

A REGULARITY THEORY FOR RANDOM ELLIPTIC OPERATORS

ANTOINE GLORIA, STEFAN NEUKAMM, AND FELIX OTTO

Abstract: The qualitative theory of stochastic homogenization of uniformly elliptic linear (but possibly non-symmetric) systems in divergence form is well-understood. Quantitative results on the speed of convergence, and on the error in the representative volume method, like those recently obtained by the authors for scalar equations, require a type of stochastic regularity theory for the corrector (e.g., higher moment bounds). One of the main insights of the very recent work of Armstrong and Smart is that one should separate these error estimates, which require strong mixing conditions in order to yield optimal rates, from the (large scale) regularity theory for α -harmonic functions, which by the philosophy of Avellaneda and Lin from periodic homogenization are expected to hold under mild mixing conditions. In this paper, we establish the regularity theory for non-symmetric systems under a mild mixing condition.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. On regularity theory for elliptic operators in divergence form	2
1.2. Generalized correctors	3
2. Statement of the main results	6
2.1. Regularity theory and the minimal radius	6
2.2. Control of the minimal radius under mild mixing conditions	10
3. Proofs	13
3.1. Proof of Lemma 1	13
3.2. Proof of Lemma 3	15
3.3. Proof of Lemma 2	23
3.4. Proof of Corollary 1	25
3.5. Proof of Corollary 2	28
3.6. Proof of Corollary 3	29
3.7. Proof of Proposition 1	35
3.8. Proof of Lemma 4	40
References	45

Date: November 7, 2018.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. On regularity theory for elliptic operators in divergence form. In the case of elliptic systems with periodic coefficient field a , Avellaneda and Lin obtained several surprising a priori estimates based on the philosophy of lifting the regularity theory of the homogenized limit to the heterogeneous situation, cf. [2, Section 3.1] where $C^{1,\alpha}$ -a priori estimates on a -harmonic functions are derived. Using these results they then proved a family of Liouville theorems for such systems [3]. The intimate connection between Schauder theory and Liouville theorems is not a surprise: Simon in [25] derived Schauder estimates [25, Theorem 1] indirectly from a Liouville result [25, Lemma 1].

Equations with random coefficients were first considered by Papanicolaou and Varadhan [23] and by Kozlov [16] in the context of qualitative stochastic homogenization. When it turns to quantitative results, new ideas and suitable quantitative assumptions on ergodicity are needed. By quantitative results we mean not only convergence rates but, as a refinement, also their stochastic integrability. The only early result in that direction was the (suboptimal) estimate obtained by Yurinskii [28] that establishes the algebraic decay of the homogenization error for $d > 2$ under a uniform mixing condition. Twenty years later progress came from the mathematical physics community. Naddaf and Spencer [22], in an inspiring unpublished manuscript, followed by Conlon and Naddaf [6], used mixing conditions in the form of a spectral gap estimate to obtain optimal bounds on fluctuations of the energy density of the corrector for small ellipticity ratio (a perturbation result), identifying the central limit theorem scaling. This approach was then combined with elliptic regularity theory by the first and third authors to obtain optimal estimates on the corrector, the fluctuations of the energy density of the corrector, and the approximation of homogenized coefficients in [13, 14, 12]. Using more probabilistic arguments, Mourrat [19] independently obtained suboptimal estimates on the decay of the associated semi-group (the environment as seen by the particle) in high dimensions and made an ingenious use of spectral theory to prove quantitative results (see also [9]). The combination of these three ingredients culminated in [10] where we proved optimal estimates (although not optimal in terms of stochastic integrability) in any dimension for scalar equations under the strong mixing condition in the form of the spectral gap estimate (in particular, the optimal decay of the semi-group, and optimal estimates of the so-called representative volume method).

The first large scale regularity results in the random setting that went beyond those known deterministically were obtained in [18]: In case of scalar equations and under strong mixing conditions encoded in a logarithmic Sobolev assumption, (large-scale) $C^{0,\alpha}$ -estimates for harmonic functions for any $\alpha < 1$ were obtained. With another flavor, Benjamini, Duminil-Copin, Kozma, and Yadin proved in [4] a Liouville-type theorem in a very general context which implies that strictly sublinear a -harmonic functions are constants under the sole assumption of stationarity and ergodicity (which contrasts with the strong mixing assumption of [18]). In a recent

and inspiring work, Armstrong and Smart [1] applied the philosophy of Avellaneda & Lin to the scalar random case under strong mixing conditions, obtaining much stronger regularity results than [18] (we believe that their method, which addresses non-necessarily quadratic scalar convex energy functionals, extends to symmetric systems and milder mixing conditions). The results are stronger in two senses: Following the ideas of Avellaneda & Lin, the authors obtain (large-scale) $C^{1,\alpha}$ -estimates for harmonic functions for any $\alpha < 1$; and with a random constant that satisfies exponential bounds (whereas in [18], just super-algebraic bounds were obtained). The exponential bounds in [1] rely on a sub-additive argument which exploits the natural variational structure of the problem, and therefore seems to require *symmetry* of the coefficients.

In the present article, we embrace the viewpoint that regularity theory should be separated from error estimates, and focus on the former. A crucial object in our analysis is a skew-symmetric tensor, which we call σ , see Lemma 1, and that allows for a representation of the residuum of the homogenization error in divergence form; it is a standard object in periodic homogenization, see for instance [15, p.27], where it is called α (incidentally, it is not used in the random case in that textbook). This tensor σ is related to the flux of the corrector. Not surprisingly this quantity appears to be as important as the corrector itself, as the definition of qualitative H-convergence already suggests (weak convergence of the gradient of the solution *and* weak convergence of the flux). Our approach is inspired by the work of Avellaneda and Lin. In particular, it is close to [2, Section 3.1], see our discussion before Lemma 2. Incidentally, σ is not used for this result and only used marginally in this paper [2, p.845], and not capitalizing on its skew symmetry. As opposed to [1], we develop an intrinsic $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity by using harmonic coordinates. Our results also improve on [2], and we expect our results to give new insight on almost-periodic coefficients as well. The merit of the present work, besides treating asymmetric coefficient fields, using only arguments that are available in the case of systems, and working under mild mixing conditions, is that it reduces the validity of the improved regularity theory to the finiteness of some random variable we call r_* that can be seen as a quantification of H-convergence. This quantity is trivially bounded for periodic coefficients, and it has exponential moments under mild mixing conditions. Under the mere assumption of ergodicity, this also allows one to obtain a Liouville result for sub-quadratic a -harmonic functions.

