous, and obtained more precisely that, for every function ϕ satisfying the above hypotheses,

$$\text{osc}_{B(x,u)} f_\alpha^\sharp \lesssim \max(\text{osc}_{B(x,2\phi(u))}(f), M \frac{u}{\phi(u)}), \quad u \in (0, 1). \quad (3.24)$$

In particular, choosing $\phi(u) = 2u^{1/(1+\beta)}$ if $\beta > 0$ yields $\text{osc}_{B(x,u)} f_\alpha^\sharp \lesssim u^{\beta/(1+\beta)}$, so f_α^\sharp is $\frac{\beta}{1+\beta}$ -Hölder continuous.

- (iii) Let us finally obtain a modulus of continuity for f_α^* . The proof is a slightly different from (ii) because the support of the heat kernel is the whole space; hence we must deal with the queue of the exponential $e^{-u^2/t}$ for $u \gg \sqrt{t}$. Assume first $\sqrt{t} \leq \phi(x-y)$. Then

$$|e^{t\Delta} f(x) - e^{t\Delta} f(y)| \leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \quad (3.25)$$

where

$$I_1 = \int_{B(x, \chi(x-y))} \frac{e^{-|x-z|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(z) - \tau_{x-y} f(z)| dz \leq \text{osc}_{B(x, \chi(x-y)) \cup B(y, \chi(x-y))}(f) \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(x, \chi(x-y))} \frac{e^{-|x-z|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(z)| dz = \int_{|u| > \chi(x-y)} \frac{e^{-|u|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(x+u)| du \\ &\leq 2^d \int \frac{e^{-|u|^2/8t}}{(8\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(x+u)| du \cdot e^{-3\chi^2(x-y)/8t} \\ &\lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{8} \frac{\phi(x-y)}{|x-y|}} f^*(x), \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

while $I_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(y, \chi(x-y))} \frac{e^{-|y-z|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(z)| dz$ is similar to I_2 . The exponential factor in front of f^* decreases to 0 when $y \rightarrow x$.

Assume now $\sqrt{t} > \phi(x-y)$. Then $|x-z|^2 \leq |x-y|^2 + |y-z|^2 + 2|x-y||y-z| \leq (1+\varepsilon)|y-z|^2 + (1+\varepsilon^{-1})|x-y|^2$ for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $\varepsilon = \frac{|x-y|}{\phi(x-y)} < \frac{1}{2}$ so that $\frac{(1+\varepsilon^{-1})|x-y|^2}{t} \lesssim \varepsilon$. Letting $t' = t(1+\varepsilon)$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} &(1+t')^\alpha \int \frac{e^{-|x-z|^2/2t'}}{(2\pi t')^{d/2}} |f(z)| dz - (1+t)^\alpha \int \frac{e^{-|y-z|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(z)| dz \\ &\gtrsim -\varepsilon(1+t)^\alpha \int \frac{e^{-|y-z|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(z)| dz \geq -\varepsilon f_\alpha^*(y). \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

Exchanging x and y gives a similar inequality, and one concludes to (3.24) as in (ii) by noting that $e^{-\frac{3}{8} \frac{\phi(u)}{u}} \lesssim \frac{u}{\phi(u)}$ for $u < 1$. □

A result in the same direction is

Lemma 3.4 *Let $f \in \mathcal{H}^0 \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, for every $t > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$,*

$$|e^{t\Delta} f(x) - f(x)| \lesssim \text{osc}_{B(x, t^\alpha)} f + e^{-\frac{1}{4} t^{2\alpha-1}} f_0^*(x). \quad (3.29)$$

Consequently, $e^{t\Delta} f \rightarrow_{t \rightarrow 0} f$ uniformly on every compact.

Proof. (3.29) follows directly from the inequality

$$|e^{t\Delta} f(x) - f(x)| \leq \int_{y \in B(x, \varepsilon)} \frac{e^{-|x-y|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} |f(y) - f(x)| dy + \int_{y \in B(x, \varepsilon)^c} e^{-\varepsilon^2/4t} \frac{e^{-|x-y|^2/4t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} (|f(y)| + |f(x)|) dy. \quad (3.30)$$

Taking $\varepsilon = t^\alpha$ with $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, using the local boundedness of f_0^* (proved in the previous lemma) and letting $t \rightarrow 0$ yields the uniform convergence on a compact set. \square

Finally, we shall later on need to approximate functions in \mathcal{H}_α^0 by functions with compact support, and use the following lemma:

Lemma 3.5 *Let $\chi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a smooth 'bump' scale 1 function, i.e. $\chi|_{B(0,1)} = 1$, $\chi|_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0,2)} = 0$. Denote by $\chi_n(x) = \chi(\frac{x}{n})$ its dilatations for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then, if $f \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^0$, the functions $f_n := f \cdot \chi_n$, $n \geq 1$ also belong to \mathcal{H}_α^0 , and $(f_n)_\alpha^* \rightarrow f_\alpha^*$, $(f_n)_\alpha^\sharp \rightarrow f_\alpha^\sharp$ uniformly on every compact.*

Proof. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ compact containing 0. We prove that $(f_n)_\alpha^* \rightarrow f_\alpha^*$ uniformly on K . Let $B(0, r)$ a ball containing K , and assume $n \gg r$. Then $\frac{|y-x|^2}{2t} \geq \frac{|y|^2}{4t}$ for all t, x, y with $t > 0$, $x \in K$, $|y| > n$. Hence

$$0 \leq e^{t\Delta} |f|(x) - e^{t\Delta} |f_n|(x) \leq 2^{d/2} \int_{|y|>n} \frac{e^{-|y|^2/4t}}{(2\pi(2t))^{d/2}} |f(y)| dy = 2^{d/2} e^{2t\Delta} (|f| - |f_n|)(0), \quad (3.31)$$

from which uniform convergence follows provided simple convergence holds at 0. But

$$f_\alpha^*(0) = \sup_t (1+t)^\alpha e^{t\Delta} (\sup_n |f_n|)(0) = \sup_{t,n} (1+t)^\alpha (e^{t\Delta} |f_n|)(0) = \lim_n (f_n)_\alpha^*(0) \quad (3.32)$$

by monotone convergence.

The proof for $(f_n)_\alpha^\sharp$ is similar: let us just state that

$$\int_{B(x,R)} (|f| - |f_n|) = 0 \quad (3.33)$$

if $B(x, R) \subset B(0, n)$, and

$$\int_{B(x,R)} (|f| - |f_n|) \leq \left(\frac{R+r}{R}\right)^d \int_{B(0,R+r)} (|f| - |f_n|) \quad (3.34)$$

otherwise. Details are left to the reader. \square

We may now finally write down our *pointwise parabolic estimates*:

Lemma 3.6 (pointwise parabolic estimates) *Let $\alpha \in [0, \frac{d}{2}]$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^0$. For every $k \geq 0$,*

$$|\nabla^k e^{t\Delta} f(x)| \lesssim t^{-\alpha-k/2} f_\alpha^*(x) \quad (3.35)$$

and

$$(\nabla^k e^{t\Delta} f)_\alpha^*(x) \lesssim t^{-k/2} f_\alpha^*(x). \quad (3.36)$$

Proof.

By differentiating k times the computations leading to (3.11), one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla^k e^{t\Delta} f(x)| &\lesssim \int dr \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{k+1} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \int_{B(x,r)} dy |f(y)| \\
&\lesssim f_\alpha^\#(x) \int dr \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{k+1} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} (1+r^2)^{-\alpha} \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) \\
&\lesssim t^{-\alpha-k/2} f_\alpha^\#(x) \int dr \frac{r}{t} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) = t^{-\alpha-k/2} f_\alpha^\#(x)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla^k e^{t\Delta} f)_\alpha^\#(x) &\lesssim \sup_\rho (1+\rho^2)^\alpha \int dr \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{k+1} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \int_{B(x,\rho)} dx' \int_{B(x',r)} dy |f(y)| \\
&\lesssim f_\alpha^\#(x) \int dr \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{k+1} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) \\
&\lesssim t^{-k/2} f_\alpha^\#(x) \int dr \frac{r}{t} \frac{e^{-r^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) = t^{-k/2} f_\alpha^\#(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

To go from the first to the second inequality in (3.38) we have made use of the following facts which are easy to prove,

$$(1+\rho^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,\rho)} dx' \int_{B(x',r)} dy |f(y)| \lesssim \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) (1+\rho^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,\rho)} dy |f(y)| \lesssim \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) f_\alpha^\#(x), \quad (\rho \gtrsim r) \tag{3.39}$$

$$(1+\rho^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,\rho)} dx' \int_{B(x',r)} dy |f(y)| \lesssim \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) (1+\rho^2)^\alpha \int_{B(x,r)} dy |f(y)| \lesssim \text{Vol}(B(x,r)) f_\alpha^\#(x), \quad (\rho \lesssim r). \tag{3.40}$$

□

In the sequel we restrict for simplicity to the case $\alpha = 0$. All results below are easily adapted to the case $\alpha > 0$ or to similar functional spaces with pointwise bounds of the form $\|f\|_\alpha(x) = \sup_{\tau>0} F(\tau, e^{\tau\Delta}|f|)(x)$.

3.2 The comparison principle

We now want to use as initial condition of (3.1) functions h_0 such that $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\lambda \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where

$$\mathcal{H}^\lambda := \{h_0 \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid e^{\lambda h_0} \in \mathcal{H}^0\}. \tag{3.41}$$

The comparison to the linear heat equation (see subsection 2.1) actually suggests to consider initial conditions in the unpleasant-looking space,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\lambda := \{h_0 \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid e^{\lambda h_0^+}, h_0^- \in \mathcal{H}^0\} \tag{3.42}$$

However, by Jensen's inequality, $e^{\lambda(h_0^-)^*(x)} \leq (e^{\lambda h_0^-})^*(x)$, so $\mathcal{H}^\lambda \subset \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\lambda$. Note that the definition is compatible with that of \mathcal{H}^0 in the previous paragraph, in the sense that $\frac{1}{\lambda}(e^{\lambda h_0(x)} - 1) \rightarrow |h_0(x)|$

when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Also, by Jensen's inequality, \mathcal{H}^λ is for $\lambda > 0$ a convex subset (but not a vector subspace) of \mathcal{H}^0 , and

$$\| \|h_0\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) := \frac{1}{\lambda} \sup_{\tau > 0} \ln \left((e^{\tau \Delta} e^{\lambda |h_0|})(x) \right) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \left((e^{\lambda |h_0|})^*(x) \right) \quad (3.43)$$

defines a family of pointwise "quasi-norms", in the sense that

$$\| \|f\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \leq \| \|f\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^{\lambda'}}(x) \quad (\lambda \leq \lambda'); \quad (3.44)$$

$$\| \|\mu f\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \leq |\mu| \| \|f\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^{|\mu|\lambda}}(x) \quad (\mu \in \mathbb{R}) \quad (3.45)$$

(the last inequality is actually an equality);

$$\| \|f_1 + f_2\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \| \|p_1 f_1\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) + \frac{1}{p_2} \| \|p_2 f_2\| \|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x) \quad (p_1, p_2 \geq 1, \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = 1). \quad (3.46)$$

We then expect the solution of (3.1) to be "uniformly bounded in \mathcal{H}^λ ", at least locally in time (thus allowing for further generalizations to equations with time-dependent coefficients), and thus to lie for all $T > 0$ in the functional space

$$\mathcal{H}^\lambda([0, T]) := \{h \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sup_{t \in [0, T]} (e^{\lambda |h_t|})^*(x) < \infty\}. \quad (3.47)$$

As mentioned previously, the comparison principle in its different forms usually requires as a cornerstone assumption the boundedness of the solutions. However, various authors have proved ad hoc comparison principles for PDE's with unbounded coefficients; the solution lies in functional spaces including functions growing at infinity. The KPZ equation is a very particular class of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations for which a comparison principle holds under *quadratic growth conditions*, see Ito [36], Da Lio-Ley [22, 23]. Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 2.1 in [22] state the following in our case:

Proposition 3.7 [22]

Let $\underline{U} \in USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ (resp. $\bar{U} \in LSC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$) be a viscosity sub-solution (resp. super-solution) of (3.1). Assume there exists $C > 0$ such that $|\underline{U}(t, x)|, |\bar{U}(t, x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^2)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \leq T$. Then $\underline{U} \leq \bar{U}$ in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

A continuous function h_0 with quadratic growth at infinity, $|h_0(x)| \lesssim 1 + |x|^2$, is in general not in \mathcal{H}^λ for any $\lambda \geq 0$. Conversely, a function in \mathcal{H}^λ , $\lambda \geq 0$ may grow arbitrarily fast in small domains Ω_n , $n \rightarrow \infty$ with $d(0, \Omega_n) \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$ provided the Lebesgue measure of Ω_n decreases to zero fast enough. On the other hand, since the supremum of n i.i.d. random variables grows like $O(\sqrt{\log n})$, one does expect random initial data h_0 to have a.s. quadratic growth at infinity. Actually, if $\varepsilon > 0$, then a.s. a random initial condition grows more slowly at infinity than $|x|^\varepsilon$. Thus the above comparison principle holds for such data, and the existence of a sub-solution and a super-solution in this class of functions entails by Perron's method the existence and unicity of a viscosity solution of (3.1).

It seems however much more natural in our setting to prove a comparison principle for functions in \mathcal{H}^λ since the bounds one expects for the solution will depend on the pointwise maximal estimates $(h_0^-)^*$ and $(e^{\lambda h_0^+})^*$ (on the contrary, solutions are expected to have a finite explosion time for initial conditions with quadratic growth, showing that this is in some sense too large a functional space). As

it happens, we get such a comparison principle, but only for solutions in spaces $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda'}$ with parameter $\lambda' \geq 2\lambda$ (our proof does not hold for $\lambda' = \lambda$). In some sense \mathcal{H}^0 is the largest natural functional space for globally defined solutions of parabolic PDE's. We conjecture that this extension of the viscosity solution theory to spaces modelled after \mathcal{H} (like \mathcal{H}^{λ} in the present case) is valid and of interest not only for the KPZ equation, but probably much beyond for many nonlinear parabolic PDE's.

Let us state our first main theorem, Theorem 1 in the Introduction, following closely the strategy of Da Lio and Ley:

Theorem 3.1 (comparison principle) *Let $\underline{U} \in USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$ (resp. $\bar{U} \in LSC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$) be a viscosity sub-solution (resp. super-solution) of (3.1). Then $\underline{U} \leq \bar{U}$ in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

The proof is very similar to [22], section 2. The essential element is the following lemma.

Lemma 3.8 *Let $\underline{U} \in USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$ be a sub-solution, and $\bar{U} \in LSC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$ be a super-solution of (3.1). Then $\Psi_\mu := \underline{U} - \mu\bar{U}$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$ is a sub-solution of the quadratic KPZ equation,*

$$\partial_t \psi = \Delta \psi + \frac{\lambda}{1-\mu} |\nabla \psi|^2. \quad (3.48)$$

Note that $(\underline{U}, \bar{U} \in \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])) \implies \Psi_\mu \in \mathcal{H}^{\lambda'}([0, T])$ by (3.46) (hence our choice of parameter, $\lambda' \geq 2\lambda$, see discussion above).

Proof.

If $U, V \in C^{1,2}$ then the proof is elementary. First,

$$\partial_t \Psi_\mu \leq \Delta \Psi_\mu + \lambda(V(\nabla \underline{U}) - \mu V(\nabla \bar{U})). \quad (3.49)$$

Then, since V is convex,

$$V(a) \leq \mu V(b) + (1-\mu)V\left(\frac{a-\mu b}{1-\mu}\right), \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.50)$$

Finally, applying this inequality to $a = \nabla \underline{U}$, $b = \nabla \bar{U}$, and using Assumption 1.1 (4), $V(y) \leq y^2$, yields the result.

Otherwise the proof is essentially a very particular case of [22], Lemma 2.2. Let us reproduce the main arguments for the sake of the reader. Let $\psi \in C^2([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) a strict local maximum of $\Psi - \psi$; we must prove that $\partial_t \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \leq \nu \Delta \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) + \frac{\lambda}{1-\mu} |\nabla \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})|^2$. This is done by the standard doubling of variables argument, namely, we let $\Theta(t, x, y) := \psi(t, x) + \frac{|x-y|^2}{\varepsilon^2}$, and $M_\varepsilon = (\Psi - \Theta)(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon)$ be the maximum of $\Psi - \Theta$ in a small ball centered at (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) ; it is known that $|x_\varepsilon - y_\varepsilon| = o(\varepsilon)$ and $M_\varepsilon \rightarrow_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$. By Theorem 8.3 in the User's guide, see in [22] for the details of computations, one finds, exploiting the hypotheses on \underline{U}, \bar{U} ,

$$\partial_t \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) + H(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, \nabla \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) + p_\varepsilon, X) - \mu H(t_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon, \frac{p_\varepsilon}{\mu}, \frac{Y}{\mu}) \leq 0 \quad (3.51)$$

where $p_\varepsilon = 2\frac{x_\varepsilon - y_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2}$, $H(x, t, p, X) := -\lambda V(p) - \nu \text{Tr}(X)$, and X, Y are symmetric $d \times d$ matrices, depending on ε and on a parameter $\rho > 0$, such that $\text{Tr}(X - Y) \leq \Delta \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) + O(\rho/\varepsilon^4)$. Hence

$$\partial_t \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) \leq \nu \Delta \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) + \lambda \left[V(\nabla \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) + p_\varepsilon) - \mu V\left(\frac{p_\varepsilon}{\mu}\right) \right] + O(\rho/\varepsilon^4). \quad (3.52)$$

Letting $\rho \rightarrow 0$ and using (3.50) as above yields

$$\partial_t \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) \leq \nu \Delta \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) + \frac{\lambda}{1-\mu} |\nabla \psi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon)|^2. \quad (3.53)$$

Finally, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives the result. \square

We shall also need a non-standard comparison lemma for the linear heat equation:

Lemma 3.9 *Let $\underline{U} \in USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^0([0, T])$ (resp. $\bar{U} \in LSC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^0([0, T])$) be a viscosity sub-solution (resp. super-solution) of the linear heat equation. Then $\underline{U} \leq \bar{U}$ in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

In other words, Theorem 3.1 holds for $\lambda = 0$.

Proof. Since the equation is linear, we may (by replacing \underline{U} with $(\underline{U} - \bar{U}) - e^{t\Delta}(\underline{U}_0 - \bar{U}_0)$) assume that $\bar{U} = 0$ and $\underline{U}_0 = 0$. Now, we have no bound at infinity available for \underline{U} , and the classical maximum principle does not hold. Instead we choose a smooth function $\chi \geq 0$ with $\chi|_{(-\infty, 0]} \equiv 1$, $\text{supp}(\chi) \subset (-\infty, 1]$, define $\chi_n(x) := \chi(|x| - n)$ and obtain the following inequality for $\underline{U}_n := \underline{U}\chi_n$,

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)\underline{U}_n + \Delta\chi_n \underline{U} + 2\nabla\chi_n \cdot \nabla\underline{U} \leq 0. \quad (3.54)$$

Assume that $\underline{U} \in C^{1,2}$ is a classical sub-solution to begin with. Then, since \underline{U}_n , $\Delta\chi_n \underline{U}$ and $\nabla\chi_n \cdot \nabla\underline{U}$ are bounded, the classical comparison principle entails

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{U}_n(t, x) &\leq - \int_0^t ds e^{(t-s)\Delta} (\Delta\chi_n \underline{U}(s)) - 2 \int_0^t ds e^{(t-s)\Delta} (\nabla\chi_n \cdot \nabla\underline{U}(s)) \\ &= \int_0^t ds e^{(t-s)\Delta} (\Delta\chi_n \underline{U}(s)) - 2 \int_0^t ds \nabla e^{(t-s)\Delta} \cdot (\nabla\chi_n \underline{U}(s)) \\ &\leq \int_0^t ds e^{(t-s)\Delta} (|\tilde{\chi}_n \underline{U}(s)|) + \int_0^t ds |\nabla e^{(t-s)\Delta} (\nabla\chi_n \underline{U}(s))|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

where $\tilde{\chi}_n = \max(|\nabla\chi_n|, |\Delta\chi_n|)$. Now $\sum_n \tilde{\chi}_n \lesssim 1$, so (by the pointwise parabolic estimates)

$$\sum_n \int_0^t ds e^{(t-s)\Delta} |\tilde{\chi}_n \underline{U}(s)|(x) \lesssim \int_0^t ds e^{(t-s)\Delta} |\underline{U}(s)|(x) \lesssim T \sup_{s \in [0, T]} (\underline{U}(s))^*(x). \quad (3.56)$$

Hence (for x fixed) $\int_0^t ds e^{(t-s)\Delta} |\tilde{\chi}_n \underline{U}(s)| \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Lemma 3.6 yields the same bound as (3.56), with T replaced by \sqrt{T} , for the term with the gradient.