1.2. Generalized correctors. We start by making precise our assumptions on the coefficient fields, and then recall the standard definition of the corrector and the (slightly less standard) definition of the flux corrector.

Assumptions on the ensemble of coefficient fields. Our two assumptions on the space of (admissible) coefficient fields $a(x)$ are pointwise boundedness and uniform ellipticity. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the bound is unity:

$$(1) \quad |a(x)\xi| \leq |\xi| \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

We require uniform ellipticity only in the integrated form of

$$(2) \quad \int \nabla \zeta \cdot a \nabla \zeta \geq \lambda \int |\nabla \zeta|^2 \quad \text{for all smooth and compactly supported } \zeta.$$

Throughout this paper, we use *scalar notation* for notational convenience. However, we only use arguments that are available in the case of systems, that is, when \mathbb{R} -valued functions ζ are replaced by fields with values in some finite dimensional Euclidean space H . More precisely, we only use the energy estimate and consequences thereof, like the Caccioppoli estimate and the higher integrability coming from the hole filling argument. In particular, we do not appeal to De Giorgi's theory. Clearly, in the case of systems, all constants acquire an additional dependence on the dimension of H .

We now address the minimal assumptions on the “ensemble” $\langle \cdot \rangle$, a probability measure on the space of (admissible) coefficient fields (endowed with a canonical topology) which will be assumed throughout the paper. Two of them are related to the operation of the shift group \mathbb{R}^d on the space of coefficient fields, that is, for any shift vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any coefficient field a , the shifted field $a(\cdot + z): x \mapsto a(x + z)$ is again a coefficient field. The first assumption is stationarity, which means that for any shift $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the random coefficient fields a and $a(\cdot + z)$ have the same (joint) distribution. The second assumption is ergodicity, which means that any (integrable) random variable $\zeta(a)$ that is shift invariant, that is, $\zeta(a(\cdot + z)) = \zeta(a)$ for all shift vectors $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -almost coefficient field a , is actually constant, that is $\zeta(a) = \langle \zeta \rangle$ for $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -almost coefficient field a .

We need a third assumption on the homogenized coefficient defined below, namely that it is uniformly elliptic in the sense of

$$(3) \quad \xi \cdot a_{hom} \xi \geq \lambda |\xi|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |a_{hom} \xi| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} |\xi| \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where for pure notational convenience, we assume that the lower bound here is identical to the one in (2). In fact, if (2) would hold in a pointwise way, then (3) would be an easy consequence (where the larger upper bound of $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ is the price of non-symmetry).

Construction of correctors. Throughout this paragraph $i = 1, \dots, d$ denotes a coordinate direction we may think of being fixed. We recall some well-known facts about the stationary field of the corrector's gradient, see for instance [15, Section 7.2], in a language adapted for our generalization in the proof of Lemma 1. Consider the space of curl-free vector fields of vanishing expectation

$$X := \{g \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d) \mid D_j g_k = D_k g_j \text{ distributionally, } \langle g_j \rangle = 0\},$$

where the “horizontal” derivative D_j is defined as in [23] by

$$(D_j \zeta)(a) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (\zeta(a(\cdot + h e_j)) - \zeta(a)).$$

Because of the stationarity, $-D_j$ is the (formal) adjoint of D_j . We note that thanks to ergodicity and stationarity, (2) translates into

$$(4) \quad \forall g \in X \quad \langle g \cdot a(0)g \rangle \geq \lambda \langle |g|^2 \rangle.$$

By the Lax-Milgram theorem, there thus exists a unique

$$(5) \quad g_i \in X, \quad \forall \tilde{g} \in X \quad \langle \tilde{g} \cdot a(0)(g_i + e_i) \rangle = 0.$$

With help of (4), we see that it satisfies the bound

$$(6) \quad \langle |g_i|^2 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

Since $\{D\phi | \phi \in H^1(\Omega)\} \subset X$, (5) implies in particular

$$(7) \quad D \cdot a(0)(g_i + e_i) = 0$$

in a distributional sense. The homogenized coefficient a_{hom} in direction e_i is then defined as

$$(8) \quad a_{hom}e_i = \langle a(0)(g_i + e_i) \rangle.$$

In particular, the random vector $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(9) \quad q_i := a(0)(g_i + e_i) - a_{hom}e_i = a(0)(g_i + e_i) - \langle a(0)(g_i + e_i) \rangle$$

which we may think of a current correction, satisfies

$$(10) \quad \langle |q_i|^2 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} + 1, \quad \langle q_i \rangle = 0, \quad D \cdot q_i = 0,$$

(the bound is seen as follows $\langle |q_i|^2 \rangle \stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \langle |a(0)(g_i + e_i)|^2 \rangle \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \langle |g_i + e_i|^2 \rangle = \langle |g_i|^2 \rangle + 1 \stackrel{(6)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\lambda} + 1$, the +1 is the price to pay for knowing (4) only for g 's with $\langle g \rangle = 0$) which mimics the properties of the field correction, namely

$$\langle |g_i|^2 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}, \quad \langle g_i \rangle = 0, \quad D_j g_{ik} = D_k g_{ij}.$$

The upcoming lemma constructs a scalar potential ϕ_i for g_i and a vector potential σ_i (that is, for $d \neq 3$, an asymmetric tensor field) for q_i .

Lemma 1. *Let $\langle \cdot \rangle$ be stationary and ergodic. Then there exist two random tensor fields $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1, \dots, d}$ and $\{\sigma_{ijk}\}_{i,j,k=1, \dots, d}$ with the following properties: The gradient fields $\nabla \phi_i$ and $\nabla \sigma_{ijk}$ are stationary, by which we understand $\nabla \phi_i(a; x+z) = \nabla \phi_i(a(\cdot+z); x)$ for any shift vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and have bounded second moments and vanishing expectation:*

$$(11) \quad \langle |\nabla \phi_i|^2 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}, \quad \sum_{j,k=1, \dots, d} \langle |\nabla \sigma_{ijk}|^2 \rangle \leq 4\left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + 1\right), \quad \langle \nabla \phi_i \rangle = \langle \nabla \sigma_{ijk} \rangle = 0.$$

Moreover, the field σ is skew symmetric in its last indices, that is,

$$(12) \quad \sigma_{ijk} = -\sigma_{ikj}.$$

Finally, we have for $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -a. e. a the equations

$$(13) \quad -\nabla \cdot a(\nabla \phi_i + e_i) = 0,$$

$$(14) \quad \nabla \cdot \sigma_i = q_i,$$

$$(15) \quad -\Delta \sigma_{ijk} = \partial_j q_{ik} - \partial_k q_{ij},$$

where $\{q_{ij}\}_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$, in line with (9), is given by

$$(16) \quad q_i = a(\nabla \phi_i + e_i) - a_{hom} e_i,$$

and where the divergence of a tensor field is defined as $(\nabla \cdot \sigma_i)_j := \sum_{k=1}^d \partial_k \sigma_{ijk}$.

As it is well-known in the homogenization theory, the fields ϕ and σ are almost surely sublinear at infinity (in the sense of (78), see proof of Corollary 1). In particular we may define Ω' as the set of $a \in \Omega$ such that $(\phi(a), \sigma(a))$ satisfies (78). As can be proved by elementary L^2 -theory, Ω' is closed by perturbations of a on compact sets. In addition Ω' has full measure. In the rest of this paper, we shall always consider $a \in \Omega'$.

2. STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Regularity theory and the minimal radius. In the Euclidean context, the $C^{1,\alpha}$ -norm of a function measures its local deviation from linear functions. As is customary in the $C^{1,\alpha}$ -theory based on energy estimates, that deviation is measured in the L^2 -sense on the level of gradients, giving rise to the Campanato spaces that are equivalent to Hölder spaces. We name this expression “excess”, cf. (19), in (linear) analogy to the quantity in the regularity theory for minimal surfaces introduced by De Giorgi, [7, Teorema 3.3]. In the context of homogenization, it is natural to replace the space of linear functions (which is d -dimensional once one factors out constants) by the d -dimensional set of harmonic coordinates, that is, $\{x \mapsto \xi \cdot x + \phi_\xi(x)\}_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ (since the generalized correctors (ϕ, σ) exist in all directions $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ almost-surely for ergodic coefficients, we implicitly assume in the sequel (and in particular for deterministic estimates) that a belongs to the Borel set of coefficients for which the generalized correctors are well-defined). Lemma 2 shows that this can be achieved provided the corrector is well-behaved in the sense that (ϕ, σ) has sufficiently small linear growth. This property has to be satisfied only in a spatially averaged sense (cf. (17)), but the smallness condition is quantitative (cf. (17)). This has to be compared to [1, Lemma 5.1] where not only a smallness condition is required, but also a convergence rate. (Here and in the sequel, we use the abbreviations $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d)$, $\sigma = (\sigma_{ijk})_{i,j,k=1,\dots,d}$, and $\phi_\xi = \sum_{i=1}^d \xi_i \phi_i$.) The regularity result provided by Lemma 2 is “quenched”, that is, entirely deterministic in the sense that the smallness condition is expressed in terms of the given “realization” of (ϕ, σ) . (In case of thermal randomness, one would speak of a “path-wise result”.) However, mild ergodicity conditions imply that the smallness condition (17) kicks in on sufficiently large scales, more precisely for radii $r \geq r_*$, where the “minimal radius” r_* is a random variable with exponential moments. This is the content of Proposition 1. Note that in [1] the quantity called \mathcal{Y} plays the same role

of r_* , but is defined as the smallest radius from which the algebraic decay holds (as opposed to the much weaker smallness property).

The following lemma, and its main ingredient, Lemma 3 below, should be compared to the work of Avellaneda & Lin, more precisely, to [2, Section 3.1]: Like here, the distance between ∇u and $\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi$ for a suitable ξ (there, it is given by the spatial average of ∇u) is monitored, however, on an L^∞ instead of an H^1 -level, see [2, Lemma 14], which is the analogue of Lemma 3. Like for Lemma 3, [2, Lemma 14] is a perturbation of an estimate for the constant homogenized coefficient. In fact, [2, Lemma 14] does not use periodicity in an explicit way, but only H-convergence of the elliptic operator $-\nabla \cdot a \nabla$ (see [20, 21]), in its scaled down version, to the homogenized limit $-\nabla \cdot a_{hom} \nabla$. More precisely, it uses an upgraded version of H-convergence, where the solutions converge in L^∞ , an upgrade which in case of scalar equations may be obtained appealing to the uniform Hölder regularity of a -harmonic functions (De Giorgi's result) and which in [2, Section 2.2] is obtained in the system's case by first deriving a $C^{0,\alpha}$ -estimate by a similar strategy to the $C^{1,\alpha}$ -estimate. Incidentally, [2, Lemma 14] also uses implicitly the sublinear growth of the corrector ϕ . The main new ingredient of Lemma 3 is that it makes the qualitative H-convergence quantitative in terms of the sublinear growth of ϕ and σ . This also requires a form of boundary regularity for a_{hom} -harmonic functions since we want to use the *whole-space* corrector (ϕ, σ) and thus need to introduce a boundary layer; this boundary regularity plays here a quite different role than in [2, Section 3.2]. The passage from Lemma 3 to Lemma 2 mimics the passage from [2, Lemma 14] to [2, Lemma 15]. Note that [2] assumes smoothness of a which helps to handle the small scales.