The above proof does not seem to extend to fonctions in $USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^0([0, T])$ by a density argument (in particular, if χ is a smooth, positive 'bump' function, then $\chi * \underline{U}$ is a smooth subsolution in the classical sense if \underline{U} is since $(\partial_t - \Delta)(\chi * \underline{U}) = \chi * (\partial_t - \Delta)\underline{U} \leq 0$, but not in the viscosity sense in general if \underline{U} is only upper-semicontinuous). Instead we use another truncation argument, which could also have been used in the classical case. We fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $n \rightarrow \infty$ as above. Since $\underline{U} \in \mathcal{H}^0$, it is locally bounded, so the function \underline{U} is a bounded sub-solution of the heat equation on $[0, T] \times B(0, n+1)$. Thus the classical maximum principle and Green's formula imply that

$$\underline{U}(t, x) \leq \int_0^t ds \int_n^{n+1} dr \int_{\partial B(0, r)} \nabla_n G_r(t, x; s, y) \underline{U}(s, y), \quad t \leq T, x \in B(0, n) \quad (3.57)$$

where ∇_n is the normal derivative and G_r is the Green function of the heat equation on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times B(0, r)$. By standard estimates, $|\nabla G_r(t, x; s, y)| \lesssim (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} G(t, x; s, y)$ if $y \in \partial B(0, r)$, where $G(t, x; s, y)$ is the usual heat kernel on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. One has thus obtained an estimate very similar to (3.55), and the end of the proof is the same. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

By Lemma 3.8, $\partial_t \Psi_\mu \leq \Delta \Psi_\mu + \frac{\lambda}{1-\mu} |\nabla \Psi_\mu|^2$. Equivalently, $(\partial_t - \Delta) \left(e^{\frac{\lambda}{1-\mu} \Psi_\mu} \right) \leq 0$. By Lemma 3.9,

$$\Psi_\mu(t, x) \leq \frac{1-\mu}{\lambda} \ln \left[\int \frac{e^{-|x-y|^2/2t}}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} e^{\lambda h_0(y)} dy \right]. \quad (3.58)$$

Letting $\mu \rightarrow 1$, one finds $\Psi_\mu \leq 0$. \square

3.3 Bounds for the solution

Let $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda} \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $\underline{h}_t := -e^{tv\Delta} h_0^-$ is a sub-solution, and $\bar{h}_t := \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln(e^{tv\Delta} e^{\lambda h_0^+})$ a super-solution of (3.1), and the pointwise parabolic estimates, together with Jensen's inequality, imply that $\underline{h}, \bar{h} \in C([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$. Perron's method (see User's guide [21], Theorem 4.1), in combination with the comparison principle of the previous paragraph, shows that

$$h(x) := \sup\{\tilde{h}(x) \mid \underline{h} \leq \tilde{h} \leq \bar{h} \text{ and } \tilde{h} \text{ is a subsolution of (2.1)}\} \quad (3.59)$$

is the unique viscosity solution in $C([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}([0, T])$ of (3.1) for every $T > 0$. We simply call h the solution on $[0, T]$ of (2.1) with initial condition h_0 .

Anticipating on section 4, the analogue of the space $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}$ in our setting is

Definition 3.10

$$\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda} := \left\{ h_0 \in \mathcal{W}_{loc}^{1,\infty} \mid \text{locsup}^j h_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}, 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_0| \in \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda} \right\} \quad (j \geq 0), \quad (3.60)$$

where locsup^j (the "scale j local supremum") operates on functions in L_{loc}^∞ in the following way,

$$\text{locsup}^j f(x) := \sup_{y \in B(x, 2^{j/2})} |f(y)|. \quad (3.61)$$

Apparently, it is necessary to consider an initial condition h_0 such that h_0 and ∇h_0 are locally bounded (see proof of Lemma 3.13) if one wants the solution to exist; these conditions are of course automatically verified if h_0 is in C^1 . Assuming the *local suprema* $\text{locsup}^j h_0, \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_0|$ to be in $\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}$ ensures that the spaces $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty;\lambda}$ are stable under the flow (well, not quite, see Lemma 3.13 for an exact statement).

The value of j is at this point arbitrary, and it is quite possible to take $j = 0$. However the scaling is important starting from section 4, so we chose to let the dependence on j explicit.

Just like $\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}$ before, $\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}$ is a convex subset of $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and

$$\| \| h_0 \| \|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}}(x) := \max \left(\| \| \text{locsup}^j h_0 \| \|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x), \| \| 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_0| \| \|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x) \right) \quad (3.62)$$

defines now a family of *local quasi-norms*, as pointed out in the Introduction. At this point we must explain clearly why we distinguish *pointwise* quasi-norms from *local quasi-norms*. A function f

such that $(\text{locsup}^j f)^*(x) < \infty$ cannot have arbitrarily large fluctuations, contrary to a function f satisfying simply $f^*(x) < \infty$ (recall the family of examples from section 3.1). Namely (choosing $j = 0$ for simplicity), if $(\text{locsup}^0 f)^*(x) < \infty$, then $(1 + |y - x|)^{-d} |f(y)| \lesssim e^{(y-x)^2 \Delta} \text{locsup}^0(f)(x)$ is bounded uniformly in y , hence $|f(y)| = O(|y - x|^d)$ grows at most polynomially. Ultimately this comes from the fact that the integral $e^{(y-x)^2 \Delta} \text{locsup}^0(f)(x)$ is equivalent (up to a multiplicative factor $O(1)$) to a weighted sum of the values of $\text{locsup}^0(f)$ over cells of the unit lattice: one gets *local* estimates instead of *pointwise* estimates. In particular, $\|\text{locsup}^0 h_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x) < \infty$ (see 3.62) implies: $|f(y)| = O_{|y| \rightarrow \infty}(\log |y|)$ (which holds if $f = \eta$ is a regularized white noise).

On the other hand, bounds also hold if one replaces the local quasi-norm $\|\text{locsup}^j h_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x)$ in (3.62) by the smaller local supremum $\text{locsup}^j(\|h_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}})(x)$, and thus go back to our previous *pointwise* "quasi-norms". Note that this quantity is finite as soon as $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda} \cap L_{loc}^\infty$ (see proof of Lemma (3.3) (i)). There is also a way to move out the local supremum of the quasi-norm for ∇h_0 in (3.62) – see next subsection for details. Then of course one can only prove bounds for the corresponding (local supremum of) pointwise quasi-norms at time t . Despite allowing more general initial conditions (i.e. with arbitrary large fluctuations), this has the inconvenient of complicating the statements. For applications to inhomogeneous KPZ equation with random forcing in section 4, the "local quasi-norm" version (3.62) will suffice.

A first easy result is:

Lemma 3.11 *Let h be the viscosity solution on $[0, T]$ of (3.1) with initial condition $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda} \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, for every $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$(e^{a\lambda|h_t|})^*(x) \leq (e^{a\lambda|h_0|})^*(x), \quad a \geq 1. \quad (3.63)$$

In particular,

$$|h_t(x)| \leq \|h_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}(x). \quad (3.64)$$

Proof. By the comparison principle, Theorem 3.1, $|h| \leq u$, where u is the solution of the quadratic KPZ equation $\partial_t u = \Delta u + \lambda |\nabla u|^2$ with initial condition $|h_0|$. Then $e^{\lambda u}$ is a solution of the linear heat equation, hence (by Jensen's inequality and pointwise parabolic estimates)

$$(e^{a\lambda|h_t|})^*(x) \leq (e^{a\lambda u_t})^*(x) = ((e^{t\Delta} e^{\lambda|h_0|})^a)^*(x) \leq (e^{t\Delta} e^{a\lambda|h_0|})^*(x) \leq (e^{a\lambda|h_0|})^*(x) \quad (3.65)$$

for $a \geq 1$. □

Thus h extends to $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and satisfies (3.63) for arbitrary t .

Note that (3.63) still holds true when one inserts local suprema: for $a \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (e^{a\lambda \text{locsup}^j h_t})^*(x) &= \sup_{\tau > 0} e^{\tau \Delta} \text{locsup}^j e^{a\lambda|h_t|}(x) \\ &\leq \sup_{\tau > 0} e^{\tau \Delta} \text{locsup}^j e^{t\Delta} e^{a\lambda|h_0|}(x) \\ &\leq \sup_{\tau > 0} e^{(\tau+t)\Delta} e^{a\lambda \text{locsup}^j h_0}(x) \leq (e^{a\lambda \text{locsup}^j h_0})^*(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

3.4 Bounds for the gradient

Let h be the (viscosity) solution of (3.1) with initial condition $h_0 \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda} \cap C^2$.

The main task in this subsection is to prove *a priori bounds* for the discrete gradient, $\sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} \frac{|h_t(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon) - h_t(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon')|}{|\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|}$. If h_t is differentiable, then this quantity is equal to $2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_t|(x)$. Proving differentiability can then be done using a cut-off argument as follows. Let χ be a 'bump' function as in Lemma 3.5, $\chi^{(L)}(x) := \chi(\frac{x}{L})$ ($L \in \mathbb{N}^*$), and $h^{(L)}$ be the solution of the homogeneous KPZ equation with initial condition $h_0^{(L)} = h_0(x)\chi^{(L)}(x)$. From Lemma 3.11, one knows that the sequence $(h^{(L)})_{L \geq 1}$ is locally uniformly bounded, i.e. for every compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and every $T > 0$, $\sup_{L \geq 1} \sup_{t \leq T} \sup_K |h_t^{(L)}| < C(K, T)$. Since $h^{(L)}$ is compactly supported and C^2 , $h^{(L)}$ is known to be classical, hence a priori bounds for the discrete gradient of $h_t^{(L)}$ hold ipso facto for the local supremum of its gradient, $2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_t^{(L)}|(x)$. Now we use the following argument:

Lemma 3.12 *Assume $(h^{(L)})_{L \geq 1}$ is locally uniformly differentiable, i.e. for all compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and all $T > 0$, $\sup_{L \geq 1} \sup_{t \leq T} \sup_K |\nabla h_t^{(L)}| < C(K, T)$. Then $h^{(L)}$, resp. $\nabla h^{(L)}$ converges to h , resp. ∇h uniformly on every compact. The function h is a classical solution of the KPZ equation.*

Proof. By Ascoli's theorem and the classical diagonal extraction procedure, one may construct a subsequence $h^{(L_m)}$ converging locally uniformly. By the stability principle for continuous viscosity solutions (see e.g. [7], Theorem 3.1), the limit is a solution of the KPZ equation with initial condition h_0 . Since the solution is unique, we have shown that $h^{(L_m)} \rightarrow_{m \rightarrow \infty} h$ in $C(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since the sequence $(h^{(L)})_L$ is pre-compact and all subsequences converge to h , the sequence $(h^{(L)})$ itself converges to h .

Now Schauder estimates applied first to the equations $(\partial_t - \Delta)h^{(L)} = \lambda V(\nabla h^{(L)})$, and then to the equations $(\partial_t - \Delta)(h^{(L)} - h^{(L')}) = \lambda(V(\nabla h^{(L)}) - V(\nabla h^{(L')}))$, imply that $\nabla^2 h^{(L)}$ are locally uniformly bounded, and then (using the uniform convergence of the sequence $(h^{(L)})$ on every compact) that the gradient sequence $(\nabla h^{(L)})$ also converge uniformly on every compact. Then the standard local existence theory for the KPZ equation implies that h is a classical solution. \square

We may now come back to a priori bounds. As mentioned above, there is a "local quasi-norm" version, and a "pointwise quasi-norm" version. We concentrate on the "local" version, and then sketch a derivation of the "pointwise" version.

Lemma 3.13 *(see Introduction)*

(i) *Assume $h_0 \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}$. Then the solution h is classical for $t > 0$. Furthermore,*

$$|\nabla h(t, x)| \leq 4 \|h_0\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}}(x). \quad (3.67)$$

(ii) *(same hypothesis) Then $h_t \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda/5}$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \|2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_t|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda/5}} &\leq 4 \| \text{locsup}^j h_0 \|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x) + \|2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_0|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x) \\ &\leq 5 \|h_0\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.68)$$

Proof.

(i) Let $\varepsilon \in B(0, 1) \setminus \{0\}$. We introduce the following notations,

$$\delta_\varepsilon^j f(\cdot) := \frac{f(\cdot + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon) - f(\cdot)}{|\varepsilon|}, \quad \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j f(\cdot) := \frac{f(\cdot + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon) - (1 - |\varepsilon|)f(\cdot)}{|\varepsilon|}. \quad (3.69)$$

Note that

$$\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j f = \delta_\varepsilon^j f + f. \quad (3.70)$$

By Lemma 3.8, $|\varepsilon|\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t(\cdot) = h(t, \cdot + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon) - (1 - |\varepsilon|)h(t, \cdot)$ is a sub-solution of the KPZ equation $\partial_t \psi = \Delta \psi + \frac{\lambda}{|\varepsilon|} |\nabla \psi|^2$, hence

$$\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t(x) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log e^{t\Delta} (e^{\lambda \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon h_0})(x). \quad (3.71)$$

On the other hand, exchanging the rôles of x and $x + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t(x) &= -\frac{1 - |\varepsilon|}{|\varepsilon|} \left(h_t(x) - \frac{1}{1 - |\varepsilon|} h_t(x + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon) \right) \\ &= -(1 - |\varepsilon|)\tilde{\delta}_{-\varepsilon}^j h_t(x + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon) + (2 - |\varepsilon|)h_t(x + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (3.72)$$

hence the two-sided bound,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t(x)| &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log e^{t\Delta} \left(\exp \lambda \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0, 1)} \frac{|h_0(2^{j/2}\varepsilon + \cdot) - (1 - |\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|)h_0(2^{j/2}\varepsilon' + \cdot)|}{|\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|} \right) (x) + 2 \text{locsup}^j h_t(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} \log e^{t\Delta} \left(\exp 2\lambda \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0, 1)} \frac{|h_0(2^{j/2}\varepsilon + \cdot) - h_0(2^{j/2}\varepsilon' + \cdot)|}{|\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|} \right) (x) + \frac{3}{2\lambda} \log e^{t\Delta} \exp(2\lambda \text{locsup}^j h_0)(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} \log e^{t\Delta} \left(\exp 2\lambda \cdot 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_0| \right) (x) + \frac{3}{2\lambda} \log e^{t\Delta} \exp(2\lambda \text{locsup}^j h_0)(x) \end{aligned} \quad (3.73)$$

From this we deduce in particular the pointwise estimate,

$$|\delta_\varepsilon^j h_t(x)| \leq |h_t(x)| + |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t(x)| \leq 5 \| \| h_0 \| \|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1, \infty; 2\lambda}}(x) \quad (3.74)$$

which is uniform in ε , and also

$$\left(e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t|} \right)^* (x) \leq e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda} \| \| 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_0| \| \|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x) e^{\frac{3}{2}\lambda} \| \| \text{locsup}^j h_0 \| \|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}}(x). \quad (3.75)$$

Applying the above arguments to $h^{(L)}$, $L \geq 1$, and letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, one obtains the first estimate (3.67) for $h^{(L)}$, with $\| \| h_0 \| \|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1, \infty; 2\lambda}}(x)$ replaced by $\| \| h_0^{(L)} \| \|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1, \infty; 2\lambda}}(x)$. The latter quantity is bounded uniformly in L , implying that h is classical by Lemma 3.12. In particular, h is differentiable, so we have actually proved (3.67).

(ii) Letting x move around in the ball $B(x, 2^{j/2})$ we see that the bound (3.73) is also valid for $F(t, x) := \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0, 1)} \frac{|h_t(x + 2^{j/2}\varepsilon) - (1 - |\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|)h_t(x + \varepsilon')|}{|\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|}$. Hence (applying Hölder's inequality with conjugate exponents $(p, q) = (\frac{5}{4}, 5)$)

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\frac{2}{5}\lambda} \|\| 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_t| \|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda/5}(x)} &\leq \left[\left(e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda F(t, \cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{4/5} \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \text{locsup}^j h_t} \right)^* (x) \right]^{1/5} \\
&\leq e^{\frac{2}{5}\lambda} \|\| 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla h_0| \|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}(x)} e^{\frac{8}{5}\lambda} \|\| \text{locsup}^j h_0 \|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}(x)}, \quad (3.76)
\end{aligned}$$

whence the result. \square

Let us now briefly explain how to derive the weaker "pointwise quasi-norm" version of this bound. Leaving the supremum over $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$ outside of the heat kernel, one obtains instead of (3.73)

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t|} (x) &= \max \left(e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t(x)}, e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t(x)} \right) \\
&\leq \max \left(\left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_0|}) (x) \right)^{1/2}, \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_{-\varepsilon}^j h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{1/2} \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{1/2} \right) \\
&\leq \max \left(\left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_0|}) (x) \right)^{1/4} \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x) \right)^{1/4}, \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_{-\varepsilon}^j h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{1/4} \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{3/4} \right) \quad (3.77) \\
&\leq \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_0|}) (x) \right)^{1/4} \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x) \right)^{1/4} + \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_{-\varepsilon}^j h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{1/4} \left(e^{t\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{3/4} \quad (3.78)
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\tau\Delta} e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_t|} (x) &\leq \left(e^{(\tau+t)\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j h_0|}) (x) \right)^{1/4} \left(e^{(\tau+t)\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x) \right)^{1/4} \\
&\quad + \left(e^{(\tau+t)\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_{-\varepsilon}^j h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{1/4} \left(e^{(\tau+t)\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{3/4} \quad (3.79)
\end{aligned}$$

and (letting $\delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}^j f(x) := \frac{f(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon) - f(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon')}{|\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|}$ and similarly $\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}^j f(x) := \frac{f(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon) - (1 - |\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|)f(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon')}{|\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|}$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} e^{\tau\Delta} e^{\frac{2}{5}\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}^j h_t|} (x) &\leq \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} \left(e^{\tau\Delta} e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}^j h_t|} (x) \right)^{4/5} \left(e^{\tau\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_t|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon') \right)^{1/5} \\
&\leq 2 \left[\sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} \left(e^{(\tau+t)\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}^j h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{1/5} \right] \left[\sup_{\varepsilon \in B(0,1)} \left(e^{(\tau+t)\Delta} (e^{2\lambda |h_0|}) (x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon) \right)^{4/5} \right] \\
&\leq 2e^{2\lambda \|h_0\|_{\mathcal{W}_{j, \text{point}}^{1, \infty; 2\lambda}}}, \quad (3.80)
\end{aligned}$$

where (compare with (3.62))

$$\|\| h_0 \|\|_{\mathcal{W}_{j, \text{point}}^{1, \infty; 2\lambda}} (x) := \max \left(\sup_{\varepsilon \in B(0,1)} \|\| h_0 \|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}(x + 2^{j/2} \varepsilon)}, \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} \|\| \delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}^j h_0 \|\|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda}(x)} \right) \quad (3.81)$$

is the aforementioned "pointwise quasi-norm". Combining Lemma 3.11 with (3.80), we get a "pointwise" version of the "local" bounds of Lemma 3.13,

$$\|\| h_t \|\|_{\mathcal{W}_{j, \text{point}}^{1, \infty; \frac{2}{5}\lambda}} (x) \leq \frac{5}{2\lambda} \ln 2 + 5 \|\| h_0 \|\|_{\mathcal{W}_{j, \text{point}}^{1, \infty; 2\lambda}} (x). \quad (3.82)$$

Note that for h_0 small (in the appropriate pointwise \mathcal{W} -quasi norm), one obviously expects h_t to be small. Letting $a, b \geq 1$ be the two terms appearing in (3.77), one may bound $\max(a, b)$ ($a, b \geq 1$) by ab instead of $a + b$. This way, we get rid of the unwanted additive factor $\frac{5}{2\lambda} \ln 2$, at the price of some more loss of regularity in the λ -exponents.

As a side application, let us consider a rate $V = V(y)$ satisfying assumption (2.16), i.e. behaving like y^2 for y small or large, and show how to generalize the conclusions of Proposition 2.3 (iii).