Lemma 2. *Let a Hölder exponent $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. Then there exists some constant $C(d, \lambda, \alpha)$ depending only on d, λ , and α with the following properties. Suppose that for some minimal radius r_* , the linear growth of (ϕ, σ) in the (centered) balls B_r on scales $r > r_*$ is small in the sense of*

$$(17) \quad \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r} (|\phi - \int_{B_r} \phi| + |\sigma - \int_{B_r} \sigma|)^2 \leq \frac{1}{C(d, \lambda, \alpha)} \quad \text{for all } r \geq r_*.$$

Then we have the following: For a radius $R \geq r_$ and an a -harmonic function $u(x)$ in B_R , that is,*

$$(18) \quad -\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R,$$

and for an arbitrary radius $r \in [r_, R]$ consider the deviation from an a -linear function on B_r (the “excess”) in the sense of*

$$(19) \quad \text{Exc}(r) := \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi)|^2.$$

Then we have “excess decay” in the sense of

$$(20) \quad \text{Exc}(r) \leq C(d, \lambda, \alpha) \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{2\alpha} \text{Exc}(R).$$

Moreover for the correctors we have a non-degeneracy property

$$(21) \quad \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2 \leq \int_{B_r} |\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda, \alpha)|\xi|^2$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r \geq r_*$. Finally, we have the mean-value property (for which $\alpha > 0$ can be fixed, say, $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$)

$$(22) \quad \int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda) \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2.$$

A fairly easy consequence of Lemma 2 in form of (20) is the Liouville property for subquadratic functions stated in Corollary 1. This partially answers to the affirmative a specific version of a question raised in [4, Question 5, p.33] on whether the dimension of the space of a -harmonic functions of a given growth exponent agrees with the dimension in the Euclidean case. The answer is partial, because only sub-quadratic growth is treated, and deals with a very special case, because only the case of uniformly elliptic coefficient fields is treated. In the even more special case of periodic coefficient fields the answer is affirmative for all growth rates [3]. Our qualitative result holds, as it should, under the purely qualitative condition of ergodicity.

Corollary 1. *Let $\langle \cdot \rangle$ be stationary and ergodic. Then for $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -a. e. coefficient field $a(x)$, the following Liouville property holds: Suppose that $u(x)$ is a -harmonic, that is $-\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = 0$ in all \mathbb{R}^d , and that it grows sub-quadratically in the sense that there exists an exponent $\alpha < 1$ such that*

$$(23) \quad \lim_{R \uparrow \infty} R^{-2(1+\alpha)} \int_{B_R} u^2 = 0.$$

Then u is a -linear in the sense that there exist $(c, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$(24) \quad u(x) = c + \xi \cdot x + \phi_\xi(x) \quad \text{for Lebesgue-a. e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The next corollary establishes a $C^{1,1}$ a priori estimate for a -harmonic functions similar to the one for plain harmonic functions. Here, by $C^{1,1}$ we mean a C^α -gradient estimate for any $\alpha < 1$ “in harmonic coordinates”. There are two restrictions: As expected from Lemma 2, such an estimate only holds on scales that are large with respect to the minimal radius $r_*(x)$, see (25). Moreover, it only holds for an *effective* gradient which is the projection of the microscopic gradient onto a -linear functions, a projection localized on the level of the minimal radius r_* , cf. (26).

Corollary 2. *Given an $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, consider the minimal radius, that is, the random variable $r_* \geq 1$ characterized by (17)*

$$r_* := \inf \left\{ r \geq 1 \mid \forall \rho \geq r \quad \frac{1}{\rho^2} \int_{B_\rho} |(\phi, \sigma) - \int_{B_\rho} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{C(d, \lambda, \alpha)} \right\}$$

with the understanding that $r_* = +\infty$ if the set is empty. By stationarity of the increments of (ϕ, σ) , we have that the stationary extension $r_*(a, x) := r_*(a(\cdot + x))$ plays the same role, that is,

$$(25) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \rho \geq r_*(x) \quad \frac{1}{\rho^2} \int_{B_\rho(x)} |(\phi, \sigma) - \int_{B_\rho(x)} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{C(d, \lambda, \alpha)}.$$

For any a -harmonic function u in a ball B_R , cf. (18), consider the vectors ξ_+ and ξ_- characterized by

$$(26) \quad \int_{B_{r_*(\pm x)}(\pm x)} |\nabla u - (\xi_\pm + \nabla \phi_{\xi_\pm})|^2 = \text{Exc}(B_{r_*(\pm x)}(\pm x)),$$

which we think of the effective gradient of u in x and $-x$ at scale r_* , respectively. Then we have provided $R \geq 8 \max\{|x|, r_*(\pm x)\}$,

$$(27) \quad |\xi_+ - \xi_-|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda, \alpha) \left(\frac{\max\{|x|, r_*(\pm x)\}}{R} \right)^{2\alpha} \text{Exc}(B_R).$$

Loosely speaking, Corollary 2 states that from the minimal radius r_* onwards, one is in the regime of $C^{1,1}$ -regularity. We expect that this holds true not just on the level for $C^{1,1}$ -regularity of a -harmonic functions, but also in terms of the full Schauder theory or in terms of Green's function estimates.

Here comes the main ingredient for Lemma 2. Harmonic functions u have the property that for all radii $r \leq R$ there exists a $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (in fact, $\xi = \nabla u(0)$ or $\xi = \int_{B_r} \nabla u$ will do) such that

$$(28) \quad \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - \xi|^2 \leq C(d) \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^2 \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2.$$

The next lemma establishes a perturbation of (28) for a -harmonic functions, provided the affine function $x \mapsto \xi \cdot x$ is replaced by its a -harmonic version $x \mapsto \xi \cdot x + \phi_\xi(x)$, and where the perturbation is controlled by the amount of linear growth of the corrector (ϕ, σ) .

Lemma 3. *Let the function $u(x)$ be a -harmonic in the ball of radius R (around the origin), that is,*

$$(29) \quad -\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R.$$

Then for all $r \leq R$, there exists a vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$(30) \quad \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi)|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda) \left((1 + \delta) \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^2 + (\delta^{\frac{1}{d+3}} + \delta) \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^d \right) \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2,$$

where we've set for abbreviation

$$(31) \quad \delta := \max \left\{ \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |(\sigma, \phi) - \int_{B_R} (\sigma, \phi)|^2, \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r} |\phi - \int_{B_r} \phi|^2 \right\}.$$

Moreover, we have the following non-degeneracy condition

$$(32) \quad (1 - C(d)\delta^{\frac{1}{4}})|\xi|^2 \leq \int_{B_r} |\xi + \nabla\phi_\xi|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda)(1 + \delta)|\xi|^2 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In view of Lemma 2 and Corollary 2, it is of interest to control the size of the stationary random field $r_*(x)$. Note that it is almost surely finite just under the assumption of ergodicity, cf. the proof of Corollary 1. To get more quantitative control, one needs to make more quantitative assumptions.