Corollary 3.14 *Let V satisfy assumption (2.16), $yV'(y) - V(y) \geq Cy^2$. Then*

$$|\nabla h_t(x)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|h_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda(x)}/\lambda}{t} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.83)$$

Proof. By (2.17),

$$|\nabla h_t^{(L)}(x)| \lesssim \left(\frac{|h_t^{(L)}(x)|/\lambda}{t} \right)^{1/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.84)$$

By Lemma 3.11, $|h_t^{(L)}(x)| \leq \|h_0^{(L)}\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda(x)}$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon \in B(0, 1)$, $\frac{1}{|\varepsilon|} |h_t^{(L)}(x + \varepsilon) - h_t^{(L)}(x)| \lesssim \sup_{B(x, 1)} \left(\frac{\|h_0^{(L)}\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda(\cdot)}/\lambda}{t} \right)^{1/2}$. The corollary follows by letting first $L \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

4 Bounds for the infra-red cut-off inhomogeneous equation

We introduce in this section the *scale j infra-red cut-off* KPZ equation (see eq. (0.12) in the Introduction, or (4.14) below) and prove the estimates for the solutions stated in Theorem 2 of the Introduction. §4.1 is a somewhat lengthy motivation for eq. (0.12), in connection to the general, motivating goal of showing diffusive large scale limit for $d \geq 3$, and to the multi-scale analysis of the linearized problem (Ornstein-Uhlenbeck's equation) in section 5. The reader ill-at-ease with the scaling analysis may take eq. (4.14) for granted and jump directly to §4.2 and §4.3, where we introduce new \mathcal{W} -spaces adapted to the time-dependent forcing term, g , and then prove Lemma 4.4, from which we deduce Theorem 2. Arguments are generally strongly based on the computations of §3.3 and §3.4, together with a *Trotter formula* sorting out the contribution of the right-hand side.

4.1 General philosophy of scale decompositions

In this section, we start our study of the inhomogeneous KPZ equation,

$$\partial_t \psi(t, x) = \nu \Delta \psi(t, x) + \lambda V(\nabla \psi(t, x)) + g(t, x) \quad (4.1)$$

where $g(t, x)$ is a continuous forcing term. For the time being, we only consider an infra-red cut-off version of this equation, see (1.2) or Definition 4.1 below. We only require here good scale-dependent averaging properties for g (see precise assumptions below). For the complete study (to be developed in the further articles) we shall take for g a regularized white noise, denoted by η .

The general motivation in the subsequent analysis is to exhibit an effective *scale separation* mechanism. In other words, let G be the Green kernel,

$$G : g \mapsto (Gg)(t) := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\nu s \Delta} g(t-s) ds \quad (4.2)$$

(called *propagator* in the physics literature). Eq. (4.1) is equivalent to the integral equation,

$$\psi = G(\lambda V(\nabla\psi) + g). \quad (4.3)$$

Now we want to write G as a sum $G = \sum_{j \geq 0} G^j$ over *scales*, in such a way that

- (1) G^j is "negligible" except at time-, resp. space distances of order 2^j , resp. $2^{j/2}$;
- (2) ψ is well approximated by the sum $\sum_j \psi^{(j)}$, where $\psi^{(j)}$ is the solution of the *single-scale* integral equation

$$\psi^{(j)} = G^j(\lambda^{(j)} V(\nabla\psi^{(j)}) + g^{(j)}), \quad (4.4)$$

where $g^{(j)}$ has typical fluctuations at time-, resp. space distances of order 2^j , resp. $2^{j/2}$; and

- (3) $\psi^{(j)}$ by the solution $\phi^{(j)}$ of the linearized equation, $\phi^{(j)} = G^j g^{(j)}$, at least for λ small enough or j large enough.

The approximations in (1), (2), (3) are responsible for the renormalization procedure in which λ becomes the scale-dependent parameter $\lambda^{(j)}$ (actually λ is not renormalized in the case of the KPZ₃ model because it is super-renormalizable in the infra-red, i.e. subcritical at large scales), g becomes $g^{(j)}$, and G^j also receives correction terms (see further article in our series).

At this point we are not interested in the renormalization procedure and would like in principle to consider a single-scale equation such as (4.4),

$$\psi^{(j)} = G^j(\lambda V(\nabla\psi^j) + g^{(j)}). \quad (4.5)$$

The easiest way to select fluctuations at time, resp. space distances of order 2^j , resp. $2^{j/2}$ is to set

$$(G^j f)(t) = \int ds \bar{\chi}^j(s) e^{s\nabla\Delta} f(t-s), \quad (4.6)$$

where $\bar{\chi}^j$ is a cut-off function s. t. $\bar{\chi}^j(s) = 0$ if $s \ll 2^j$ or $s \gg 2^j$ (see Definition 5.1). Coming back to $g = \eta$ to mimic the behaviour of the noisy KPZ equation, we are led to set $\phi^j = G^j \eta$, $\eta^j = (\partial_t - \Delta)\phi^j$. Recall

$$d_\phi := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d}{2} - 1 \right) \quad (4.7)$$

is the *scaling dimension* of the solution of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck or of the KPZ equation, see Introduction. It is proved in Appendix A that

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi^j(t, x)\phi^{j'}(t', x')] \lesssim 2^{-|j-j'|} (2^{-\max(j, j')})^{2d_\phi} e^{-c2^{-\max(j, j')}|t-t'| - c2^{-\max(j, j')/2}|x-x'|} \quad (4.8)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta^j(t, x)\eta^{j'}(t', x')] \lesssim 2^{-2|j-j'|} (2^{-\max(j, j')})^{2+2d_\phi} e^{-c2^{-\max(j, j')}|t-t'| - c2^{-\max(j, j')/2}|x-x'|} \quad (4.9)$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Consider first the diagonal covariance ($j = j'$): since ϕ^j and η^j are Gaussian, (4.8), (4.9) essentially mean that the following *scalings* hold,

$$\phi^j(t, x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi}), \quad \eta^j(t, x) = O((2^{-j})^{1+d_\phi}), \quad (4.10)$$

with random prefactors. The bounds in Appendix A also yield an order of magnitude of the gradients, with a supplementary $2^{-j/2}$ factor,

$$\nabla\phi^j(t, x) = O((2^{-j})^{\frac{1}{2}+d_\phi}), \quad \nabla\eta^j(t, x) = O((2^{-j})^{\frac{3}{2}+d_\phi}). \quad (4.11)$$

For $j \neq j'$ one has an extra decaying exponential factor in $2^{-|j-j'|}$ which lies at the root of the scale separation mechanism.

We shall not pursue along this road in this article. The reason is that the integral equation (4.4) is a delay, non-local equation which does not satisfy at all the maximum principle, and we have no a priori bounds for its solutions, save in the *perturbative* regime where g or η is small. So we introduce instead in the sequel a very simple *infra-red cut-off of scale j* for the propagator, namely, we replace $\nu\Delta$ by $\nu\Delta - 2^{-j}$. Denoting by $G^{j\rightarrow}$ the Green kernel of the operator $\nu\Delta - 2^{-j}$, one has the explicit formula

$$G^{j\rightarrow}(t, x; t', x') = \mathbf{1}_{t>t'} e^{-2^{-j}(t-t')} p_{\nu(t-t')}(x - x'), \quad (4.12)$$

which makes apparent an exponential decay in time and space: since $\inf_{s>0} (\frac{|x-x'|^2}{2\nu s} + s2^{-j}) \approx 2^{-j/2}|x-x'|$,

$$G^{j\rightarrow}(t, x; t', x') \lesssim (t-t')^{-d/2} e^{-c2^{-j}(t-t') - c2^{-j/2}|x-x'|}. \quad (4.13)$$

for some constant $c > 0$. The idea is that $G^{j\rightarrow}$ is a good substitute for the sum $\sum_{k \leq j} G^k$. We also replace the force term g by g^j such that $g^j(t, x) = O((2^{-j})^{1+d_\phi})$ as for η^j , see (4.10). Thus the new equation is the following.

Definition 4.1 (inhomogeneous KPZ equation with scale j infra-red cut-off) *The inhomogeneous KPZ equation with scale j infra-red cut-off is*

$$\partial_t \psi = (\Delta - 2^{-j})\psi + \lambda V(\nabla \psi) + g. \quad (4.14)$$

As in §3.4, we have chosen $\nu = 1$ for simplicity. The integral form of this equation is

$$\psi = G^{j\rightarrow}(V(\nabla \psi) + g). \quad (4.15)$$

Note that the kernel $G^{j\rightarrow}$ has no *ultra-violet cut-off*, in the sense that it behaves like the full Green kernel G for time separations $|t-t'| \ll 2^j$. Because g has an ultra-violet cut-off, it actually turns out that the solution ψ of (4.14) has the correct scaling, $\psi(t, x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$, see (4.10), under appropriate assumptions on g that we now proceed to write down. Note that, conversely, since $G^{j\rightarrow}$ has an *infra-red* cut-off, it is not really necessary to put an infra-red cut-off on g too (see remark at the very end of section 5).

4.2 Functional spaces of scale j

As in the case of the homogeneous equation, we need a "local supremum" operation adapted to space-time functions g . Generalizing (3.61) in a straightforward way, taking into account the parabolic scaling, we let

$$\text{Locsup}^j g(t, x) := \sup_{s \in (t-2^j, t+2^j)} \sup_{y \in B(x, 2^{j/2})} |g(s, y)|. \quad (4.16)$$

We shall assume that the right-hand side, g , sits in a new convex subspace $\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}([0, T]) \subset C([0, T], W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ that we now proceed to define, in its stronger "local quasi-norm" version (a weaker, somewhat ugly "pointwise quasi-norm" version also exists),

Definition 4.2 For $g \in C([0, T], W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, let

(i) for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|g\|_{\lambda,j}([0, T], x) := 2^{-j} \int_0^T e^{-2^{-j}s} \|2^j g(T-s, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}^\lambda(x)} ds; \quad (4.17)$$

(ii) for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}([0,T])}(x) := \max\left(\| \text{Locsup}^j g \|_{\lambda,j}([0, T], x), \|2^{j/2} \text{Locsup}^j |\nabla g| \|_{\lambda,j}([0, T], x)\right). \quad (4.18)$$

If $\|g\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}([0,T])}(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then we say that $g \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}([0, T])$.

If $\|g\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}([0,t])}(x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$ then Theorem 2 in the Introduction (proved in the following subsection) ensures that $\psi(t, x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$, $\nabla\psi(t, x) = O((2^{-j})^{\frac{1}{2}+d_\phi})$ as expected (see (4.11)). It is proved in section 6 that, indeed, $\|\eta^j\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}([0,t])}(x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$ a.s.

4.3 Bounds

Consider an initial condition $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda'} \cap C^2$ with $\lambda' > \lambda$, and forcing term $g \in W_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}([0, T]) \cap C([0, T], C^3(\mathbb{R}^d))$, for some large but finite time horizon T . We prove here our second main theorem, Theorem 2 in the Introduction.

We use the following notations in this paragraph. The homogeneous nonlinear semi-group generated by the homogeneous KPZ equation (3.1) is denoted by $\Phi^\lambda(t)$, i.e. $\Phi^\lambda(t)h_0$ is the solution at time t of the homogeneous KPZ equation with initial condition $h_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}$. Let also $\tau_k(s) : C(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow C(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $f \mapsto \tau_k(s)f$ by $\tau_k(s)f(x) := \int_{kt/n}^{s+kt/n} g(u, x) du + f(x)$ ($0 \leq k \leq n-1$). Treating each term in (4.14) separately, we get three equations: (i) $\partial_t \psi = -2^{-j} \psi$, with solution $\psi(t) = e^{-2^{-j}t} \psi(0) \simeq (1-2^{-j}t) \psi(0)$ for small t ; (ii) $(\partial_t - \Delta) \psi = \lambda V(\nabla \psi)$, with solution $\psi(t) = \Phi^\lambda(t) \psi(0)$; (iii) $\partial_t \psi = g$, with solution $\psi(s+kt/n) = \tau_k(s) \psi_{kt/n}$. Alternating the action of these three non-linear semi-groups, we obtain

Definition 4.3 Let, for $k = 0, \dots, n$,

$$\psi_{kt/n}^{(n)}(x) := \left((1 - 2^{-j}t/n) \Phi^\lambda(t/n) \tau_{k-1}(t/n) \right) \left((1 - 2^{-j}t/n) \Phi^\lambda(t/n) \tau_{k-2}(t/n) \right) \cdots \left((1 - 2^{-j}t/n) \Phi^\lambda(t/n) \tau_0(t/n) \right) \psi_0(x). \quad (4.19)$$

Having a "Trotter formula" in this setting means proving that $\psi^{(n)}$ converges in some norm to ψ , solution of (4.14). Trotter formulas have been shown with some generality for non-linear monotonous operators acting on Hilbert spaces [13]. However here the natural spaces, L^∞ , $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}$ and their localized counterparts, \mathcal{H}^λ , $\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}$, are not Hilbert spaces. To show this lemma we therefore follow instead the proof of convergence of "viscous splitting" algorithms for the Navier-Stokes equation, as found in [11], §3.4, resting on their *stability* and *consistency*. *Stability* means that the sequence $(\psi^{(n)})_n$ is bounded in the relevant norms. Once one has proved stability, one may prove *consistency*, i.e. prove that $\psi^{(n)} - \psi$ converges to 0 when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 4.4 (stability) Let $n > 2^{-j}t$ and $p := (2^{-j}\frac{t}{n})^{-1} - 1$. Assume $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda\frac{p+1}{p}}$ (i.e. $\lambda' \geq \lambda\frac{p+1}{p}$). Then the following bounds hold,

$$\| \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)} \|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda}}(x) \leq (1 + O(\frac{1}{p})) e^{-2^{-j}t} \| \text{locsup}^j \psi_0 \|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p}}}(x) + \| \text{locsup}^j g \|_{a\lambda,j}([0, t], x), \quad a \in [1, 2] \quad (4.20)$$

and

$$\| 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla \psi_t^{(n)}| \|_{\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda/5}}(x) \leq 5(1 + O(\frac{1}{p})) \left(\| g \|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}([0,t])}(x) + e^{-2^{-j}t} \| \psi_0 \|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda\frac{p+1}{p}}}(x) \right). \quad (4.21)$$

Proof. Note first that the condition $\lambda' \geq \lambda\frac{p+1}{p}$ is always verified for n large enough since by hypothesis $\lambda' > \lambda$. We shall rely on the following two elementary bounds,

$$(e^{\lambda a \text{locsup}^j |\Phi^\lambda(s)f|})^*(x) \leq (e^{\lambda a \text{locsup}^j |f|})^*(x), \quad (a \geq 1) \quad (4.22)$$

(see (3.66)) and Hölder's inequality

$$(e^{\lambda(f+\tilde{f})})^*(x) \leq \left[(e^{\lambda\frac{p+1}{p}|\tilde{f}|})^*(x) \right]^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \left[(e^{\lambda(p+1)|f|})^*(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p+1}}. \quad (4.23)$$

Choose $p = (2^{-j}\frac{t}{n})^{-1} - 1$ in (4.23).

For $0 \leq x \leq \ln(2)$, $e^x - 1 \leq x + x^2 \leq \frac{x}{1-x}$. Hence (letting $x = 2^{-j}\frac{t}{n}$)

$$e^{-2^{-j}\frac{t}{n}} \leq \frac{p+1}{p} = \frac{1}{1-2^{-j}t/n} \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1, \quad \left(\frac{p}{p+1} \right)^n \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-2^{-j}t}.$$

Thus, by (4.22), for $a \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(e^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_{(k+1)t/n}^{(n)}(\cdot)} \right)^*(x) &= \left(e^{a\lambda \text{locsup}^j (\Phi^\lambda(t/n) \circ \tau_k(\frac{t}{n})) (\psi_{kt/n}^{(n)}(\cdot))} \right)^*(x) \\ &\leq \left[(e^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_{kt/n}^{(n)}(\cdot)})^*(x) \right]^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \left[(e^{a\lambda(p+1) \int_{kt/n}^{(k+1)t/n} \text{locsup}^j g(u,\cdot) du})^*(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \\ &\leq \left[(e^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_{kt/n}^{(n)}(\cdot)})^*(x) \right]^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \left[(e^{a\lambda 2^j \text{Locsup}^j g(kt/n,\cdot) du})^*(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

By induction on k , this gives

$$\left(e^{a\lambda \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}} \right)^*(x) \leq \left(e^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}} \right)^*(x) \leq \left[\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (A_k^{(n)}(x))^{\frac{1}{p+1} (\frac{p}{p+1})^k} \right] (A_n^{(n)}(x))^{\frac{p}{p+1}}, \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$A_k^{(n)}(x) = \left(e^{a\lambda 2^j \text{Locsup}^j g(t-kt/n,\cdot)} \right)^*(x) \quad (k = 0, \dots, n-1), \quad A_n^{(n)}(x) = \left(e^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_0} \right)^*(x) \quad (4.26)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{a\lambda} \ln \left(e^{a\lambda \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}} \right)^*(x) &\leq \left(\frac{p}{p+1} \right)^{n-1} \| \psi_0 \|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p}}} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1} \right)^k \| 2^j \text{Locsup}^j g(t - \frac{kt}{n}, \cdot) \|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda}}(x) \\ &\leq e^{-2^{-j}\frac{p-1}{n}t} \| \psi_0 \|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p}}} + 2^{-j}\frac{t}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e^{-2^{-j}\frac{k}{n}t} \| 2^j \text{Locsup}^j g(t - \frac{kt}{n}, \cdot) \|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda}}(x) \\ &\leq (1 + O(2^{-j}\frac{t}{n})) \left(e^{-2^{-j}t} \| \psi_0 \|_{\mathcal{H}^{a\lambda\frac{p+1}{p}}} + \| \text{Locsup}^j g \|_{a\lambda,j}[0, t], x \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

as claimed in (4.20).