2.2. Control of the minimal radius under mild mixing conditions. The upcoming results, Corollary 3, Proposition 1, and Lemma 4, are all devoted to establishing that r_* admits stretched exponential bounds under a mild form of quantification of ergodicity. Let us be a bit more precise: By definition of the former, controlling the minimal radius r_* means controlling the sublinear growth of the corrector (ϕ, σ) . The sublinear growth of the corrector, a key element of all homogenization results, is the consequence of the cancellations coming from $\langle \nabla(\phi, \sigma) \rangle = 0$, which due to ergodicity translate into $\lim_{r \uparrow \infty} \int_r \nabla(\phi, \sigma)$, cf. the proof of Corollary 1. The quantification of this relies on two distinct ingredients:

- On the one hand, one needs good *locality* properties of the field $\nabla(\phi, \sigma) = \nabla(\phi, \sigma)(a, x)$: By this it is meant that the solution (ϕ, σ) of the elliptic system (13) & (15) at some point x depends only weakly on the coefficients field a far away from that point: $\nabla(\phi, \sigma)(x)$ depends only weakly on $a|_{\{|y||y-x| \geq R\}}$ for $R \gg 1$. This is established by what we call a *sensitivity* estimate, which is the content of Corollary 3, a purely deterministic result (with a stochastic application in mind).
- On the other hand, one needs good *mixing* properties of the ensemble $\langle \cdot \rangle$ of random coefficient fields a : By this it is meant that the random value of a at some point x statistically depends only weakly on its values far away: $a(x)$ is nearly independent of $a|_{\{|y||y-x| \geq R\}}$ for $R \gg 1$. On the level of Gaussian random fields, this is characterized in terms of the covariance, see Lemma 4.

The goal of the remainder of the paper is to show that by establishing a strong sensitivity estimate in Corollary 3, one can get stretched exponential moment bounds for r_* in Proposition 1 under a mild mixing assumption that allows for strong correlations. Through the family of examples treated in Lemma 4 we argue that in terms of correlations our mixing assumption is the weakest possible quantification of ergodicity. Hence the philosophy is to get away with mild mixing assumption by uncovering a strong sensitivity estimate.

Following Naddaf & Spencer [22] and our earlier work, [13, 10, 11] we use the functional-analytic framework of *spectral gap conditions* to express mixing. Analytically speaking, such a spectral gap estimate is a Poincaré inequality with mean value zero for $\langle \cdot \rangle$ where the role of the gradient is played by what is called the “vertical derivative”, which measures the sensitivity of a random variable $\zeta = \zeta(a)$ on the coefficient field a , cf. (40). In the case of a discrete medium $\{a(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, the

vertical derivative is the Euclidean norm of the partial derivatives $\{\frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial a(x)}\}_x$ and the simplest measure of sensitivity is its ℓ^2 -norm $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial a(x)})^2$. However, the corresponding spectral gap estimate (the name stems from the fact that it bounds the spectral gap of the generator of Glauber dynamics on the space of coefficient fields) expresses a strong form of mixing: Lemma 4 for $\beta' = 0$ reflects the well-known fact that spectral gap in this simple form is related to an *integrable* decay of correlations. Hence to reach our ambitious goal, we need a weakening of the simple spectral gap estimate, which amounts to a strengthening of the norm of the vertical derivative, and thus a strong sensitivity estimate. As we shall see, this flexibility w. r. t. the measure of sensitivity comes naturally for a *continuum* medium.

As mentioned above, we need to capture how sensitively $\nabla(\phi, \sigma) = \nabla(\phi_i, \sigma_{ijk})_{i,j,k=1,\dots,d}$ react to changes of the coefficient field a . It is convenient to measure the influence on $\nabla(\phi, \sigma)$ via its influence on *linear* functionals $F\nabla(\phi, \sigma)$ like the spatial average $\int_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma)$. We think of the average as a function $F(a) := \int_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma)$ defined on the space of uniformly elliptic coefficient fields Ω , and appeal to the functional derivative $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial a}(a, x)$, that is, the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -gradient of F . We recall that for any (bounded and compactly supported) infinitesimal perturbation $\delta a = \delta a(x)$ of a coefficient field a , the functional derivative is characterized by

$$(33) \quad \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (F(a + t\delta a) - F(a)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\partial F}{\partial a}(a, x) \delta a(x) dx.$$

In fact, rather than in this differential structure itself, we are interested in the L^1 -norm of the gradient on some measurable set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, which in view of (33) can be characterized as follows

$$(34) \quad \int_D \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial a} \right| = \sup \left\{ \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (F(a + t\delta a) - F(a)) \mid \sup_{x \in D} |\delta a| \leq 1, \delta a = 0 \text{ outside of } D \right\}.$$

This quantity measures the sensitivity of the random variable F on changes in the coefficient field localized to D . With the spectral gap in case of a discrete medium in mind, we seek an ℓ^2 -way of consolidating these local sensitivities. This is naturally done by working with a partition $\{D\}$ of \mathbb{R}^d into measurable sets and considering the following combined measure of sensitivity

$$(35) \quad \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2.$$

It is obvious from the additivity of (34) in D that (35) is the larger the coarser the partition $\{D\}$ is. The upcoming lemma establishes that $\{D\}$ can be almost as coarse as dyadic annuli, see (38), for (35) to be controlled.

The main progress over the sensitivity estimates in [13, 10, 11] is that we use the $C^{0,1}$ -regularity encoded in (22) of Lemma 2 to get this strong form of sensitivity estimate. Loosely speaking, (22) replaces De Giorgi's $C^{0,\epsilon}$ -theory (for some small

$0 < \epsilon(d, \lambda) \leq 1$) in the earlier work. The price to pay is the appearance of the minimal radius on the r. h. s. of (39).

Corollary 3. *Consider the minimal radius, that is, the random variable $r_* \geq 1$ characterized by (17) for $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, that is*

$$(36) \quad r_* := \inf \left\{ r \geq 1 \mid \forall \rho \geq r \quad \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r} |(\phi, \sigma) - \int_{B_r} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{C(d, \lambda)} \right\}$$

with the understanding that $r_* = +\infty$ if the set is empty.

Consider a linear functional $g \mapsto Fg$ on vector fields $\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \mapsto g(x)$ with the boundedness property that

$$(37) \quad |Fg| \leq \left(\int_{B_r} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some radius $r \geq 1$. Let $\{D\}$ be a partition of \mathbb{R}^d that is not too coarse in the sense that there exists an exponent $\beta < 1$ with

$$(38) \quad \text{diam}D \leq (\text{dist}D + 1)^\beta,$$

where $\text{diam}D := \sup_{x, y \in D} |x - y|$ and $\text{dist}D := \inf_{x \in D} |x|$ denote the diameter and the distance to the origin of a set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, respectively. Then there exists an exponent $0 < \epsilon(d, \lambda) \leq 1$ (from hole-filling) and a constant $C(d, \lambda, \beta) < \infty$ such that we have for all indices $i, j, k = 1, \dots, d$:

$$(39) \quad \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \phi_i}{\partial a} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \sigma_{ijk}}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \leq C(d, \lambda, \beta) \left(\frac{(r + r_*)^{1 - \epsilon(1 - \beta)}}{r} \right)^d.$$

Here comes the main probabilistic result on the minimal radius r_* at which the smallness condition (17) kicks in. It states that if the ergodicity of $\langle \cdot \rangle$ can be quantified in a mild manner, then r_* has exponential moments, cf. (41) below. The ergodicity is quantified by a mild spectral gap condition, cf. (40); it is mild in the sense that the underlying partition $\{D\}$ is allowed to be almost as coarse as dyadic annuli, cf. (38).

Proposition 1. *We assume that $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is stationary and satisfies a spectral gap condition of the following type: There exists a partition $\{D\}$ of \mathbb{R}^d not too coarse in the sense that (38) holds for some $0 \leq \beta < 1$ and there exists a constant $0 < \rho \leq 1$ such that for all random variables ζ*

$$(40) \quad \langle (\zeta - \langle \zeta \rangle)^2 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \left\langle \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \right\rangle.$$

Then r_* defined in (36) has stretched exponential moments in the sense that

$$(41) \quad \left\langle \exp \left(\frac{1}{C(d, \lambda, \rho, \beta)} r_*^{\frac{d}{2} \epsilon(1 - \beta)} \right) \right\rangle \leq 2,$$

where $\epsilon(d, \lambda) > 0$ is the exponent from Corollary 3.

The next lemma shows that the spectral gap condition (40) only requires the mildest decay of correlations. In order to make this point in a simple framework, we choose the case of Gaussian ensemble of scalar fields $a(x)$; in order to get an example of an ensemble of uniformly elliptic coefficient fields, one applies a pointwise nonlinear Lipschitz transform to possibly several copies of the above, which does not affect the validity of the spectral gap condition (43).

Lemma 4. *Let $\langle \cdot \rangle$ stand for the distribution of a scalar Gaussian field $a(x)$ that is stationary and centered, and thus characterized by its covariance*

$$c(x) := \langle a(x)a(0) \rangle.$$

We assume that the covariance decays mildly in the sense that there exists $\beta' \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$(42) \quad |c(x)| \leq (|x| + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')}.$$

Then for all $1 > \beta > \beta'$ there exists a partition $\{D\}$ of \mathbb{R}^d that is not too coarse in the sense of (38) but for which nevertheless the corresponding spectral gap condition holds, that is, there exists $C(d, \beta, \beta') < \infty$ such that for all ζ ,

$$(43) \quad \langle (\zeta - \langle \zeta \rangle)^2 \rangle \leq C(d, \beta, \beta') \left\langle \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right|^2 \right) \right\rangle.$$

3. PROOFS

In this first version of the paper, when it comes to the quantitative probabilistic arguments in Proposition 1, we allow ourselves to be a bit sloppy with questions of measurability and existence (like the qualitative assumption that the minimal radius r_* does have stretched exponential moments), just focussing on the estimates proper. In particular the last issue can and will be handled by a suitable approximation argument.

3.1. Proof of Lemma 1. We make an Ansatz to obtain g , but now consider the space of curl-free *symmetric tensor* fields of vanishing expectation:

$$(44) \quad Y := \{b \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_{sym}^{d \times d}) \mid D_k b_{lm} = D_m b_{lk} \text{ distributionally, } \langle b_{kl} \rangle = 0\},$$

where $R_{sym}^{d \times d}$ stands for the space of symmetric matrices. By Riesz' representation theorem, there exists a unique

$$(45) \quad b_{ij} \in X, \quad \forall \tilde{b} \in X \quad \langle \tilde{b}_{kl} b_{ijkl} - \tilde{b}_{kk} q_{ij} \rangle = 0,$$

where q is defined in (9) and we used Einstein's convention of summation over repeated indices. Clearly, b satisfies the estimate

$$(46) \quad \left\langle \sum_{k,l=1,\dots,d} |b_{ijkl}|^2 \right\rangle \leq \langle |q_{ij}|^2 \rangle.$$

We now claim that definition (45) implies

$$(47) \quad b_{ijkk} = q_{ij}.$$

In giving the argument for (47) we suppress the pair of indices ij . Since $\{D^2\zeta | \zeta \in H^2(\Omega)\} \subset Y$, we have by definition (45) of b and by the curl-free condition in the definition (44) of Y :

$$0 = \langle D_k D_l \zeta b_{kl} - D_k D_k \zeta q \rangle = \langle D_k D_k \zeta (b_{ll} - q) \rangle.$$

Hence in a distributional sense we have $D \cdot D(b_{ll} - q) = 0$, which implies that the random variable $b_{ll} - q$ is shift invariant. By ergodicity, this yields $b_{ll} - q = \langle b_{ll} - q \rangle$. Moreover, by the vanishing-expectation condition in the definition (44) of Y and by the second item in (10) we have $\langle b_{ll} - q \rangle = 0$.