Note for further use that the exponents in (4.25) sum up to 1,

$$\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^k = 1. \quad (4.28)$$

The proof of (4.21) is similar but requires a further elaboration on the arguments developed in the course of the proof of Lemma 3.13, to which we refer the reader for the notations. Let $\varepsilon \in B(0, 1)$ and $a \geq 1$. First

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j \psi_{(k+1)t/n}^{(n)}(x)} &= e^{\lambda \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j \Phi^\lambda \left(\frac{t}{n} \right) (\psi_{kt/n}^{(n)} + \int_{kt/n}^{(k+1)t/n} g_u du)(x)} \\ &\leq e^{\frac{t}{n} \Delta} \left(e^{\lambda \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j (\psi_{kt/n}^{(n)} + \int_{kt/n}^{(k+1)t/n} g_u du)(x)} \right) \\ &\leq \left[e^{\frac{t}{n} \Delta} \left(e^{\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j \psi_{kt/n}^{(n)}(x)} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \left[e^{\frac{t}{n} \Delta} \left(e^{\lambda(p+1) \int_{kt/n}^{(k+1)t/n} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j g_u du}(x) \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

By induction on k , this yields

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j \psi_{(k+1)t/n}^{(n)}(x)} &\leq \left[e^{t \Delta} \left(e^{\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j \psi_0} \right) (x) \right]^{\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left[e^{\frac{kt}{n} \Delta} \left(e^{\lambda(p+1) \int_{t-(k+1)t/n}^{t-kt/n} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j g_u du} \right) (x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^k} \\ &\leq \left[\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(B_k^{(n)}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^k} \right] \left(B_n^{(n)}(x) \right)^{\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

where

$$B_k^{(n)}(x) = e^{\frac{kt}{n} \Delta} \left(e^{\lambda 2^j [2^{j/2} \text{Locsup}^j |\nabla g(t-kt/n, \cdot) + \text{Locsup}^j g(t-kt/n, \cdot)]} \right) (x) \quad (k = 0, \dots, n-1), \quad (4.31)$$

$$B_n^{(n)}(x) = e^{t \Delta} \left(e^{\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} [2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla \psi_0| + \text{locsup}^j \psi_0]} \right) (x) \quad (4.32)$$

For the reverse inequality, proceeding as in (3.72), we get

$$e^{-\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x)} = e^{\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} (1-|\varepsilon|) \tilde{\delta}_{-\varepsilon}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x+2^{j/2} \varepsilon)} e^{-\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} (2-|\varepsilon|) \tilde{\delta}_\varepsilon^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x+2^{j/2} \varepsilon)}, \quad (4.33)$$

whence the two-sided, uniform inequality,

$$e^{\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon-\varepsilon'}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x+2^{j/2} \varepsilon')|} \leq \left[\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(B_k^{(n)}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^k} \right] \left(B_n^{(n)}(x) \right)^{\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n} e^{2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x)}, \quad (4.34)$$

from which (using Hölder's inequality with exponents (4.28))

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon-\varepsilon'}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon')|} \right)^* (x) \\
& \leq \left(e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon-\varepsilon'}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon')|} \right)^* (x) \\
& \leq \left[\left((B_n^{(n)}(x))^{\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (B_k^{(n)}(x))^{\frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^k} \right)^* (x) \right]^{1/2} \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(\cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq \left\{ (B_n^{(n)})^*(x)^{\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left((B_k^{(n)})^*(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^k} \right\}^{1/2} \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(\cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq \left\{ \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \cdot 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla \psi_0(\cdot)|} \right)^* (x) \right]^{\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n} \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \cdot \text{locsup}^j \psi_0(\cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^n} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left\{ \left(e^{2\lambda \cdot 2^{3j/2} \text{Locsup}^j |\nabla g(t-kt/n, \cdot)|} \right)^* (x) \left(e^{2\lambda \cdot 2^j \text{Locsup}^j g(t-kt/n, \cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p+1} \left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^k} \right\}^{1/4} \\
& \quad \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(\cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq e^{\lambda(1+O(2^{-j}t/n))} \|g\|_{W_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}((0,t))} (x) e^{\lambda e^{-2^{-j}t} \|\psi_0\|} e^{\lambda e^{-2^{-j}t} \|\psi_0\|} \|W_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p}}(x) \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(\cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{1/2} \quad (4.35)
\end{aligned}$$

(compare with (4.27)). Finally, using Hölder's inequality with conjugate exponents $(p, q) = (\frac{5}{4}, 5)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(e^{\frac{2}{5}\lambda 2^{j/2} \text{locsup}^j |\nabla \psi_t^{(n)}|} \right)^* (x) \leq \left(e^{\frac{2}{5}\lambda [\sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon-\varepsilon'}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon')| + \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(\cdot)]} \right)^* (x) \\
& \leq \left[\left(e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda \sup_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in B(0,1)} |\tilde{\delta}_{\varepsilon-\varepsilon'}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(x+2^{j/2}\varepsilon')|} \right)^* (x) \right]^{4/5} \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(\cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{1/5} \\
& \leq e^{\frac{4}{5}\lambda(1+O(2^{-j}t/n))} \|g\|_{W_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}((0,t))} (x) e^{\frac{4}{5}\lambda e^{-2^{-j}t} \|\psi_0\|} e^{\frac{4}{5}\lambda e^{-2^{-j}t} \|\psi_0\|} \|W_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p}}(x) \left[\left(e^{2\lambda \frac{p+1}{p} \text{locsup}^j \psi_t^{(n)}(\cdot)} \right)^* (x) \right]^{3/5} \quad (4.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Applying now our previous bound (4.27) yields (4.21). □

Let us now turn to the proof of *consistency*. Since this is an essentially perturbative, short-time argument, it introduces non-linear terms, typically, $|\nabla \psi^{(n)}|^2$, whose \mathcal{H}^λ -norm cannot be assumed to be bounded. Hence we use the same cut-off procedure as in §3.4, and introduce instead the doubly-indexed sequence $(\psi^{(L,n)})_{L,n}$, $L, n \in \mathbb{N}$, constructed as in Definition 4.3 but with cut-off initial data and right-hand side, $\psi_0 \rightsquigarrow \psi_0^{(L)}(\cdot) := \psi_0(\cdot) \chi^{(L)}(\cdot)$, $g(s, \cdot) \rightsquigarrow g^{(L)}(s, \cdot) := g(s, \cdot) \chi^{(L)}(\cdot)$, where $\chi^{(L)}$ is a cut-off function as in Lemma 3.12. Since $g^{(L)}$ is regular and bounded, the standard theory of existence for KPZ equation implies that $\psi^{(L)}$ is classical. For sake of convenience, we slightly modify the notation of Definition 4.3 (but not the scheme of approximation) by letting

$$\psi_{(k+1)t/n}^{(L,n)}(x) := \tau_k(t/n) (1 - 2^{-j}t/n) \Phi^\lambda(t/n) \psi_{kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x) \quad (k \geq 0), \quad \psi_0^{(L,n)}(x) := \tau_0(t/n) \psi_0^{(L)}(x). \quad (4.37)$$

Introduce, for $0 \leq s \leq t/n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x) &:= \tau_k(s)(1-2^{-j}s)\Phi^\lambda(s)\psi_{kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x) \\ &= \int_{kt/n}^{s+kt/n} g^{(L)}(u,x) du + (1-2^{-j}s)\Phi^\lambda(s)\psi_{kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x).\end{aligned}\quad (4.38)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s \psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x) &= g_{s+kt/n}^{(L)}(x) - 2^{-j}\Phi^\lambda(s)\psi_{kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x) + (1-2^{-j}s)(\Delta(\Phi^\lambda(s)\psi_{kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)) + \lambda V(\nabla(\Phi^\lambda(s)\psi_{kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)))) \\ &= (\Delta - 2^{-j})\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x) + \lambda V(\nabla\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)) + g_{s+kt/n}^{(L)}(x) + (A_1^{(L,n)} + A_2^{(L,n)} + A_3^{(L,n)})(s,x),\end{aligned}\quad (4.39)$$

where:

$$|A_1^{(L,n)}(s,x)| = \left| -2^{-j}((1-2^{-j}s)^{-1} - 1)\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x) \right| \lesssim 2^{-2j} \frac{t}{n} |\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)|; \quad (4.40)$$

$$|A_2^{(L,n)}(s,x)| = \left| (1-2^{-j}s)\lambda V((1-2^{-j}s)^{-1}\nabla\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)) - \lambda V(\nabla\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)) \right| \lesssim 2^{-j} \frac{t}{n} \lambda |\nabla\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)|^2; \quad (4.41)$$

$$\begin{aligned}|A_3^{(L,n)}(s,x)| &= \left| (1-2^{-j}s)\lambda \left(V((1-2^{-j}s)^{-1}\nabla\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)) - \int_{kt/n}^{s+kt/n} g^{(L)}(u,x) du \right) - V((1-2^{-j}s)^{-1}\nabla\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2^{-j}(1-2^{-j}s)^{-1} \int_{kt/n}^{s+kt/n} g^{(L)}(u,x) du - \int_{kt/n}^{s+kt/n} \Delta g^{(L)}(u,x) du \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{t}{n} \left\{ 2^{-j} \text{Locsup}^j g^{(L)}(kt/n, x) + \lambda \left(|\nabla\psi_{s+kt/n}^{(L,n)}(x)|^2 + (\text{Locsup}^j |\nabla g_{kt/n}^{(L)}(x)|)^2 \right) + \text{Locsup}^j \Delta g_{kt/n}^{(L)}(x) \right\}.\end{aligned}\quad (4.42)$$

Let now $\Psi_u^{(L,n)}(x) := \psi_u^{(L,n)}(x) - \psi_u^{(L)}(x)$, $\frac{kt}{n} < u := s + \frac{kt}{n} < (k+1)\frac{t}{n}$. Subtracting the evolution equations for $\psi^{(L,n)}$ and $\psi^{(L)}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_u \Psi_u^{(L,n)}(x) &= (\Delta - 2^{-j})\Psi_u^{(L,n)}(x) + \lambda \left(V(\nabla\psi^{(L,n)}(x)) - V(\nabla\psi^{(L)}(x)) \right) + (A_1^{(L,n)} + A_2^{(L,n)} + A_3^{(L,n)})(s,x) \\ &= (\Delta - 2^{-j})\Psi_u^{(L,n)}(x) + a(t,x) \cdot \nabla\Psi_u^{(L,n)}(x) + (A_1^{(L,n)} + A_2^{(L,n)} + A_3^{(L,n)})(s,x),\end{aligned}\quad (4.43)$$

where (as follows from Lemma 4.4 and standard bounds for $\nabla\psi^{(L)}$) $|a(t,x)| \leq C$, with $C = C(\|g^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\nabla g^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\psi_0^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\nabla\psi_0^{(L)}\|_\infty)$. By the usual comparison principle,

$$\|\Psi_{(k+1)t/n}^{(L,n)}\|_\infty \leq \|\Psi_{kt/n}^{(L,n)}\|_\infty + O\left(\left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^2 \left(2^{-j}\|g^{(L)}\|_\infty + \|\Delta g^{(L)}\|_\infty + \lambda \left(\|\nabla g^{(L)}\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla\psi^{(L,n)}\|_\infty^2 \right) \right)\right), \quad (4.44)$$

from which by induction $\|\psi_t^{(L,n)} - \psi_t^{(L)}\|_\infty \leq C\frac{t^2}{n} + \|\psi_0^{(L,n)} - \psi_0^{(L)}\|_\infty \lesssim C\left(\frac{t^2}{n} + \frac{t}{n}\right)$, with $C = C(\|g^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\nabla g^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\nabla^2 g^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\psi_0^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\nabla\psi_0^{(L)}\|_\infty)$. Hence $\psi^{(L,n)} \rightarrow \psi^{(L)}$ locally uniformly. Differentiating (4.43) one prove similarly that $\nabla\psi^{(L,n)} \rightarrow \nabla\psi^{(L)}$ locally uniformly (at this point we need $g(t, \cdot)$ to be C^3). Thus the bounds of Lemma 4.4 hold for the limit $\psi^{(L)}$.

Finally Lemma 3.12 allows to conclude that $\psi^{(L)} \rightarrow \psi$ locally uniformly, with ψ solution of (4.14), and $\nabla\psi^{(L)} \rightarrow \nabla\psi$ locally uniformly, with the limit, ψ , satisfying the same bounds as in Lemma 4.4.

On the other hand, in absence of a comparison principle for the inhomogeneous KPZ equation, we *cannot* conclude to the unicity of the limit. The difficulty here is to control the dependence of $\psi(t, x)$

on the (possibly large!) values of the data (ψ_0, g) at space locations y at distance $|x - y| \rightarrow \infty$. We *did not manage*, by purely PDE arguments, to show that the sequence $(\psi^{(L)})$ is Cauchy for the uniform convergence on compacts. At this point it is more natural to solve the KPZ equation by using characteristics. In [67] (see §2.2) it is shown that characteristics going far astray from their starting point x hardly contribute to the value of h_t at x , implying, with more generality than required here, that $(\psi^{(n)})$ is a Cauchy sequence whenever $\psi^{(n)}$ are the solutions of the KPZ equations $(\partial_t - \Delta + 2^{-j})\psi^{(n)} = \lambda V(\nabla\psi^{(n)}) + g^{(n)}$ with initial condition $\psi_0^{(n)}$, for all sequences of bounded data $\psi_0^{(n)} \in \mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}$, $g^{(n)} \in C([0, T], \mathcal{W}^{1,\infty})$ such that

- (i) $\|\psi_0^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty}(x)}$, $\|g^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty}([0,t])}(x)$ are uniformly bounded;
- (ii) for all $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ compact, $\psi_0^{(n)} \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_0$ in $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}(K)$ and $g^{(n)} \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} g$ in $C([0, t], \mathcal{W}^{1,\infty})$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2 in the Introduction.

5 Scale decompositions

As a general motivation for this section, consider the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (0.4),

$$\partial_t \phi = \nu \Delta \phi + \eta \quad (5.1)$$

where η is a *regularized white noise*. Our precise choice of regularization is the following: we define η_{reg} to be a "kick force", namely, we choose an infinite number of independent copies $(\xi_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^{reg})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of regularized space white noises and let $\eta(t) := \xi_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^{reg}$ be constant on $t \in (n, n+1)$. For definiteness we take $\xi^{reg} = e^{\nu^{(0)}\Delta} \xi$, where ξ is a standard space white noise. Thus $\tilde{\eta}$ is the piecewise continuous in time, smooth in space, centered Gaussian process with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta(t, x), \tilde{\eta}(t', x')] = \delta_1(t, t') p_{2\nu}(x - x'), \quad (5.2)$$

where: $\delta_1(t, t') = 1$ if t, t' are in the same unit time interval $(n, n+1)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, 0 else; and $p_\tau(x - x') := \frac{1}{(2\pi\tau)^{d/2}} e^{-|x-x'|^2/2\tau}$ is the standard heat kernel. Note that the choice of a piecewise continuous "kick force" instead of a time delta-correlated noise avoids the use of the stochastic calculus toolbox.

Let $G = (\partial_t - \nu\Delta)^{-1}$ be the Green kernel of the linear heat equation; formally, $\phi = G\eta$. Thus scale j fluctuation fields ϕ^j and η^j should be in direct link, namely, $\phi^j = G\eta^j$. A natural way to accomplish this is to cut G itself into scales, $G = \sum_j G^j$, and set $\phi^j = G^j\eta$, $\eta^j = (\partial_t - \nu\Delta)\phi^j$.

The *stationary* Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process,

$$\phi(t, x) = \int_{-\infty}^t ds e^{(t-s)\nu\Delta} \eta_s(x), \quad (5.3)$$

solution of (0.4), has covariance kernel (assuming e.g. $t \geq t'$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\phi(t, x)\phi(t', x')] &= \int_{-\infty}^t ds \int_{-\infty}^{t'} ds' \int dy dy' p_{\nu(t-s)}(x-y) p_{\nu(t'-s')}(x'-y') \delta_1(s, s') p_{2\nu}(y-y') \\ &\approx \int_0^{+\infty} du \left(\int dy dy' p_{\nu(t-t'+u)}(x-y) p_{\nu u}(x'-y') p_{2\nu}(y-y') \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

The regularization has a measurable effect only around the diagonal $t = t', x = x', u = 0$. Away from the diagonal the last integral (5.4) behaves like $\int^{+\infty} du p_{\nu(t-t'+2u)}(x-x') = \int^{+\infty} du \frac{e^{-|x-x'|^2/2\nu(t-t'+2u)}}{(2\pi\nu(t-t'+2u))^{d/2}}$, an integrable function at infinity since $d/2 > 1$. Thus

$$|\mathbb{E}[\phi_t(x)\phi_{t'}(x')]| \lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} du (t-t'+u)^{-d/2} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{|x-x'|}{\sqrt{t-t'+u}}\right)\right)^{-N}, \quad N \geq 1 \quad (5.5)$$

is bounded by a constant times $(t-t')^{1-d/2}$ if $|x-x'| \lesssim \sqrt{t-t'}$, and by $\int_{|x-x'|^2}^{+\infty} s^{-d/2} ds = \frac{C}{|x-x'|^{d-2}}$ (the Green kernel of the Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^d) in the contrary case.

We now want to cut ϕ into scales, i.e. understand how it behaves typically for time separations of order 2^j ($j \geq 0$), or space separations of order $2^{j/2}$. The main task is to cut G into dyadic scales, $G = \sum_{j \geq 0} G^j$; then (as discussed above) we define

$$\phi^j = G^j \eta, \quad \eta^j = (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \phi^j. \quad (5.6)$$

With these definitions, $\sum_{j \geq 0} \phi^j = G \eta = \phi$ is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck field, and $\sum_{j \geq 0} \eta^j = (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) G \eta = \eta$.

We proceed as follows. Let $\bar{\chi} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a smooth 'bump' function of scale 1 supported away from the origin, say, $\bar{\chi}|_{[2^{-\frac{1}{2}}, 2^{\frac{1}{2}}]} \equiv 1$, $\bar{\chi}|_{\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus (2^{-1}, 2)} \equiv 0$, chosen in such a way that

$$\bar{\chi}^0(\cdot) := \sum_{n \geq 0} \bar{\chi}(2^n \cdot), \quad \bar{\chi}^j(\cdot) := \bar{\chi}(2^{-j} \cdot) \quad (j \geq 1) \quad (5.7)$$

form a partition of unity, i.e. $\sum_{j \geq 0} \bar{\chi}^j \equiv 1$ on \mathbb{R}_+ , with $\text{supp} \bar{\chi}^0 \subset B(0, 2)$, $\text{supp}(\bar{\chi}^j) \subset B(0, 2^{j+1}) \setminus B(0, 2^{j-1})$ ($j \geq 1$).

Definition 5.1 (cut-off) Let G^j be the operator

$$(G^j g)(t) := \int \bar{\chi}^j(s) e^{s\nu \Delta} g(t-s) ds, \quad j \geq 0 \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$\phi^j = G^j \eta, \quad \eta^j = (\partial_t - \nu \Delta) \phi^j. \quad (5.9)$$

Clearly, $\sum_{j \geq 0} G^j = G$ and $\sum_{j \geq 0} \phi^j = \phi$ is the solution of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck equation (0.4). Note that, for $j \geq 1$, $\eta^j(t) = \int (\bar{\chi}^j)'(s) e^{s\nu \Delta} \eta(t-s) ds$ is smooth, while $\eta^0(t) = \eta(t) + \int (\bar{\chi}^0)'(s) e^{s\nu \Delta} \eta(t-s) ds$ has an extra "kick force" term.

Let $t \geq t'$. Assume $j \geq 1$. The diagonal covariance kernel $C_\phi^j(t, x; t', x') = \mathbb{E}[\phi_t^j(x)\phi_{t'}^j(x')]$ is non-zero only for $t-t' \lesssim 2^j$, in which case (recall $d_\phi := \frac{1}{2}(d-1)$)

$$\begin{aligned} C_\phi^j(t, x; t', x') &\lesssim \int_0^{2^j} du \left(e^{\nu(M^{j-1}+u)\Delta} e^{\nu(M^{j-1}+u-(t-t'))\Delta} \right) p_{2\nu}(x-x') \\ &\lesssim 2^j p_{c\nu 2^j}(x-x') \\ &\lesssim (2^{-j})^{2d_\phi} e^{-c' 2^{-j/2} |x-x'|} \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

for some constants $c, c' > 0$. A similar formula holds for $j = 0$: if $t - t' \lesssim 1$,

$$C_\phi^0(t, x; t', x') \lesssim \int_0^1 du \left(e^{\gamma u \Delta} e^{\gamma(u-(t-t'))\Delta} \right) p_{2\gamma}(x - x') \lesssim p_{c\gamma}(x - x') \lesssim e^{-c'|x-x'|}. \quad (5.11)$$

Then the off-diagonal covariances

$$C_\phi^{j,j'}(t, x; t', x') = \mathbb{E}[\phi_t^j(x)\phi_{t'}^{j'}(x')] \quad (5.12)$$

are similarly shown to satisfy for $j \geq j'$ the estimate

$$|C_\phi^{j,j'}(t, x; t', x')| \lesssim 2^{j'} p_{c\nu 2^{j'}}(x - x') \lesssim 2^{-|j-j'|} (2^{-j})^{2d_\phi} e^{-c'2^{-j/2}|x-x'|}. \quad (5.13)$$

Since $C_\phi^{j,j'}(t, \cdot; t', \cdot) = 0$ for $|t - t'| \gg 2^j$, one may clearly also write

$$|C_\phi^{j,j'}(t, x; t', x')| \lesssim 2^{-|j-j'|} (2^{-j})^{2d_\phi} e^{-c2^{-j}|t-t'| - c2^{-j/2}|x-x'|}. \quad (5.14)$$

Finally gradients applied to the heat kernel produce by standard parabolic estimates small factors of order $O(2^{-\max(j,j')/2})$. Let us recapitulate.

Lemma 5.2 (covariance kernel estimates) *Let*

$$C_\phi^{j,j'}(t, x; t', x') = \mathbb{E}[\phi_t^j(x)\phi_{t'}^{j'}(x')], C_\eta^{j,j'}(t, x; t', x') = \mathbb{E}[\eta^j(t, x)\eta^{j'}(t', x')] \quad (5.15)$$

and

$$C_\phi^j := C_\phi^{j,j}, \quad C_\eta^j := C_\eta^{j,j}. \quad (5.16)$$

Then, for $j \geq j'$,

$$\left| \nabla_x^p \nabla_{x'}^{p'} C_\phi^{j,j'}(t, x; t', x') \right| \lesssim 2^{-|j-j'|} 2^{-\frac{j}{2}(p+p')} (2^{-j})^{2d_\phi} e^{-c2^{-j}|t-t'| - c2^{-j/2}|x-x'|} \quad (5.17)$$

and

$$\left| \nabla_x^p \partial_t^q \nabla_{x'}^{p'} \partial_{t'}^{q'} C_\eta^{j,j'}(t, x; t', x') \right| \lesssim 2^{-|j-j'|} 2^{-\frac{j}{2}(p+p')} (2^{-j})^{2+2d_\phi} e^{-c2^{-j}|t-t'| - c2^{-j/2}|x-x'|}. \quad (5.18)$$

Furthermore, if $j \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\eta_t^j(x) - \eta_t^j(y))^2] \lesssim (2^{-j})^{3+2d_\phi} |x - y|^2 \quad (5.19)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[(\eta_t^j(x) - \eta_s^j(x))^2] \lesssim (2^{-j})^{4+2d_\phi} |t - s|^2. \quad (5.20)$$

The last two estimates (5.19), (5.20) follows immediately from Taylor's formula: letting $\mathbf{v} := \frac{y-x}{|y-x|}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\eta_t^j(x) - \eta_t^j(y))^2] \leq \int_0^{|y-x|} dz \int_0^{|y-x|} dz' \left| \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \nabla_{\mathbf{v}'} C_\eta^j(t, x + z\mathbf{v}; t, x + z'\mathbf{v}) \right| \quad (5.21)$$

and similarly for $\mathbb{E}[(\eta_t^j(x) - \eta_s^j(x))^2]$.