We now claim that thanks to $D \cdot q_i = 0$, cf. (10), we also get from definition (45)

$$(48) \quad b_{ikkj} = 0.$$

For this purpose, we suppress the first index i and note that it holds in a distributional sense by the curl-free condition and the symmetry condition:

$$D_l D_l b_{kjk} = D_l D_k b_{kjl} = D_k D_l b_{klj} = D_k D_j b_{kll} \stackrel{(47)}{=} D_k D_j q_k \stackrel{(10)}{=} 0.$$

Like above, by (qualitative) ergodicity, this yields $b_{kkj} = b_{kjk} = 0$ as desired.

By construction of g and b , these fields are horizontally curl-free in a distributional sense:

$$D_j g_{ik} = D_k g_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad D_l b_{ijkm} = D_m b_{ijkl}.$$

We extend the random variables g , q , and b to stationary fields according to $g(a, x) = g(a(\cdot + x))$, however keeping the same symbol so that in particular (9) is consistent with (16). By definition of the horizontal derivative, spatial and horizontal derivatives are then related by $(\partial_j g)(a, x) = (D_j g)(a(\cdot + x))$, so that we obtain in particular

$$\partial_j g_{ik} = \partial_k g_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_l b_{ijkm} = \partial_m b_{ijkl}.$$

Therefore, there exist fields $\phi_i = \phi_i(a, x)$ and $\sigma_{ijk} = \sigma_{ijk}(a, x)$ with the property that

$$(49) \quad g_{ij} = \partial_j \phi_i, \quad b_{ijkl} - b_{ikjl} = \partial_l \sigma_{ijk}.$$

Clearly, the build-in vanishing expectation properties of g and b translate into those in (11). Moreover, via (46), the moment bounds on g and q , cf. (6) and (10), where thanks to (46), the latter implies a moment bound on b , translate into the moment bounds stated in (11). The fields ϕ_i and σ_{ijk} are uniquely determined by (49) up to a random additive constant in x , which we may fix by requiring $\phi_i(0) = \sigma_{ijk}(0) = 0$, making the fields (generically) non-stationary. However, this ensures that $\{\sigma_{ijk}\}_{ijk}$ inherits the build-in asymmetry of $\{b_{ijkl} - b_{ikjl}\}_{ijk}$, so that we obtain (12).

We note that by definition (49) and (7), the latter rewritten in terms of spatial instead of horizontal derivatives as $\nabla \cdot a(g_i + e_i) = 0$, we obtain (13). For (14), we note that

$$\partial_l \sigma_{ijl} \stackrel{(49)}{=} b_{ijll} - b_{ijjl} \stackrel{(47),(48)}{=} q_{ij}.$$

Finally (15) can be seen as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_l \partial_l \sigma_{ijk} &\stackrel{(49)}{=} \partial_l b_{ijkl} - \partial_l b_{ikjl} \\
&= \partial_l b_{ijlk} - \partial_l b_{iklj} \quad \text{by symmetry of } b \\
&= \partial_k b_{ijll} - \partial_j b_{ikll} \quad \text{by curl-freeness of } b \\
&\stackrel{(47)}{=} \partial_k q_{ij} - \partial_j q_{ik}.
\end{aligned}$$

3.2. Proof of Lemma 3. We split the proof into five steps. In the proof we shall use Caccioppoli's estimate twice, which we recall for convenience in the first step. Following [2], we recover the improvement (30) for a -harmonic functions as a perturbation of a result for a_{hom} -harmonic functions. We thus collect results on the inner and boundary regularity for a_{hom} -harmonic functions $u(x)$ in B_R in the second step. We then compare a -harmonic functions to a_{hom} -harmonic functions in Step 3, and derive a representation formula for the difference which makes crucial use of the correctors (ϕ, σ) . We then combine the regularity theory of Step 2 to the representation formula of Step 3 to prove (30) in Step 4. The last step is dedicated to the proof of (32).

Step 1. Caccioppoli's estimate.

For any a -harmonic function $u(x)$ in B_R , any radius $0 < \rho < \frac{R}{2}$, and any constant c we have

$$(50) \quad \int_{B_{R-\rho}} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\rho^2} \int_{B_R - B_{R-\rho}} (u - c)^2,$$

where here and in the remainder of the proof, \lesssim denotes \leq up to a generic constant that only depends on d and λ . For the convenience of the reader, we recall this standard argument under the weak ellipticity assumption (2), which thanks to the homogeneity of the coefficients could be weakened further, see [8, Proposition 2.1]. By scaling, we may w. l. o. g. assume that $R = 1$ and by adding a constant, $c = 0$, so that it remains to show

$$(51) \quad \int_{B_{1-\rho}} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\rho^2} \int_{B_1 - B_{1-\rho}} u^2.$$

To this purpose we test $-\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = 0$ with $\eta^2 u$, where η is a cut-off for $B_{1-\rho}$ in B_1 ; using Leibniz' rule in form of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla(\eta^2 u) \cdot a \nabla u \\
&= \nabla(\eta u) \cdot a \nabla(\eta u) + u \nabla \eta \cdot a \nabla(\eta u) - u \nabla(\eta u) \cdot a \nabla \eta - u^2 \nabla \eta \cdot a \nabla \eta,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\int \nabla(\eta u) \cdot a \nabla(\eta u) = \int (-u \nabla \eta \cdot a \nabla(\eta u) + u \nabla(\eta u) \cdot a \nabla \eta + u^2 \nabla \eta \cdot a \nabla \eta).$$

By uniform ellipticity and boundedness of a , cf. (2) and (1), this yields

$$\lambda \int |\nabla(\eta u)|^2 \leq \int (2|u| |\nabla \eta| |\nabla(\eta u)| + u^2 |\nabla \eta|^2).$$

By Young's inequality this entails

$$\int |\nabla(\eta u)|^2 \lesssim \int u^2 |\nabla \eta|^2,$$

so that by the properties of the cut-off function we obtain (51).

Step 2. Elliptic regularity theory for constant-coefficients equations.