One has thus obtained a very elaborate version of the scalings (4.10), $\phi^j(t, x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$, $\eta^j(t, x) = O((2^{-j})^{1+d_\phi})$, together with a first indication of the scale-separation mechanism: the prefactors in powers of $2^{-|j-j'|}$ show clearly that fields of widely separated scales are effectively independent.

Remark. Note that the *low-momentum fields*, $\phi^{\rightarrow j}(t, x) := \sum_{k \geq j} \phi^k(t, x)$, $\eta^{\rightarrow j}(t, x) := \sum_{k \geq j} \eta^k(t, x)$ verify the same scaling as the single-scale fields, namely, $\phi^j(t, x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$, $\eta^j(t, x) = O((2^{-j})^{1+d_\phi})$.

6 Appendix. Large deviations estimates for the single-scale noisy equation

6.1 Introduction

We consider here the noisy KPZ equation with scale j infra-red cut-off,

$$\partial_t \psi = (\nu \Delta - 2^{-j}) \psi + \lambda V(\nabla \psi) + \eta^j \quad (6.1)$$

with right-hand side $\eta^j = G^j \eta$ defined as in section 5. Recall the conclusion of the discussion at the end of §4.2: by Theorem 2 (see Introduction), if $\|\eta^j\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty;2\lambda}}([0, t], x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$, then $|\psi(t, x)| = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$, $|\nabla \psi(t, x)| = O((2^{-j})^{\frac{1}{2} + d_\phi})$.

We show in this section that $\|\eta^j\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda}}([0, \infty), x)$ is a.s. bounded, and prove large deviation estimates for this quantity when it is much larger than $O(2^{-jd_\phi})$. Contrary to the previous sections, this one is of essentially probabilistic nature. Non-specialists who are not particularly interested in stochastic PDEs may safely skip it.

The random variables appearing in the definition of the pointwise "quasi-norms" associated with $\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty;2\lambda}$ are essentially time- and space-averages of a large number of independent *log-normal variables*, such as $e^{4\lambda 2^j |\eta^j(t,x)|}$. Log-normal variables have large tails in $e^{-a(\ln z)^2}$ and thus no exponential moment, hence standard large-deviation theory (notably Cramér's theorem) does not give any valuable information on the probability that such averages become large. Some authors have been considering this problem, notably Russians, starting from the 60es; one may cite Linnik [46], Nagaev [52, 53], Rozovski [59], see also e.g. Klüppelberg and Mikosch [41] for a renewal of the theory with a view to applications in insurance. The theory is not easily accessible, partly because written originally in Russian journals in the 60es and 70es (in particular in *Teoriya Veroyatnostei i ee Primeneniya*, later translated to English as *Theory of Probability and its Applications*), partly for the lack of a theory as general and satisfactory as the standard large-deviation theory.

Let us just point out the difficulties (this very short abstract is taken from an inspiring review in [51]). Choose a random variable X with finite first and second moments; by translation and rescaling we may assume that $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = 1$. Let $S_n := X_1 + \dots + X_n$, $M_n := \max(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, where X_1, \dots, X_n are independent copies of X . Let finally $\bar{F}^X(x) := \mathbb{P}[X > x]$, $\bar{F}_n^X(x) := \mathbb{P}[S_n > x]$ and $\text{Errfc}(x) := \int_x^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-y^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dy$ be resp. the queues of X , of S_n and of a standard Gaussian variable. By the central limit theorem, one expects

$$\bar{F}_n^X(x) \approx \text{Errfc}(x/\sqrt{n}), \quad (6.2)$$

at least if $x \approx \sqrt{n}$. On the other hand, one clearly has if $X \geq 0$

$$\bar{F}_n^X(x) \geq \mathbb{P}[M_n > x] \sim_{x \rightarrow \infty} n \bar{F}^X(x). \quad (6.3)$$

Subexponential distributions (including log-normal distributions) are precisely defined by the asymptotic relation $\bar{F}_n^X(x) \sim_{x \rightarrow \infty} n \bar{F}^X(x)$, implying a heavy queue. For distribution with lighter queues (such as e.g. Gaussian distributions), the inequality in (6.3) is very rough, in the sense that typically $n \bar{F}^X(x) \ll \bar{F}_n^X(x)$ for every $x \geq x_0$, with x_0 independent from n .

Thus, one expects, specifically for subexponential distributions, a *central limit theorem behaviour* as in (6.2) for $x \ll c_n$, with c_n defined by $\text{Errfc}(c_n/\sqrt{n}) \approx \bar{F}_n^X(c_n)$, and an *extreme-value regime*,

$$\bar{F}_n^X(x) \sim n\bar{F}^X(x), \quad x \gg d_n \quad (6.4)$$

with $d_n \geq c_n$, in which $n\bar{F}^X(x) \gg \text{Errfc}(x/\sqrt{n})$. Optimal sequences c_n, d_n have been identified for various types of subexponential distributions; for a standard log-normal variable $X = e^Z$, $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, one finds $c_n, d_n \approx n^{\frac{1}{2}} \ln n$. One major drawback of this picture is that it doesn't say anything about the behaviour of $\bar{F}_n^X(x)$ in the window $c_n \lesssim x \lesssim d_n$ (in our case, for $x \approx c_n$ since $c_n = d_n$), which is expected to be a mixture of (6.2) and (6.3). The complicated asymptotics, valid on the whole real line, proved by Rozovski [59] – a veritable tour de force – give a more complete answer.

This being said, our problem does not fit exactly into this frame, since (1) we are only interested in *upper bounds* for \bar{F}_n^X , moreover in the *extreme-value regime*, with $x \gtrsim n$; on the other hand (2) the variables $X_1, \dots, X_i, \dots, X_j, \dots, X_n$ (chosen as local space or space-time averages of the noise) are not independent, but have *correlations which decrease exponentially* with the scaled distance d^j (see below) or equivalently with $|j - i|$; (3) we need *scale-dependent estimates* for \bar{F}_n^X since $X \approx e^{2^{-jd_\phi}|Z|}$, $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is strongly j -dependent. However all the previous results are strongly dependent on the particular form of the distribution, in particular on the first and second moments, and it is often difficult to retrace the j -dependence of the constants in the bounds.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 6.1 *Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda > 0$. Then the function $x \mapsto \|\eta^j\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}(\mathbb{R}_+)}(x)$ is a.s. everywhere defined (i.e. finite). Furthermore, the following large deviation estimates holds for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{B(x, 2^{j/2})} \|\eta^j\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;\lambda}(\mathbb{R}_+)}(x) > A2^{-jd_\phi}\right] \lesssim A^{-c \ln(A)}, \quad A \geq 1 \quad (6.5)$$

where $c > 0$ is some constant.

As follows from Theorem 2, this implies (up to the replacement of λ by 2λ) that the solution ψ of the full KPZ equation with scale j infra-red cut-off (4.14) is defined a.s. for all positive times $t \geq 0$ and sits in the space $\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda/5}$, with $\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{W}_j^{1,\infty;2\lambda/5}}(x) = O(2^{-jd_\phi})$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with a random multiplicative prefactor $A(x)$ whose queue is bounded *locally* in x by that of a log-normal distribution. (Note that the prefactor $A(x)$ is *not globally* bounded!)

The proof includes both Gaussian inequalities taken from the monograph [2], and an adaptation to weakly correlated variables of a result about large deviations for subexponential distributions [53]. We shall need quite a few preliminary results before the proof, given at the very end of the present section.

We finish this introductory paragraph with the tiny bit of stochastic domination and Gaussian inequalities used in the sequel, and a little bit of geometry.

Definition 6.1 *Let $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, Y : \Omega' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two real-valued random variables, defined a priori on two different probability spaces. Then X is stochastically dominated by Y if*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{P}[X > x] \leq \mathbb{P}[Y > x]. \quad (6.6)$$

We then write $X \leq Y$.

By Strassen's theorem [45], if $X \leq Y$, there exists a coupling between X and Y , i.e. random variables $X', Y' : \Omega'' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on the same probability space, with $X' \stackrel{(d)}{=} X$, $Y' \stackrel{(d)}{=} Y$, and such that $X' \leq Y'$.

Proposition 6.2 (see [2]) *Let (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) be a centered Gaussian vector, and $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function with polynomial growth at infinity. Then $\mathbb{E}[\phi(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)]$ is an increasing function of the coefficients $c_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[Z_i Z_j]$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.*

This technical lemma, due to Slepian (whose short proof relies on a Gaussian integration by parts) is one of the main tools for Gaussian inequalities. It extends to Gaussian fields $(Z_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ and convex functionals ϕ under adequate regularity assumptions.

Proposition 6.3 (Borell-Tsirelson-Ibragimov-Sudakov or BTIS inequality) (see [2])

Let $(Y_x)_{x \in \mathcal{D}}$, $\mathcal{D} \subset B(0, 1)$ be a centered Gaussian process, such that $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2 = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}[Y_x^2] < \infty$, and $\delta(x, y) := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(Y_x - Y_y)^2]} \lesssim |x - y|$. Let $\|Y\|_{\infty} := \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}} |Y_x|$. Then a.s. $\|Y\|_{\infty} < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_{\infty}] \lesssim 1$ and

$$\mathbb{P}[\|Y\|_{\infty} - \mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_{\infty}] > u] \leq e^{-u^2/2\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2}. \quad (6.7)$$

This is actually a particular case of the BTIS inequality. For a Gaussian process Y indexed by an abstract set \mathcal{D} , $\mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_{\infty}]$ is bounded by the integral of the square-root of the entropy $\log N(\varepsilon)$, $\mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_{\infty}] \lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} \sqrt{\ln N(\varepsilon)} d\varepsilon$, where $N(\varepsilon)$ is the minimum number of balls of diameter $\leq \varepsilon$ (with respect to the metric induced by $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$) covering \mathcal{D} . In our proposition, $\ln N(\varepsilon) = 0$ for $\varepsilon \gg 1$ since $\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \delta(x, y) \lesssim 1$, and $N(\varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^d)$ otherwise by hypothesis, hence the result.

The above proposition applies for fixed t_0, x_0 to $Y_x := 2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \eta^j(t_0, x_0 + 2^{j/2} x)$, with $\mathcal{D} = B(0, 1)$. It follows from Lemma 5.2 in Appendix A that $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \approx 1$ and $d(x, y) \lesssim |x - y|$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{B(x_0, 2^{j/2})} |\eta_{t_0}^j| \right] \lesssim 2^{-j(1+d_\phi)} \quad (6.8)$$

and there exists a constant $C \lesssim 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \sup_{B(x_0, 2^{j/2})} |\eta_{t_0}^j| > u + C] \leq e^{-u^2/2C}. \quad (6.9)$$

One easily deduces that

$$2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \sup_{B(x_0, 2^{j/2})} |\eta_{t_0}^j| \leq C'(|Z| + 1) \quad (6.10)$$

if $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Recall from section 3.1 that $f^* \leq f^\#$ ($f \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$) – note, and this is very important, that the inequality is *exact*, with a coefficient one –, where $f^\#(x) = \sup_{\rho > 0} \int_{B(x, \rho)} |f|$. We cannot bound directly a supremum over a continuous parameter (here ρ), so it is natural to start by rewriting $(\eta_{t_0}^j)^*$ in terms of its local averages or suprema on balls of radius $2^{j/2}$, over which we have a good control. However, we cannot obviously cover \mathbb{R}^d (nor $B(x, \rho)$) by disjoint balls of fixed radius, and taking

into account error terms due to overlaps or boundary effects would cost a multiplicative coefficient, which we cannot afford to do. Hence we first transform balls centered at x into cubes by letting

$$\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad y \mapsto \Phi(y) = x + \frac{|y-x|}{\|y-x\|_\infty} (y-x) \quad (6.11)$$

where $\|y-x\|_\infty := \sup(|y_1-x_1|, \dots, |y_d-x_d|)$ is the supremum norm. The Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$ and the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ are equivalent, hence (the easy proof is left to the reader) Φ and Φ^{-1} are uniformly Lipschitz. Thus $\sup_{B(x,\rho)} |\eta_{t_0}^j| = \sup_{\tilde{B}(x,\rho)} |\eta_{t_0}^j \circ \Phi^{-1}|$, where $\tilde{B}(x,\rho) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|y-x\|_\infty = \rho\}$ is a cube. The field $\eta_{t_0}^j \circ \Phi^{-1}$ has the same general properties as $\eta_{t_0}^j$ (scaling, exponentially decreasing covariance) as stated in Lemma 5.2, so (by abuse of notation) we simply denote $\eta_{t_0}^j \circ \phi^{-1}$ by $\eta_{t_0}^j$ in the sequel.

Definition 6.4 (scale j cubes) Let \mathbb{D}^j be the set of all scale j cubes, i.e. of all primitive cells $[k_1 2^{j/2}, (k_1+1) 2^{j/2}] \times \dots \times [k_d 2^{j/2}, (k_d+1) 2^{j/2}]$, $k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ of the square lattice $2^{j/2} \mathbb{Z}^d$.

We denote by $x_\Delta = (x_{\Delta,1}, \dots, x_{\Delta,d})$ the center of a cube $\Delta \in \mathbb{D}^j$.

We now show how to bound an average $\int_{\tilde{B}(x,\rho)} |f|$, $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ over a cube of arbitrary radius in terms of the local suprema $f_\Delta := \sup_\Delta |f|$, $\Delta \in \mathbb{D}^j$. We give the proof in dimension 2 to simplify notations (in general, we would need the whole cellular decomposition of a cube). Let, for $\rho > 0$,

$$\tilde{B}^j(x,\rho) := \cup\{\Delta \in \mathbb{D}^j \mid \Delta \subset \tilde{B}(x, 2^{j/2}\rho)\}, \quad \partial\tilde{B}^j(x,\rho) := \cup\{\Delta \in \mathbb{D}^j \mid \Delta \cap \tilde{B}(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \neq \emptyset\} \setminus \tilde{B}^j(x,\rho), \quad (6.12)$$

and $n := \#\tilde{B}^j(x,\rho)$. The boundary $\partial\tilde{B}^j(x,\rho)$ decomposes into 8 disjoint subsets,

$$\partial\tilde{B}_{\text{right}}^j(x,\rho) := \cup\{\Delta = [x_{\Delta,\min}, x_{\Delta,\max}] \times [y_{\Delta,\min}, y_{\Delta,\max}] \mid a < x_{\Delta,\min} < b < x_{\Delta,\max}, c \leq y_{\Delta,\min} < y_{\Delta,\max} \leq d\} \quad (6.13)$$

and similiary $\partial\tilde{B}_{\text{left}}^j(x,\rho), \partial\tilde{B}_{\text{up}}^j(x,\rho), \partial\tilde{B}_{\text{down}}^j(x,\rho)$ for the sides of the square;

$$\partial\tilde{B}_{\text{up,right}}^j(x,\rho) = \cup\{\Delta = [x_{\Delta,\min}, x_{\Delta,\max}] \times [y_{\Delta,\min}, y_{\Delta,\max}] \mid a < x_{\Delta,\min} < b < x_{\Delta,\max}, c < y_{\Delta,\min} < d < y_{\Delta,\max}\} \quad (6.14)$$

and similiary for the three other corners. We let $c_{\text{right}} := \frac{\text{Vol}(\partial\tilde{B}_{\text{right}}^j(x,\rho) \cap \tilde{B}(x,\rho))}{\text{Vol}(\partial\tilde{B}_{\text{right}}^j(x,\rho))}$, and similarly c_{left}, \dots be the corresponding volume ratios. Let

$$F(c_{\text{right}}, c_{\text{left}}, \dots) := \frac{\sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}^j(x,\rho)} f_\Delta + c_{\text{right}} \sum_{\Delta' \in \partial\tilde{B}_{\text{right}}^j(x,\rho)} f_{\Delta'} + \dots}{n + c_{\text{right}} \#\partial\tilde{B}_{\text{right}}^j(x,\rho) + \dots}; \quad (6.15)$$

note that $\int_{\tilde{B}(x,\rho)} f \leq F(c_{\text{right}}, \dots)$ since c_{right} is the uniform volume ratio $\frac{\text{Vol}(\Delta) \cap \tilde{B}^j(x,\rho)}{\text{Vol}(\Delta)}$ of all scale j cubes at the right border, as follows from the fact that the border is straight. Then trivially $F(c_{\text{right}}, c_{\text{left}}, \dots) \leq \max(F(0, c_{\text{left}}, \dots), F(0, c_{\text{right}}, \dots))$; this same elementary remark may be repeated for the eight c coefficients. Thus we have proved that

$$\int_{\tilde{B}(x,\rho)} f \leq \max_{B^j} \frac{\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} f_\Delta}{\#B^j}, \quad (6.16)$$

where the B^j range among 2^8 subsets of squares, and by definition $\tilde{B}^j(x,\rho) \subset B^j \subset \tilde{B}^j(x,\rho) \cup \partial\tilde{B}^j(x,\rho)$.

6.2 A first preliminary result: large deviations for the noise

We prove in this paragraph the following result.

Lemma 6.5 *Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then the function $x \mapsto (\eta^j)^*(t_0, x)$ is a.s. everywhere defined (i.e. finite). Furthermore, the following large deviation estimates holds,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{B(x, 2^{j/2})} (\eta^j)^*(t_0) > A 2^{-j(1+d_\phi)}\right] \leq e^{-c(A-C)_+^2} \quad (6.17)$$

for some constants $c, C > 0$, where $(A - C)_+^2 = (A - C)^2 \mathbf{1}_{A > C}$.

It is actually reasonable to expect, on account of the central limit theorem, that $|\eta^j(t_0, x)| - \mathbb{E}[|\eta^j(t_0, x)|] \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^0$ for every $\alpha < d/4$, and that the norm in \mathcal{H}_α^0 satisfies large deviation estimates as in (6.17), but we do not prove this. The above result, however natural it may be, is not really needed anywhere in the article, but the proof of Theorem 6.2 is based on the arguments developed for the proof of the lemma.

Proof. In the sequel $c, c', C > 0$ are constants possibly varying from line to line (contrary to c_0, m_0 , see below, which are fixed once and for all). As already recalled, $(\eta^j)^*(t_0, x) \leq (\eta^j)^\sharp(t_0, x) = \sup_{\rho > 0} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho)} dy |\eta^j(t_0, y)|$. Also, from the results of Appendix A, the correlations of the field $(\eta_{t_0}^j(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ decay exponentially with the *scaled distance* $d^j(x, x') := 2^{j/2}|x - x'|$, in the sense that, for a certain constant c_0 ,

$$|\mathbb{E}[\eta_{t_0}^j(x) \eta_{t_0}^j(x')]| \lesssim 2^{-2j(1+d_\phi)} e^{-c_0 d^j(x, x')}. \quad (6.18)$$

We split the proof into several points.

- (i) In order to use the exponential decay, we first choose $m_0 \geq 2$ large enough (depending on further considerations), and partition \mathbb{D}^j into m_0^d disjoint subsets \mathbb{D}_μ^j , $\mu \in \{1, \dots, m_0\}^d$, with $\Delta = [k_1 2^{j/2}, (k_1 + 1) 2^{j/2}] \times \dots \times [k_d 2^{j/2}, (k_d + 1) 2^{j/2}] \in \mathbb{D}_\mu^j \Leftrightarrow k_i \equiv \mu_i \pmod{m_0}$. Two points x, x' located in disjoint cubes $\Delta \neq \Delta'$ in the same sublattice \mathbb{D}_μ^j are thus at distance $d^j(x, x') \gtrsim m_0$, which amounts (up to rescaling) to replacing c_0 by $m_0 c_0$ in (6.18); in the sequel, we may thus assume that c_0 is large enough. By abuse of notation, we also denote by \mathbb{D}_μ^j the subset $\cup\{\Delta; \Delta \in \mathbb{D}_\mu^j\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Clearly,

$$\int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho)} dy |\eta^j(t_0, y)| \leq \sup_{\mu} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\eta^j(t_0, y)|. \quad (6.19)$$

If $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is increasing, then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\psi\left(\int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho)} dy |\eta^j(t_0, y)|\right)\right] \leq \sum_{\mu} \mathbb{E}\left[\psi\left(\int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\eta^j(t_0, y)|\right)\right]. \quad (6.20)$$

- (ii) Next, we want to bound the average $\int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\eta^j(t_0, y)|$ over some fixed sublattice by the average of a finite number of variables representing the supremum of $|\eta^j|$ on each cube. For that (note that the following construction is μ -dependent, which we do not always specify) we

introduce i.i.d. copies $(\eta_\Delta^j)_{\Delta \in \mathbb{D}_\mu^j}$ of the field $\eta_{t_0}^j|_{[-\frac{1}{2}2^{j/2}, \frac{1}{2}2^{j/2}]^d}$ restricted to some reference cube, and define a new random field $\tilde{\eta}^j$ on \mathbb{D}_μ^j ,

$$\tilde{\eta}^j(x) := \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} \eta_{\Delta'}^j(x - x_\Delta), \quad x \in \Delta \quad (6.21)$$

separately on each cube $\Delta \in \mathbb{D}_\mu^j$, where

$$d^j(\Delta, \Delta') := 2^{-j/2} \sup_{x \in \Delta} \inf_{y \in \Delta'} |x - y| \quad (6.22)$$

is the set distance measured in scaled units, and

$$\tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) := \{\Delta \in \mathbb{D}_\mu^j \mid \Delta \subset \tilde{B}(x, 2^{j/2}\rho)\} \quad (6.23)$$

(compare with the previous definition, (6.12)). By a simple computation, one finds

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\eta}^j(x)\tilde{\eta}^j(x')] \approx (1 + d^j(\Delta, \Delta'))^d e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} \mathbb{E}[\eta_{t_0}^j(x - x_\Delta)\eta_{t_0}^j(x' - x_{\Delta'})] \gtrsim \mathbb{E}[\eta_{t_0}^j(x)\eta_{t_0}^j(x')] \quad (6.24)$$

if $x \in \Delta$, $x' \in \Delta'$ and

$$\Delta, \Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) \cup \partial \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) := \{\Delta \in \mathbb{D}_\mu^j \mid \Delta \cap \tilde{B}(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (6.25)$$

Applying Proposition 6.2 with $\phi(\eta_{t_0}^j) = \psi\left(2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\eta_{t_0}^j(y)|\right)$ where ψ is any convex, increasing function ² on \mathbb{R}_+ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\psi\left(2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\eta_{t_0}^j(y)|\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\psi\left(2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\tilde{\eta}^j(y)|\right)\right]. \quad (6.26)$$

As follows from the discussion in the previous paragraph,

$$\int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\tilde{\eta}^j(y)| \leq \max_{B^j} \frac{\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} \tilde{Y}_\Delta}{\#B^j}, \quad (6.27)$$

where

$$\tilde{Y}_\Delta := \sup_{\Delta} |\tilde{\eta}^j| \quad (6.28)$$

and the B^j are a finite number (depending only on d) of subsets of cubes such that $\tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) \subset B^j \subset \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) \cup \partial \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)$.

(iii) By construction, see (6.21),

$$\tilde{Y}_\Delta \leq \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} \sup |\eta_{\Delta'}^j|. \quad (6.29)$$

²Observe that $\psi_1 \circ \psi_2$ is convex if $\psi_1 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and increasing and $\psi_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is convex, since $\nabla^2(\psi_1 \circ \psi_2) = \psi_1'' \circ \psi_2 \cdot \nabla \psi_2 \otimes \nabla \psi_2 + \psi_1' \circ \psi_2 \cdot \nabla^2 \psi_2$.

We have seen in (6.10) that $2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \sup |\eta_{\Delta'}^j| \leq C(|Z_{\Delta'}| + 1)$ if $Z_{\Delta'} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Since the fields $(\eta_\Delta^j)_\Delta$ are independent, we may by the above cited Strassen theorem define a coupling of the field $\eta^j|_{\mathbb{D}_\mu^j}$ with i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables $(Z_\Delta)_{\Delta \in \mathbb{D}_\mu^j}$ in such a way that

$$2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \sup |\eta_\Delta^j| \leq C(|Z_\Delta| + 1). \quad (6.30)$$

Hence

$$2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} \tilde{Y}_\Delta \leq C \sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} (|Z_\Delta| + 1) \quad (6.31)$$

– note that the bound in the right hand side does not depend on the choice of B^j – and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(2^{j(1+d_\phi)} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy |\tilde{\eta}^j(y)| \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{C}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} (|Z_\Delta| + 1) \right) \right]. \quad (6.32)$$

We rewrite the expectation as an integral by integration by parts,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{C}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (|Z_\Delta| + 1) \right) \right] = \int_0^{+\infty} dA \psi'(A) \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{C}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (|Z_\Delta| + 1) > A \right] + \psi(0). \quad (6.33)$$

Finally, $\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} |Z_\Delta|$ is a sum of n independent copies of $|Z|$, where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, to which we may apply standard large deviation arguments in a trivial setting,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} |Z_\Delta| > nA \right] &\leq \min \left(1, \min_{t \geq 0} e^{-tA} \mathbb{E} [e^{t \sum_{\Delta} |Z_\Delta|}] \right) \leq \min \left(1, 2^n \min_{t \geq 0} e^{-tA + nt^2/2} \right) \\ &= \min \left(1, 2^n e^{-nA^2/2} \right) \leq C e^{-n(A-C)_+^2/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.34)$$

Thus we may choose $\psi(A) = e^{cn(A-C)_+^2} \mathbf{1}_{A > C} + \mathbf{1}_{A \leq C}$ so that $\mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{C}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (|Z_\Delta| + 1) \right) \right] \lesssim 1$. Collecting (6.20), (6.26) and (6.32), one obtains by Markov's inequality

$$\mathbb{P} \left[M^{j(1+d_\phi)} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho)} dy |\eta_{t_0}^j(y)| > A \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{\psi(A)} \lesssim e^{-cn(A-C)^2}, \quad A \geq C. \quad (6.35)$$

For each fixed $n \geq 1$, the set $\{B^j(x, \rho), \rho \geq 0 \mid \#B^j(x, \rho) = n\} \cup \{B^j(x, \rho) \cup \partial B^j(x, \rho), \rho \geq 0 \mid \#B^j(x, \rho) \cup \partial B^j(x, \rho) = n\}$ consists of 0, 1 or 2 elements. Thus, using (6.20),

$$\mathbb{P} \left[(\eta^j)^*(t_0, x) > A 2^{-j(1+d_\phi)} \right] \lesssim \min \left(1, \sum_{n \geq 1} e^{-cn(A-C)_+^2} \right) \lesssim e^{-c(A-C)_+^2}. \quad (6.36)$$

Finally, we use a scaled version of (3.18),

$$\sup_{B(x, 2^{j/2})} (\eta_{t_0}^j)^\# \lesssim \sup_{B(x, 2^{2j/2})} |\eta_{t_0}^j| + (\eta_{t_0}^j)^\#(x), \quad (6.37)$$

from which we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{B(x, 2^{j/2})} (\eta_{t_0}^j)^* > A 2^{-j(1+d_\phi)} \right] \leq e^{-c(A-C)_+^2}. \quad (6.38)$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{P} [\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (\eta_{t_0}^j)^*(x) = +\infty] \leq \sum_{\Delta \in \mathbb{D}^j} \mathbb{P} [\sup_{\Delta} (\eta_{t_0}^j)^* = +\infty] = 0. \quad (6.39)$$

□

6.3 Large deviations for the exponential of the noise

We now turn to large deviation estimates for $(e^{\lambda 2^j |\eta_{t_0}^j|})^*(x)$ and prove the following result.

Theorem 6.2 *Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda > 0$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then the function $x \mapsto (e^{\lambda 2^j |\eta_{t_0}^j|})^*(x)$ is a.s. everywhere defined (i.e. finite). Furthermore, the following large deviation estimates holds for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{B(x, 2^{j/2})} \ln(e^{\lambda 2^j |\eta_{t_0}^j|})^*(x) > \varepsilon A\right] \lesssim A^{-c \ln(A)}, \quad A \geq 1 \quad (6.40)$$

where $\varepsilon = \lambda 2^{-jd_\phi}$ and $c > 0$ is some constant.

The proof is essentially similar to that of Lemma 6.5, except that it is based on large deviation estimates for log-normal variables. We cite a result by Nagaev, show how to apply it in our context, and prove a few technical lemmas before turning to the proof of Theorem 6.2.

6.3.1 Log-normal large deviations

Proposition 6.6 *(see [53], Corollary 1.8) Let X be a real-valued random variable such that $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[|X|^t] < \infty$ for some $t \geq 2$, and X_1, \dots, X_n n i.i.d. copies of X , $S_n := X_1 + \dots + X_n$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}[S_n > A] \lesssim n \mathbb{E}[X^t \mathbf{1}_{X>0}] A^{-t} + e^{-2(t+2)^{-2} e^{-t} A^2 / n \mathbb{E}[X^2]}. \quad (6.41)$$

Note that this general bound mixes the two regimes (6.2) and (6.3).

Corollary 6.7 *Let $(Z_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$, $n \geq 1$ be i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables, and let*

$$S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \left(e^{\varepsilon |Z_i|} - \mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon |Z_i|}] \right), \quad \tilde{S}_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \left(e^{\varepsilon |Z_i|} - 1 \right) \quad (6.42)$$

where $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Let finally $A \gg n\varepsilon$ and $B \gg \ln(n)$. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{P}[S_n > A] \lesssim (A/\varepsilon)^{-c \ln(A/\varepsilon)} \quad (6.43)$$

or equivalently

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\ln\left(\frac{S_n}{\varepsilon}\right) > B\right] \lesssim e^{-cB^2}; \quad (6.44)$$

$$(iii) \quad \mathbb{P}[\ln S_n > A] \lesssim (A/\varepsilon)^{-c \ln(A/\varepsilon)}. \quad (6.45)$$

Furthermore, the same estimates (6.43), (6.44), (6.45) still hold if one replaces S_n by \tilde{S}_n .

Proof.

Note that (ii) is equivalent to (i), and (iii) follows directly from (ii) since $e^A \gg n\varepsilon$ and $\frac{e^A}{\varepsilon} \gg \frac{A}{\varepsilon}$ if $A \gg n\varepsilon$. Also, since $\mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon |Z_i|}] = 1 + O(\varepsilon)$, $\tilde{S}_n - S_n = O(n\varepsilon) \ll A$, so the same estimates hold indifferently for S_n or \tilde{S}_n (up to the choice of c).

Therefore we need only prove (i) for S_n . We apply the above Proposition with $X = e^{\varepsilon|Z|} - \mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon|Z|}]$, where Z is any of the variables Z_i . One finds $\mathbb{E}X^2 = \mathbb{E}[e^{2\varepsilon|Z|}] - (\mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon|Z|}])^2 \approx \varepsilon^2$ and $\mathbb{E}[X^t \mathbf{1}_{X>0}] < \mathbb{E}[e^{t\varepsilon|Z|}] \leq 2e^{t^2\varepsilon^2/2}$. The bound (6.41) is close to optimal if one chooses $t = \frac{1}{2} \ln(A/\varepsilon) \gg 1$; we then find (using $\ln^2(A/\varepsilon) \ll (A/\varepsilon)^\kappa$ for all $\kappa > 0$)

$$\mathbb{P}[S_n > A] \lesssim ne^{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{8} \ln^2(A/\varepsilon)} A^{-\frac{1}{2} \ln(A/\varepsilon)} + e^{-\frac{c}{n}(A/\varepsilon)^{\frac{3}{2}-\kappa}}. \quad (6.46)$$

(i) Assume first that $A \gtrsim e^{1/\varepsilon} \gg 1$. The second term in the right-hand side of (6.46) is then the smaller one since (for $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$)

$$e^{-\frac{c}{n}(A/\varepsilon)^{\frac{3}{2}-\kappa}} \leq e^{-\frac{c}{n}(A/\varepsilon)(A/\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} \ln(A/\varepsilon)^2} = (A/\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2} \ln(A/\varepsilon)} \leq A^{-\frac{1}{2} \ln(A/\varepsilon)}. \quad (6.47)$$

As for the first term, it is bounded by $A^{-c \ln(A/\varepsilon)}$ since (using $A \gg 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{8} \ln^2(A/\varepsilon)} &\leq e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{8} \ln^2(A/\varepsilon)} \leq e^{\frac{1}{8}(\varepsilon \ln(A)+1) \ln(A/\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq e^{\frac{1}{3} \ln(A) \ln(A/\varepsilon)} = A^{\frac{1}{3} \ln(A/\varepsilon)} \end{aligned} \quad (6.48)$$

and

$$n \ll A/\varepsilon = e^{\ln(A/\varepsilon)} \lesssim A^{\frac{1}{12} \ln(A/\varepsilon)}. \quad (6.49)$$

All together one has obtained

$$\mathbb{P}[S_n > A] \lesssim A^{-c \ln(A/\varepsilon)} \lesssim (A/\varepsilon)^{-c' \ln(A/\varepsilon)}, \quad A \gtrsim e^{1/\varepsilon}. \quad (6.50)$$

(ii) We now assume that $A \lesssim e^{1/\varepsilon}$, implying that $t = \frac{1}{2} \ln(A/\varepsilon) \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Then A^t is not necessarily small, so we must first improve our bound on $\mathbb{E}[X^t \mathbf{1}_{X>0}]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X^t \mathbf{1}_{X>0}] &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[(e^{\varepsilon Z} - 1)^t \mathbf{1}_{Z>0}] \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{1/\varepsilon} dz (e^{\varepsilon z} - 1)^t e^{-z^2/2} + \int_{1/\varepsilon}^{+\infty} dz (e^{\varepsilon z} - 1)^t e^{-z^2/2} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} dz (\varepsilon z)^t e^{-z^2/2} + \mathbb{E}[e^{t\varepsilon Z}] e^{-1/2\varepsilon^2} \\ &= 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\varepsilon \sqrt{2})^t \Gamma\left(\frac{t}{2} + 1\right) + e^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon^2 t^2 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2})}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.51)$$

Since $t \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, we find $e^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon^2 t^2 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2})} \lesssim e^{-c/\varepsilon^2} \ll e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|} \lesssim e^{-t |\ln \varepsilon|} = \varepsilon^t$. Hence

$$n\mathbb{E}[X^t \mathbf{1}_{X>0}] A^{-t} \lesssim n t^t (A/\varepsilon)^{-c \ln(A/\varepsilon)} \lesssim (A/\varepsilon)^{-c' \ln(A/\varepsilon)}. \quad (6.52)$$

As for the second term, clearly $e^{-\frac{c}{n}(A/\varepsilon)^{5/4}} \leq (A/\varepsilon)^{-c' \ln(A/\varepsilon)}$ (see (6.47)). All together,

$$\mathbb{P}[S_n > A] \lesssim (A/\varepsilon)^{-c \ln(A/\varepsilon)}, \quad A \lesssim e^{1/\varepsilon}. \quad (6.53)$$

□

Remark. The above results are actually valid as soon as $A \gg n^\kappa \varepsilon$ with $\kappa > \frac{1}{2}$, as the reader may easily check (choose $t = c \ln(A/\varepsilon)$ with c small enough and see how (6.46) and (6.47) are modified). The condition $A \gg n^\kappa \varepsilon$ may certainly be further improved with some extra effort.

Corollary 6.7 has the following generalization.

Corollary 6.8 (block large deviation estimates) Let $Z := \sum_{i'=1}^{n'} |\tilde{Z}_{i'}|$, where $(\tilde{Z}_{i'})_{i'=1, \dots, n'}$, $n' \gg 1$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables; $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ a multiple of n' , Z_i , $i = 1, \dots, n/n'$ i.i.d. copies of Z ;

$$S_n := \sum_{i=1}^{n/n'} (e^{\varepsilon Z_i} - \mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon Z_i}]), \quad \tilde{S}_n := \sum_{i=1}^{n/n'} (e^{\varepsilon Z_i} - 1) \quad (6.54)$$

where $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\varepsilon n' \ll 1$. Let finally $A \gg n\varepsilon$ and $B \gg \ln(n)$. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{P}[S_n > A] \lesssim (A/n'\varepsilon)^{-c \ln(A/n'\varepsilon)} \quad (6.55)$$

or equivalently

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{P}[\ln\left(\frac{S_n}{n'\varepsilon}\right) > B] \lesssim e^{-cB^2}; \quad (6.56)$$

$$(iii) \quad \mathbb{P}[\ln S_n > A] \lesssim (A/n'\varepsilon)^{-c \ln(A/n'\varepsilon)}. \quad (6.57)$$

Furthermore, the same estimates (6.55), (6.56), (6.57) still hold if one replaces S_n by \tilde{S}_n .

Proof. The result is exactly the one stated in Corollary 6.7 if $n' = 1$. We want to prove the same kind of result for blocks of size n' . Standard large deviation arguments apply to Z , yielding (see (6.34)) $\mathbb{P}[Z > A] \leq ce^{-\frac{1}{2n'}(A-cn')^2_+}$, hence (letting as before $X := e^{\varepsilon Z} - \mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon Z}]$), $\mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon Z}] = 1 + O(n'\varepsilon)$, $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \text{Var}(Z) = O(n'\varepsilon^2)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X^t \mathbf{1}_{X>0}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{t\varepsilon Z}] \lesssim t\varepsilon \int_0^{+\infty} e^{t\varepsilon z} e^{-\frac{1}{2n'}(z-cn')^2_+} dz \\ &\leq \int_0^{2cn'} t\varepsilon e^{t\varepsilon z} dz + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{t\varepsilon z - \frac{1}{8n'}z^2} dz \\ &\lesssim e^{2Cn't\varepsilon} + e^{Cn'(t\varepsilon)^2/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.58)$$

We set $t := \frac{1}{2} \ln(A/n'\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ and distinguish two regimes according to whether $A \geq e^{1/(\varepsilon\sqrt{n'})}$, corresponding to $t \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon\sqrt{n'}}$. Thus

$$e^{2Cn't\varepsilon} = e^{Cn'\varepsilon \ln(A/\varepsilon\sqrt{n'})} \leq e^{\ln(A/\varepsilon\sqrt{n'})} \ll A^{\frac{1}{3} \ln(A/\varepsilon\sqrt{n'})} \quad (6.59)$$

instead of (6.48), and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X^t \mathbf{1}_{X>0}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[(e^{\varepsilon Z} - 1)^t] \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{1/\varepsilon} dz (e^{\varepsilon z} - 1)^t e^{-\frac{1}{2n'}(z-cn')^2_+} + \int_{1/\varepsilon}^{+\infty} dz (e^{\varepsilon z} - 1)^t e^{-\frac{1}{2n'}(z-cn')^2_+} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{2cn'} dz (\varepsilon z)^t + \int_0^{+\infty} dz (\varepsilon z)^t e^{-z^2/8n'} + \int_{1/\varepsilon}^{+\infty} dz e^{t\varepsilon z} e^{-\frac{z^2}{8n'} - \frac{c}{n'\varepsilon^2} z} \\ &\lesssim (2\varepsilon Cn')^{t+1} + (Cn')^{\frac{1}{2}(t+1)} \varepsilon^t \Gamma\left(\frac{t}{2} + 1\right) + e^{c(n'\varepsilon^2 t^2 - \frac{1}{n'\varepsilon^2})} \end{aligned} \quad (6.60)$$

instead of (6.51). Hence all estimates contained in the proof of Corollary 6.7 hold if one replaces A/ε by $A/n'\varepsilon$ or $A/\sqrt{n'}\varepsilon$. □

6.3.2 Mayer expansion

We also need in the course of the proof of Theorem 6.2 a technical result which we choose to state separately for the sake of clarity. In the sequel, B^j is one of the μ -dependent subsets of cubes with $\tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) \subset B^j \subset \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) \cup \partial \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)$ introduced in section 6.2.

Lemma 6.9 ("Mayer expansion") *Let $(z_\Delta)_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}_j(x, \rho)} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $c > 0$. Define*

$$y_\Delta := \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}_j(x, \rho)} e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} z_{\Delta'} \quad (6.61)$$

(see eq. (6.29)).

(i) ("Mayer expansion") *Let*

$$S_\delta((z_\Delta)) := \sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}_j(x, \rho)} \left(e^{e^{-c_0 \delta} \varepsilon z_\Delta} - 1 \right), \quad \delta \geq 0 \quad (6.62)$$

and

$$S_0((y_\Delta)) := \sum_{\Delta \in B_j} (e^{\varepsilon y_\Delta} - 1). \quad (6.63)$$

Then

$$0 \leq S_0((y_\Delta)) \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m} \prod_{p=1}^m S_{\delta_p}((z_\Delta)) \quad (6.64)$$

where δ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$ range among the set $\{d^j(\Delta, \Delta'), \Delta, \Delta' \in B^j\}$.

More generally, if $\delta_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then

$$\begin{aligned} S_0((y_\Delta)) &\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\delta_{\max} < \delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m} \prod_{p=1}^m S_{\delta_p}((z_\Delta)) \\ &+ \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{m'=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{(m-1-m')!} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{m'} \leq \delta_{\max} < \delta_{m'+1} < \dots < \delta_m} S_0((z_\Delta))^{1+O(e^{-c_0})} \prod_{p=m'+1}^m S_{\delta_p}((z_\Delta)) \\ &+ \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m \leq \delta_{\max}} S_0((z_\Delta))^{O(e^{-c_0})}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.65)$$

(ii) *Let*

$$T((z_\Delta)) := \sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}_j(x, \rho)} e^{\varepsilon z_\Delta} \quad (6.66)$$

and similarly

$$T((y_\Delta)) := \sum_{\Delta \in B_j} e^{\varepsilon y_\Delta}. \quad (6.67)$$

Then

$$T((y_\Delta)) \leq (T((z_\Delta)))^{1+O(e^{-c})}. \quad (6.68)$$

Note that (by invariance by translation) $\delta_i \in \{d^j(\Delta, \Delta'), \Delta' \in \mathbb{D}^j\} = \{0 < d_1 < d_2 < \dots\}$ where Δ is some arbitrary fixed cube, and $d_i \approx_{i \rightarrow \infty} i^{1/d}$. The indexation is easier if we choose a distorted distance instead of the Euclidean distance, i.e., if we define e.g. $|x-y| = \sup_{i=1, \dots, d} |(\mathcal{R}(x-y))_i|$ where \mathcal{R} is a generic rotation, so that the set $\{\Delta' \in \mathbb{D}^j \mid d^j(\Delta, \Delta') = \delta\}$ contains at most one element for Δ, δ fixed, which we denote by $\Delta(\delta)$. The nickname "Mayer expansion" refers to a common expansion of the free energy in equilibrium statistical physics where $e^{\beta \mathcal{H}}$, \mathcal{H} being the local energy density, is expanded into $(e^{\beta \mathcal{H}} - 1) + 1$, which is exactly what we do in (i).

Proof.

(i) Let $a_\Delta(\delta) := e^{-c_0 \delta \varepsilon z_\Delta} - 1$ ($\Delta \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)$) and $a_\Delta := a_\Delta(0) = e^{\varepsilon z_\Delta} - 1$. Rewriting $S_0((y_\Delta))$ in terms of the z -variables and expanding the product of terms of the form $a_{\Delta(\delta)}(\delta) + 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} S_0((y_\Delta)) &= \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} \left[\prod_{\delta} (a_{\Delta(\delta)}(\delta) + 1) \right] - 1 = \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{\delta_1 < \delta_2 < \dots < \delta_m} \prod_{p=1}^m a_{\Delta(\delta_p)}(\delta_p) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\delta_1 < \delta_2 < \dots < \delta_m} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} a_{\Delta(\delta_1)}(\delta_1) \\ &\quad \left(\sum_{\Delta_2 \in \{\Delta(\delta_2), \dots, \Delta(\delta_m)\}} a_{\Delta_2}(\delta_2) \left(\sum_{\Delta_3 \in \{\Delta(\delta_2), \dots, \Delta(\delta_m)\} \setminus \Delta_2} a_{\Delta_3}(\delta_3) (\dots) \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6.69)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\delta_1 < \delta_2 < \dots < \delta_m} \left(\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} a_\Delta(\delta_1) \right) \left(\sum_{\Delta_2 \in B^j} a_{\Delta_2}(\delta_2) (\dots) \right) \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m} \prod_{p=1}^m S_{\delta_p}((z_\Delta)). \end{aligned} \quad (6.70)$$

For the proof of (6.65), we fix $\delta_{max} \geq 0$, start from (6.69) and pick its p -th factor, $A_p = \sum_{\Delta_p \in \{\Delta(\delta_2), \dots, \Delta(\delta_m)\} \setminus \{\Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_{p-1}\}} a_{\Delta_p}(\delta_p)$. If $\delta_p > \delta_{max}$ we bound A_p by $S_{\delta_p}((z_\Delta))$ as before. Otherwise we use the identity $(x-1)^\kappa \leq x^\kappa - 1$ ($x \geq 1, \kappa \geq 1$) and Hölder's inequality to get $a_{\Delta_p}(\delta_p) \leq (e^{\varepsilon z_{\Delta_p}} - 1) e^{-c_0 \delta_p} = a_{\Delta_p}^{e^{-c_0 \delta_p}}$ and

$$A_p \leq (m-p+1) \left(\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} a_\Delta \right)^{e^{-c_0 \delta_p}} = (m-p+1) S_0((z_\Delta))^{e^{-c_0 \delta_p}}. \quad (6.71)$$

Finally, $\sum_p e^{-c_0 \delta_p} \leq 1 + e^{-c_0 d_1} + e^{-c_0 d_2} + \dots = 1 + O(e^{-c_0})$.

(ii) One finds (all sums or supremums in the next expressions range over subsets of $\tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)$, unless

otherwise stated)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\varepsilon y_\Delta} &\leq \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} \prod_{\Delta'} e^{e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} \varepsilon z_{\Delta'}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{\Delta_1} e^{\varepsilon z_{\Delta_1}} \left(\sum_{\Delta_2 \neq \Delta_1} e^{e^{-c_0 d^1} \varepsilon z_{\Delta_2}} \left(\sum_{\Delta_3 \neq \Delta_1, \Delta_2} e^{e^{-c_0 d^2} \varepsilon z_{\Delta_3}} (\dots) \right) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \left(\sum_{\Delta_1} e^{\varepsilon z_{\Delta_1}} \right) \sup_{\Delta_1} \left(\sum_{\Delta_2 \neq \Delta_1} e^{e^{-c_0 d^1} \varepsilon z_{\Delta_2}} \right) \dots \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \left(\sum_{\Delta_1} e^{\varepsilon z_{\Delta_1}} \right) \cdot \left[(n-1) \left(\sum_{\Delta_2} e^{\varepsilon z_{\Delta_2}} \right)^{e^{-c_0 d^1}} \right] \dots \tag{6.72}
\end{aligned}$$

(Hölder's inequality was used in the last line). The product of the prefactors in the last expression, $(n-1)(n-2)\dots$ is exactly compensated by the factorial $\frac{1}{(n-1)!}$, and there remains

$$\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\varepsilon y_\Delta} \leq \left(\sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{\varepsilon z_\Delta} \right)^{1+O(e^{-c_0})}. \tag{6.73}$$

□

Again, this lemma has a block generalization. Roughly speaking, we want to group together all cubes Δ' at distance $\delta \approx 3^k$ of a given cube Δ and sum over k , instead of summing over the δ_i 's which (as a detailed computation proves) increase too slowly with i to give a converging series. Actually, we bother to do so only for $\delta > \delta_{max}$, in a region where the exponential decay governs essentially the estimates; the value of δ_{max} is fixed later in the text. In order to avoid blocks with "holes" and overlaps between blocks, we introduce the following definitions. Let $\mathbb{D}^{j,k}$, $k \geq \log_3 \delta_{max}$ be the set of blocks $\Delta^k = [3^k 2^{j/2} k_1, 3^k 2^{j/2} (k_1 + 1)] \times \dots \times [3^k 2^{j/2} k_d, 3^k 2^{j/2} (k_d + 1)]$ of size 3^k included in $\tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)$. The $3^d - 1$ blocks of size 3^k , $[x_{\Delta,1} + \varepsilon_1 3^k 2^{j/2} (k_1 - \frac{1}{2}), x_{\Delta,1} + \varepsilon_1 3^k 2^{j/2} (k_1 + \frac{1}{2})] \times \dots \times [x_{\Delta,d} + \varepsilon_d 3^k 2^{j/2} (k_d - \frac{1}{2}), x_{\Delta,d} + \varepsilon_d 3^k 2^{j/2} (k_d + \frac{1}{2})]$, where $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^d \setminus \{0, \dots, 0\}$, are all situated at a scaled distance $\geq \delta = 3^k$ of Δ . We denote them by $\Lambda(\delta)$, where $\delta := (\delta, \varepsilon)$ is a composite index including both the distance δ and a discrete index ε ranging in a fixed finite set. Then, for smaller distances $\delta < 3^k$, we set $\Lambda(\delta) = \Delta(\delta)$ as in the previous lemma, and $\delta = \delta$ simply. All together the blocks $(\Lambda(\delta))_\delta$, $\delta = (\delta, \varepsilon)$ ($\delta \geq 3^k$) or δ ($\delta < 3^k$) define for every fixed cube Δ a partition of \mathbb{R}^d . We choose in the sequel some arbitrary total ordering $<$ of the indices δ such that $(\delta = (\delta, \varepsilon)$ or δ , $\delta' = (\delta', \varepsilon')$ or δ' , $\delta < \delta') \Rightarrow \delta < \delta'$.

Lemma 6.10 (block "Mayer expansion") *Let $(z_\Delta)_{\Delta \in B_j} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $c > 0$. Define as in the previous lemma*

$$y_\Delta := \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} z_{\Delta'}, \quad S_0((y_\Delta)) := \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (e^{\varepsilon y_\Delta} - 1), \quad S_0((z_\Delta)) := \sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} (e^{\varepsilon z_\Delta} - 1) \tag{6.74}$$

and let, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$S_{3^k}((z_\Delta)) := \sum_{\Delta^k \in \mathbb{D}^{j,k}} \left(e^{e^{-c_0 3^k} \varepsilon \sum_{\Delta \in \Delta^k \cap B^j} z_\Delta} - 1 \right), \quad k \geq 0, \tag{6.75}$$

a block version of (6.62) distinguished by the boldface letter. Choose some value of δ_{max} and order the indices δ as indicated above. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
S_0((y_\Delta)) &\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\delta_{max} < \delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m} \prod_{p=1}^m S_{\delta_p}((z_\Delta)) \\
&+ \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{m'} \leq \delta_{max} < \delta_{m'+1} < \dots < \delta_m} S_0((z_\Delta))^{1+O(e^{-c_0})} \prod_{p=1}^k S_{\delta_p}((z_\Delta)) \\
&+ \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m \leq \delta_{max}} S_0((z_\Delta))^{1+O(e^{-c_0})}. \tag{6.76}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. If Δ is a block of size 3^k for some $k \geq 0$, we let $a_\Delta(\delta) := e^{e^{-c_0} \varepsilon \sum_{\Delta \in \Delta} z_\Delta} - 1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
S_0((y_\Delta)) &\leq \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} \left[\prod_{\delta} a_{\Delta(\delta)}(\delta) + 1 \right] - 1 \\
&= \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\delta_1 > \delta_2 > \dots > \delta_m} \prod_{p=1}^m a_{\Delta(\delta_p)}(\delta_p). \tag{6.77}
\end{aligned}$$

We then expand as in (6.69) and (6.70), and forget the unnecessary factorials in the denominator (which would require a short discussion in any case since there is no symmetry factor for terms belonging to blocks with different sizes). \square

6.3.3 Proof of Theorem 6.2

We shall use several times the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 6.11 *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n, n \geq 1$ be real-valued random variables, and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_n = 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}[\lambda_1 X_1 + \dots + \lambda_n X_n > A] \leq \mathbb{P}[\sup_{p=1, \dots, n} X_p > A] \leq \sum_{p=1}^n \mathbb{P}[X_p > A]. \tag{6.78}$$

Proof of Theorem 6.2. The general scheme of the proof is the same as that of Lemma 6.5. Applying Proposition 6.2 with $\phi(\eta_{t_0}^j) = \psi\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy \left(e^{\lambda 2^j |\eta_{t_0}^j(y)|} - 1 \right)\right)$ where $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is any convex, increasing function yields instead of (6.26)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy \left(e^{\lambda 2^j |\eta_{t_0}^j(y)|} - 1 \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy \left(e^{\lambda 2^j |\tilde{\eta}^j(y)|} - 1 \right) \right) \right].$$

Then we bound the last integral by sums of local suprema $\tilde{Y}_\Delta = \sup_{\Delta} |\tilde{\eta}^j(y)|$,

$$\int_{B(x, 2^{j/2}\rho) \cap \mathbb{D}_\mu^j} dy e^{\lambda 2^j |\tilde{\eta}^j(y)|} \leq \max_{B^j} \frac{\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta}}{\#B_j} \tag{6.79}$$

where B^j is a union of cubes ranging over a finite set as in subsections 6.1 and 6.2, and $\#B_j \leq \#\tilde{B}^j(x, \rho) = n$. Eq. (6.29), (6.30) imply

$$\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta \leq C\varepsilon \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} (|Z_{\Delta'}| + 1) \leq C'\varepsilon + C'\varepsilon \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} |Z_{\Delta'}|. \quad (6.80)$$

Finally, we use the formula

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} - 1) \right) \right] = \int_0^{+\infty} dA \psi'(A) \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} > n(1 + \varepsilon A) \right] + \psi(0) \quad (6.81)$$

Clearly, $e^{-C'\varepsilon}(1 + \varepsilon A) \geq (1 - C'\varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon A) \geq 1 + c\varepsilon A$ if $A \gg 1$. Hence, assuming $\text{supp} \psi' \in [C, +\infty]$ with C large enough, one finds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} - 1) \right) \right] \leq \int_0^{+\infty} dA \psi'(A) \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{c\varepsilon Y_\Delta} > n(1 + \varepsilon A) \right] + \psi(0) \quad (6.82)$$

with

$$Y_\Delta := \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{-c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} |Z_{\Delta'}| \quad (6.83)$$

(see (6.30) and (6.80)).

Below we prove that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\varepsilon Y_\Delta} > n(1 + \varepsilon A) \right] \leq e^{-c \ln^2(nA)}, \quad A \gg 1. \quad (6.84)$$

Hence $\mathbb{P}[\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\varepsilon Y_\Delta} > n(1 + \varepsilon A)] \lesssim \psi^{-2}(A)$ with

$$\psi(A) := e^{c \ln^2(n(A-C))} \mathbf{1}_{A > C(1 + \frac{1}{n})} + e^{c \ln^2(C)} \mathbf{1}_{A < C(1 + \frac{1}{n})}. \quad (6.85)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} - 1) \right) \right] \lesssim \left[-\frac{1}{\psi(A)} \right]_0^{+\infty} + \psi(0) = O(1) \quad (6.86)$$

and, by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} > 1 + \varepsilon A \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{\psi(A)} \lesssim e^{-c \ln^2(nA)}, \quad A \gg 1 \quad (6.87)$$

so

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\ln \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} \right) > \varepsilon A \right] = \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} > e^{\varepsilon A} \right] \lesssim e^{-c \ln^2(nA)}. \quad (6.88)$$

(Note that, if $\varepsilon A \gg 1$, one obtains in fact a Gaussian queue distribution,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\ln \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\lambda 2^j \tilde{Y}_\Delta} \right) > \varepsilon A \right] \lesssim e^{-c(\varepsilon A + \ln \frac{n}{\varepsilon})^2} \leq e^{-c(\varepsilon A)^2}, \quad (6.89)$$

with a very bad coefficient ε in front of A however.) Thus

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\ln(e^{\lambda 2^j |\eta_{t_0}^j}|)^*(x) > \varepsilon A\right] \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 1} e^{-c \ln^2(nA)} \lesssim A^{-c \ln(A)}. \quad (6.90)$$

It remains to prove the key estimate (6.84). Recall $Y_\Delta = \sum_{\Delta' \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} e^{c_0 d^j(\Delta, \Delta')} |Z_{\Delta'}|$, where $(Z_\Delta)_\Delta$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables. It turns out that there are four different large deviation regimes, according to the value of $S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta) = \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (e^{\varepsilon |Z_\Delta|} - 1)$, written as \tilde{S}_n in Corollary 6.8, or $S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) = \sum_{\Delta \in B^j} (e^{\varepsilon Y_\Delta} - 1)$ (see Lemma 6.10). By assumption

$$\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\varepsilon Y_\Delta} > n(1 + \varepsilon A) \quad (6.91)$$

with $A \gg 1$; in other terms,

$$S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) > n\varepsilon A. \quad (6.92)$$

- (i) (Gaussian regime) Assume $S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta) = \tilde{S}_n \leq 2$. Then $\varepsilon |Z_\Delta| = O(1)$ for all Δ , hence $\varepsilon Y_\Delta = O(1)$ too, so $S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) \lesssim S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta) \approx \varepsilon \sum_{\Delta \in \partial B^j} |Z_\Delta|$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\varepsilon Y_\Delta} > n(1 + \varepsilon A)\right] \leq \mathbb{P}[S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) > n\varepsilon A] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{\Delta \in \tilde{B}^j(x, \rho)} |Z_\Delta| > cnA\right] \lesssim e^{-c' n(A-C)^2}. \quad (6.93)$$

Clearly this last quantity is bounded by $e^{-c'' \ln^2(nA)}$ for A large enough.

- (ii) (very large deviation regime) Assume $S_0(Y_\Delta)_\Delta \gg n^{1+O(e^{-c_0})}$, or equivalently $A\varepsilon \gg n^{O(e^{-c_0})}$. Then the "Mayer expansion" (see Lemma 6.9 (i)) is not needed; we use Lemma 6.9 (ii) and find successively $S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) \approx T((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) \leq T((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta)^{1+O(e^{-c_0})}$, so $T((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta) \gg n$, hence again $T((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta) \approx S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta)$. All together we have found $S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) \lesssim (S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta))^{1+O(e^{-c_0})}$.

So we may apply Corollary 6.7, to the result that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{\Delta \in B^j} e^{\varepsilon Y_\Delta} > n(1 + \varepsilon A)\right] \leq \mathbb{P}[\tilde{S}_n > (n(1 + \varepsilon A))^{1/(1+O(e^{-c_0}))}] \lesssim e^{-c'' \ln^2(nA)}. \quad (6.94)$$

- (iii) Assume $n\varepsilon \lesssim 1$ and $A\varepsilon \lesssim n^{O(e^{-c_0})}$. Then we use the generalized block "Mayer expansion" (6.76) with $\delta_{max} = 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}[S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) > n\varepsilon A] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\delta_1 > \dots > \delta_m} \prod_{p=1}^m \mathbf{S}_{\delta_p}((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta) > n\varepsilon A\right]. \quad (6.95)$$

Since $\sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\delta_1 > \dots > \delta_m} e^{-\frac{c_0}{2}(\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_m)} \approx \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m} e^{-\frac{c_0}{2}(\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_m)} \approx 1$, we get by Lemma

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) > n\varepsilon A] &\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m} \mathbb{P} \left[\prod_{p=1}^m \frac{\mathbf{S}_{\delta_p}((|Z_\Delta)_\Delta)}{n\varepsilon e^{-c_0 \delta_p}} > \prod_{p=1}^m \left(e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}-1} A^{1/m} \right) \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m} \sum_{p=1}^m \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\mathbf{S}_{\delta_p}((|Z_\Delta)_\Delta)}{n\varepsilon e^{-c_0 \delta_p}} > e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}-1} A^{1/m} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{6.96}$$

where $\bar{\delta} := \frac{1}{m}(\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_m)$. Note that the expression \mathbf{S}_{δ_p} is a sum over blocks of size $n' \approx \delta_p^d \ll (\varepsilon e^{-c_0 \delta_p})^{-1}$, and $e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}-1} A^{1/m} \gg 1$, hence we are in the large deviation regime studied in Corollary 6.8. Also,

$$n e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}-1} A^{1/m} \geq n e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} A^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}-O(e^{-c_0})} \tag{6.97}$$

if $m \geq 2$. For $m = 1$ the estimates of Corollary 6.8 give directly a log-normal queue, so we sum over $m \geq 2$. By construction $\delta_m \geq 3^{m/(3^d-1)}$, so $\bar{\delta} > \frac{\delta_m}{m} \gtrsim \sqrt{\delta_m}$ and $n' \approx \delta_p^d \leq \delta_m^d \ll e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}}$. Hence

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\mathbf{S}_{\delta_p}((|Z_\Delta)_\Delta)}{\varepsilon e^{-c_0 \delta_p}} > n e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}-1} A^{1/m} \right] \lesssim e^{-c \ln^2 \left(\frac{n}{n'} e^{c_0 \bar{\delta}} A \right)} \lesssim e^{-c \ln^2 \left(n e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} A \right)} \lesssim e^{-c' \bar{\delta}^2} (nA)^{-c' \ln(nA)}. \tag{6.98}$$

Let $V_m(r) := \#\{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m) \mid \bar{\delta} < r\} = \#\{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m) \mid \sum_{p=1}^m \delta_p < mr\}$: clearly $V_m(r) \lesssim \#\{(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m \mid i_1 + \dots + i_m = mr\}$, hence

$$V_m(r) \lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} dx_1 \dots dx_m \mathbf{1}_{\sum_p x_p < mr} = \frac{(mr)^m}{m!} \lesssim (Cr)^m. \tag{6.99}$$

Thus (with an extra factor $\frac{1}{m!}$ due to the ordering $\delta_1 > \dots > \delta_m$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m \geq 2} \sum_{\delta_1 > \dots > \delta_m} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\mathbf{S}_{\delta_p}((|Z_\Delta)_\Delta)}{n\varepsilon e^{-c_0 \delta_p}} > e^{\frac{c_0}{2} \bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}-1} A^{1/m} \right] &\lesssim \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} (nA)^{-c \ln(nA)} \sum_{r=0}^{+\infty} (V_m(r) - V_m(r-1)) e^{-cr^2} \\
&\leq (nA)^{-c \ln(nA)} \sum_{r=0}^{+\infty} e^{-cr^2} \sum_m \frac{V_m(r)}{m!} \\
&\lesssim (nA)^{-c \ln(nA)}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.100}$$

(iv) Finally, assume $n\varepsilon \gtrsim 1$ and $A\varepsilon \lesssim n^{0(e^{-c_0})}$, and apply the generalized "Mayer expansion" with $\delta_{max} = \frac{8}{c_0} \ln(n\varepsilon)$ defined in such a way that $e^{\frac{c_0}{8} \delta} \geq n\varepsilon$ for $\delta \geq \delta_{max}$. Since

$$\sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{m'=0}^m \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{m'} < \delta_{max} \leq \delta_{m'+1} < \dots < \delta_m} e^{-\frac{c_0}{2} (\delta_{m'+1} + \dots + \delta_m)} \lesssim \#\mathcal{P}(\{1, \dots, \delta_{max}\}) = 2^{\delta_{max}} = (n\varepsilon)^{2 \ln(2)/c_0}, \tag{6.101}$$

the generalized "Mayer expansion", together with Lemma 6.11, yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[S_0((Y_\Delta)_\Delta) > n\varepsilon A] &\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{m'=0}^m \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{m'} \leq \delta_{\max} < \delta_{m'+1} < \dots < \delta_m} \\ &\quad \mathbb{P} \left[S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta)^{1+O(e^{-c_0})} \prod_{p=m'+1}^m \frac{S_{\delta_p}((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta)}{n\varepsilon e^{-c_0 \delta_p}} > (n\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{2\ln(2)}{c_0}} A \prod_{p=m'+1}^m \frac{e^{\frac{c_0}{2}\bar{\delta}}}{n\varepsilon} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \left\{ \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m \leq \delta_{\max}} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta)^{1+O(e^{-c_0})}}{\varepsilon} > \varepsilon^{-2\ln(2)/c_0} n^{1-\frac{2\ln(2)}{c_0}} A \right] \right. \end{aligned} \quad (6.102)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \sum_{m'=0}^{m-1} \sum_{\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{m'} \leq \delta_{\max} < \delta_{m'+1} < \dots < \delta_m} \left(\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{S_0((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta)^{1+O(e^{-c_0})}}{\varepsilon} > \varepsilon^{-2\ln(2)/c_0} n^{1-\frac{2\ln(2)}{c_0}} e^{\frac{c_0}{4}\bar{\delta}} A \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{p=m'+1}^m \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{S_{\delta_p}((|Z_\Delta|)_\Delta)}{\varepsilon e^{-c_0 \delta_p}} > \frac{e^{\frac{c_0}{4}\bar{\delta}}}{\varepsilon} \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6.103)$$

where $\bar{\delta} := \frac{1}{m-m'}(\delta_{m'+1} + \dots + \delta_m)$.

For c_0 large enough (recall c_0 has been multiplied by m_0 , thus it suffices to choose m_0 large enough)

$$n^{1-\frac{2\ln(2)}{c_0}} \varepsilon^{-2\ln(2)/c_0} e^{\frac{c_0}{4}\bar{\delta}} A \gtrsim e^{\frac{c_0}{4}\bar{\delta}} A n^\kappa \gtrsim n^\kappa \quad (6.104)$$

with $\kappa > \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\frac{e^{\frac{c_0}{4}\bar{\delta}}}{\varepsilon} \geq \max \left(n, \frac{e^{\frac{c_0}{6}\bar{\delta}} (n\varepsilon)^{2/3}}{\varepsilon} \right) \gtrsim \max \left(n, e^{\frac{c_0}{6}\bar{\delta}} A^{\frac{1}{3}} n^{\frac{2}{3}-O(e^{-c_0})} \right). \quad (6.105)$$

Thus we are in the large deviation regime (see remark after Corollary 6.7, and Corollary 6.8), and the lower bounds are as in (6.97), yielding a bound $O((nA)^{-c \ln(nA)})$ for the sum (6.103) over m' and $\delta_{m'+1}, \dots, \delta_m$. As for the first sum over $\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_m \leq \delta_{\max}$ in (6.102), or $\delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{m'}$ in (6.103), it produces as in (6.101) a supplementary multiplicative factor of order $(n\varepsilon)^{2\ln(2)/c_0}$, of no incidence on the result since $(n\varepsilon)^{2\ln(2)/c_0} (nA)^{-c \ln(nA)} \leq n^{2\ln(2)/c_0} (nA)^{-c \ln(nA)} \lesssim (nA)^{-c' \ln(nA)}$.

□

6.4 Proof of Theorem 6.1

We may now finally prove Theorem 6.1. Let

$$F(\delta t, [0, t]) := 2^{-j} \delta t \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor t/\delta t \rfloor} (e^{-2^{-j} \delta t})^p \ln \left[\left(e^{\lambda 2^j \int_{t-p\delta t}^{t-(p-1)\delta t} |\eta^j(s)| ds} \right)^* (x) \right], \quad (6.106)$$

and

$$c_{\delta t} := \left[2^{-j} \delta t \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor t/\delta t \rfloor} (e^{-2^{-j} \delta t})^p \right]^{-1} \gtrsim 1. \quad (6.107)$$

Clearly,

$$F(\delta t, [0, t]) \leq 2^{-j} \delta t \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor t/\delta t \rfloor} (e^{-2^{-j} \delta t})^p \ln \left[\left(e^{\lambda 2^j \|\tilde{\eta}^j\|_{\infty, [t-p\delta t, t-(p-1)\delta t]}} \right)^* (x) \right] \quad (6.108)$$

where $\|\tilde{\eta}^j\|_{\infty, [t-p\delta t, t-(p-1)\delta t]}(x) := \sup_{s \in [t-p\delta t, t-(p-1)\delta t]} |\eta^j(s, x)|$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\delta t} F(\delta t) &\leq \sup_p (e^{-2^{-j} \delta t})^p \ln \left[\left(e^{\lambda 2^j \|\tilde{\eta}^j\|_{\infty, [t-p\delta t, t-(p-1)\delta t]}} \right)^* (x) \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{N}} e^{-q} \ln \left[\left(e^{\lambda 2^j \|\tilde{\eta}^j\|_{\infty, [t-q2^j, t-(q-1)2^j]}} \right)^* (x) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.109)$$

The estimates we developed for $|\eta_{t_0}^j|$ in Theorem 6.2 extend to $\|\tilde{\eta}^j\|_{\infty, [t-q2^j, t-(q-1)2^j]}(x)$ by using the BTIS inequality once again. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[F(\delta t, [0, t]) > \varepsilon A] &\lesssim \sum_q \mathbb{P} \left[\ln \left[\left(e^{\lambda 2^j \|\tilde{\eta}^j\|_{\infty, [t-q2^j, t-(q-1)2^j]}} \right)^* (x) \right] > c \varepsilon e^q A \right] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{q=0}^{+\infty} (e^q A)^{-c' \ln(e^q A)} \lesssim A^{-c'' \ln A} \end{aligned} \quad (6.110)$$

by Theorem 6.2.

Now, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\delta t, [0, t]) &\leq \frac{1}{2} 2^{-j} \delta t \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor t/\delta t \rfloor} (e^{-2^{-j} \delta t})^p \left\{ \ln \left[\left(e^{\lambda 2^j \int_{t-p\delta t}^{t-(p-1/2)\delta t} |\eta^j(s)| ds} \right)^* (x) \right] + \ln \left[\left(e^{\lambda 2^j \int_{t-(p-1/2)\delta t}^{t-p\delta t} |\eta^j(s)| ds} \right)^* (x) \right] \right\} \\ &\leq e^{2^j \delta t/2} F(\delta t/2, [0, t]) \end{aligned} \quad (6.111)$$

so $\|\|\eta^j\|\|_{\lambda, j}(\mathbb{R}_+, x) \leq \limsup_{\delta t \rightarrow 0, t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} F(\delta t, [0, t])$ by (4.17), and by monotone convergence we get $\mathbb{P}[\|\|\eta^j\|\|_{\lambda, j}(\mathbb{R}_+, x) > A 2^{-j d_\phi}] \leq \limsup_{\delta t \rightarrow 0, t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}[F(\delta t, [0, t]) > \varepsilon A] \lesssim A^{-c \ln A}$.

The estimates for $\|\|2^{j/2} \frac{\eta^j(\dots + \delta x) - \eta^j(\dots)}{|\delta x|}\|\|_{\lambda, j}(\mathbb{R}_+, x)$ are proved in the same way since $2^{j/2} \frac{\eta^j(\dots + \delta x) - \eta^j(\dots)}{|\delta x|} = O((2^{-j})^{1+d_\phi})$ scales like $\eta_t^j(x)$ (see 5.20). □

Acknowledgements. We wish to express our thanks to S. Benachour and G. Barles for useful discussions.

References

- [1] A. Abdesselam, V. Rivasseau. *Trees, forests and jungles: A botanical garden for cluster expansions*, Lecture Notes in Physics **446**, Springer Berlin/Heidelberg (1995).
- [2] R. J. Adler. *The geometry of random fields*, SIAM (2010).
- [3] A. Altland, B. Simons. *Condensed matter field theory*, Cambridge University Press (2010).
- [4] G. Amir, I. Corwin, J. Quastel. *Probability distribution of the free energy on the continuum directed reandom polymer in 1+1 dimensions*, Comm. Pure Applied Math. **64**, 466-537 (2011).

- [5] L. Amour, M. Ben-Artzi. *Global existence and decay for viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications **31**, 621–628 (1998).
- [6] A.-L. Barabasi, H. E. Stanley. *Fractal concepts in surface growth*. Cambridge University Press (1995).
- [7] G. Barles. *Solutions de viscosité et équations elliptiques du deuxième ordre*, (graduate course given at the University of Tours, available at: www.lmpt.univ-tours.fr/~barles/Toulcours.pdf) (1997).
- [8] S. Benachour, M. Ben-Artzi, P. Laurençot. *Sharp decay estimates and vanishing viscosity for diffusive Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Adv. Differential Equations **14**, 1–25 (2009).
- [9] S. Benachour, G. Karch, P. Laurençot. *Asymptotic profiles of solutions to viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **83**, 1275–1308 (2004).
- [10] S. Benachour, P. Laurençot. *Global solutions to viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations with irregular initial data*, Comm. Partial Diff. Eq. **24**, 1999–2021 (1999).
- [11] A. J. Majda, A. L. Bertozzi. *Vorticity and incompressible flow*, Cambridge texts in applied mathematics, Cambridge University Press (2002).
- [12] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*, Wiley (1968).
- [13] H. Brézis. *Opérateurs maximaux monotones et semi-groupes de contractions dans les espaces de Hilbert*, North-Holland (1973).
- [14] J. Bricmont, K. Gawędzki, A. Kupiainen. *KAM theorem and quantum field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **201**, 699–727 (1999).
- [15] J. Bricmont, A. Kupiainen. *Random walks in asymmetric random environments*, Comm. Math. Phys. **142** (2), 345–420 (1991).
- [16] J. Bricmont, A. Kupiainen, G. Lin. *Renormalization group and asymptotics of solutions of nonlinear parabolic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **47**, 893–922 (1994).
- [17] J. Cardy, *Field theory and nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*, cours de 3ème cycle de la Suisse Romande, semestre d’été de l’année académique 1998-1999 (in English).
- [18] P. Carmona, Y. Hu. *On the partition function of a directed polymer in a random environment*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **124**, 431–457 (2002).
- [19] F. Comets, N. Yoshida. *Directed polymers in random environment are diffusive at weak disorder*, Ann. Prob. **34**, 1746–1770 (2006).
- [20] I. Corwin, *The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation and universality class*, Random Matrices Theory Appl. **1** (1), 113001 (2012).
- [21] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, P.-L. Lions. *User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. AMS **27** (1), 1–67 (1992).

- [22] F. Da Lio, O. Ley. *Uniqueness results for second order Bellman-Isaacs equations under quadratic growth assumptions and applications*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **45** (1), 74–106 (2006).
- [23] F. Da Lio, O. Ley. *Uniqueness results for convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations under $p > 1$ growth conditions on data*, arXiv:0810.1435.
- [24] B. Derrida, M. R. Evans, V. Hakim, V. Pasquier. *Exact solution of a 1D asymmetric exclusion model using a matrix formulation*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **26**, 1493–1517 (1993).
- [25] *Constructive quantum field theory*, Proceedings of the 1973 Erice Summer School, ed. by G. Velo and A. Wightman, Lecture Notes in Physics **25**, Springer (1973).
- [26] L. C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **19**, AMS (199).
- [27] J. Feldman, J. Magnen, V. Rivasseau, R. Sénéor. *Construction and Borel summability of infrared Φ_4^4 by a phase space expansion*, Comm. Math. Phys. **109**, 437–480 (1987).
- [28] A. Friedman. *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*, Prentice-Hall(1964).
- [29] J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer. *The Kosterlitz-Thouless transition in two-dimensional abelian spin systems and the Coulomb gas*, Comm. Math. Phys. **81**, 527–602 (1981).
- [30] G. Gallavotti, K. Nicolò. *Renormalization theory in 4-dimensional scalar fields*, Comm. Math. Phys. **100**, 545–590 and **101**, 247–282 (1985).
- [31] B. H. Gilding, M. Guedda, R. Kersner. *The Cauchy problem for $u_t = \Delta u + |\nabla u|^q$* , J. Math. Anal. Appl. **284**, 733-755 (2003).
- [32] J. Glimm and A. Jaffe. *Quantum Physics, A Functional Point of View*, Springer (1987)
- [33] N. Goldenfeld. *Lectures on phase transitions and the renormalization group*, Addison-Wesley (1992).
- [34] M. Hairer. *Solving the KPZ equation*, arXiv:1109.6811.
- [35] J. Z. Imbrie, T. Spencer. *Diffusion of directed polymer in a random environment*, J. Statist. Phys. **52**, 609–626 (1988).
- [36] K. Ito. *Existence of solutions to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation under quadratic growth conditions*, J. Diff. Eq. **176**, 11-28 (2001).
- [37] K. Johansson, *Shape fluctuations and random matrices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **209**, 437–476 (2000).
- [38] S. Kaplan. *On the growth of solutions of quasi-linear parabolic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **16**, 305–330 (1963).
- [39] I. Karatzas, S. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, Springer-Verlag (1991).
- [40] M. Kardar, G. Parisi, Y.-C. Zhang. *Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (9), 889–892 (1986).

- [41] C. Klüppelberg, T. Mikosch. *Large deviations of heavy-tailed random sums with applications to insurance and finance*, J. Appl. Probab. **34**, 293–308 (1997).
- [42] P. Laurençot, P. Souplet. *On the growth of mass for a viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equation*, Jour. Anal. Math. **89**, 367–383 (2003).
- [43] M. Laguës, A. Lesne. *Invariance d'échelle. Des changements d'état à la turbulence*, Belin (2003).
- [44] M. Le Bellac. *Quantum and statistical field theory*, Oxford Science Publications (1991).
- [45] T. Lindvall. *Lectures on the coupling method*, John Wiley and sons (1992).
- [46] Yu. V. Linnik. *Limit theorems allowing large deviations for the sums of independent variables I, II*, Theory Probab. Appl. **6**, 145–161 and 377–391 (1961).
- [47] J. Magnen, J. Unterberger. *From constructive theory to fractional stochastic calculus. (I) An introduction: rough path theory and perturbative heuristics*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **12**, 1199–1226 (2011).
- [48] J. Magnen, J. Unterberger. *From constructive theory to fractional stochastic calculus. (II) The rough path for $\frac{1}{6} < \alpha < \frac{1}{4}$: constructive proof of convergence*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **13**, 209–270 (2012).
- [49] V. Mastropietro. *Non-perturbative renormalization*, World Scientific (2008).
- [50] J. Magnen and D. Iagolnitzer. *Weakly self avoiding polymers in four dimensions*, Commun. Math. Phys., **162**, 85–121 (1994)
- [51] T. Mikosch, A. V. Nagaev. *Large deviations of heavy-tailed sums with applications in insurance*, Extremes **1**, 81-110 (1998).
- [52] A. V. Nagaev. *Integral limit theorems for large deviations when Cramér's condition is not fulfilled I,II*, Theory Probab. Appl. **14**, 51–64 and 193–208 (1969).
- [53] A. V. Nagaev. *Large deviations of sums of independent random variables*, Ann. Prob. **7**, 745–789 (1979).
- [54] E. Nelson. *A quartic interaction in two dimensions*, in Mathematical Theory of Elementary Particles, R. Goodman and I. Segal eds, MIT Press (1966)
- [55] B. Øksendal. *Stochastic differential equations. An introduction with applications*, Springer (2000).
- [56] M. Prähofer, H. Spohn. *Scale invariance of the PNG droplet and the Airy process*, J. Stat. Phys. **108**, 1071–1106 (2001).
- [57] D. Revuz, M. Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, Springer (1999).
- [58] V. Rivasseau. *From perturbative to constructive renormalization*, Princeton Series in Physics (1991).

- [59] L. V. Rozovski. *Probabilities of large deviations on the whole axis*, Theory Probab. Appl. **38**, 53–79 (1993).
- [60] M. Salmhofer. *Renormalization: an introduction*, Springer Verlag (1999).
- [61] T. Sasamoto, H. Spohn. *Exact height distributions for the KPZ equation with narrow wedge initial condition*, Nucl. Phys. **B834**, 523–542 (2010).
- [62] M. E. Schonbek, *Uniform decay rates for parabolic conservation laws*, Nonlinear Anal., Theory, Methods and Appl. **10** (9), 943–956 (1986).
- [63] I. Smears. *Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. Analysis and numerical analysis*, research report available on www.math.dur.ac.uk/Ug/projects/highlights/PR4/Smears_HJB_report.pdf
- [64] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton University Press (1993).
- [65] C. A. Tracy, H. Widom. *Integral formulas for the asymmetric simple exclusion process*, Comm. Math. Phys. **279**, 815–844 (2008).
- [66] J. Unterberger. *Hölder-continuous paths by Fourier normal ordering*, Comm. Math. Phys. **298** (1), 1–36 (2010).
- [67] J. Unterberger. *Generalized PDE estimates for KPZ equations through Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman formalism*, arXiv:1312.5293.
- [68] J. Unterberger. *Mode d’emploi de la théorie constructive des champs bosoniques. Avec une application aux chemins rugueux*, to appear at: Confluentes Mathematicae (in French with an English lexicon).
- [69] F. Vignes-Tourneret. *Renormalisation des théories de champs non commutatives*, Thèse de doctorat de l’Université Paris 11, arXiv:math-ph/0612014.
- [70] K. G. Wilson. *Renormalization Group and Critical Phenomena. I. Renormalization Group and the Kadanoff Scaling Picture* Phys. Rev. **B4**, 3174–3184 (1971).
- [71] K. G. Wilson and J. Kogut. *The renormalization group and the ε expansion*. Physics Reports **12**, 75–200 (1974).