In terms of inner regularity we need for a_{hom} -harmonic functions u on B_R :

$$(52) \quad R^2 \sup_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |\nabla^2 u|^2 + \sup_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2.$$

In terms of boundary regularity we need for any radius $0 < \rho < \frac{R}{2}$

$$(53) \quad \int_{B_R - B_{R-\rho}} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \rho \int_{\partial B_R} |\nabla^{tan} u|^2.$$

For the convenience of the reader, we reproduce the standard argument for the inner regularity (52) in the system's setting, see for instance [8, Chapter III]. (In the scalar setting there is an alternative approach via the maximum principle.) By scaling, it is enough to consider the case of $R = \frac{1}{2}$; for the sake of brevity we focus on the first estimate, that is

$$\sup_{B_1} |\nabla^2 u|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_2} |\nabla u|^2.$$

Since the coefficients a_{hom} are constant, to the effect that also the components of ∇u are harmonic, this amounts to show

$$\sup_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_2} |u|^2.$$

By Sobolev's embedding, it is enough to show for some integer k with $k > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ that

$$\int_{B_1} (|\nabla^k u|^2 + |\nabla^{k-1} u|^2 + \dots + |\nabla u|^2) \lesssim \int_{B_2} |u|^2.$$

Again, since the components of the tensor $\nabla^\ell u$, $\ell = 0, \dots, k-1$ are a_{hom} -harmonic, this follows from a k -fold application of the Caccioppoli estimate (50), where the radius decreases at every step by the amount of $\frac{1}{k}$.

We now turn to the argument for the boundary regularity (53), which might be a bit less standard in the system's case (in the scalar case, one could w. l. o. g. assume a_{hom} to be isotropic and then argue by the mean value property). In the systems' case it can, by an extension construction, be derived from the Calderon-Zygmund estimate $\int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^p \lesssim \int_{B_R} |g|^p$ for $-\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = \nabla \cdot g$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. For the convenience of the reader, we give an elementary argument based on L^2 -theory, see (60). By scaling, we may w. l. o. g. assume that $R = 1$:

$$(54) \quad \int_{B_1 - B_{1-\rho}} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \rho \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} u|^2 \quad \text{for } 0 < \rho \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By one of the equivalent definitions of the fractional Sobolev norm $(\int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} |^{\frac{1}{2}} u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, there exists an extension $v(x)$ of u such that $\int_{B_1} |\nabla v|^2 \leq \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} |^{\frac{1}{2}} u|^2$. Testing $-\nabla \cdot a_{hom} \nabla u$ with $u - v$, we obtain from using uniform ellipticity and boundedness of a_{hom} :

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla(u - v)|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_1} |\nabla v|^2,$$

and thus by the triangle inequality and the above trace estimate

$$(55) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} |^{\frac{1}{2}} u|^2.$$

In order to obtain a similar estimate for second derivatives (without introducing a change of variables) we work with derivatives $X = X_k \partial_k$ (Einstein's summation convention) which are tangential in the sense that the normal component of the vector field X vanishes on ∂B_1 . We select a finite family of such smooth vector fields with the property that at every point $x \in B_1$, $\{X(x)\}$ generate the tangential subspace $\{\xi | \xi \cdot x = 0\}$ of \mathbb{R}^d . Because of the commutator relation $[\partial_i, X] = (\partial_i X_k) \partial_k$, we obtain from the equation:

$$(56) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\nabla \cdot a_{hom} \nabla X(u) \\ &= -\partial_i (a_{hom,ij} (\partial_j X_k) \partial_k u) - (\partial_i X_k) \partial_k (a_{hom,ij} \partial_j u) \\ &= -\partial_i (a_{hom,ij} (\partial_j X_k) \partial_k u) - \partial_k ((\partial_i X_k) a_{hom,ij} \partial_j u) + (\partial_k \partial_j X_k) a_{hom,ij} \partial_j u. \end{aligned}$$

We note that there exists an extension v of $u|_{\partial B_1}$ such that

$$(57) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla X(v)|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_1} (|\nabla^2 v|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} |^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2.$$

Since X is tangential, $X(u) - X(v)$ vanishes on ∂B_1 and thus is a good test function for (56), so that we obtain as for (55)

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla X(u)|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_1} |\nabla X(v)|^2 + \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2.$$

Using once more the commutator, this turn into

$$\int_{B_1} |X(\nabla u)|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_1} |\nabla X(v)|^2 + \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2.$$

By (55) and (57), this yields the a priori estimate

$$\int_{B_1} |X(\nabla u)|^2 \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} |^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2 + \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} |^{\frac{1}{2}} u|^2 \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla |^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2.$$

Since the X 's generate the tangential space, this implies

$$(58) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla^{tan} \nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} |^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2.$$

Rewriting the equation in non-divergence form as $-a_{hom,ij} \partial_i \partial_j u = 0$, and using that the uniform ellipticity yields $a_{hom,rr} \gtrsim 1$ for the radial-radial component (which in case of systems means that $a_{hom,rr}$ is positive definite and thus invertible), we

recover the second radial derivative in terms of the other ones so that (58) may be upgraded to

$$(59) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla \nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} \|\nabla^{tan}\|^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2.$$

We view (55) and (59) as statements on the boundedness of the a_{hom} -harmonic extension operator in fractional Sobolev spaces. By a simple interpolation argument, this yields the intermediate bound

$$(60) \quad \int_{B_1} \|\nabla\|^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2 + \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} u|^2.$$

In view of (55) and Poincaré's inequality on ∂B_1 , we may focus on the leading order

$$(61) \quad \int_{B_1} \|\nabla\|^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2 \lesssim \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} u|^2.$$

Here comes the argument for (61): Starting point is the equivalent characterization of norms

$$(62) \quad \int_{B_1} \|\nabla\|^{\frac{1}{2}} u|^2 \sim \int_0^\infty \min_{u=u_0+u_1} (\ell \int_{B_1} |\nabla u_1|^2 + \ell^{-1} \int_{B_1} u_0^2) \frac{d\ell}{\ell}.$$

$$(63) \quad \int_{\partial B_1} \|\nabla^{tan}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} v|^2 \sim \int_0^\infty \min_{v=v_0+v_1} (\ell \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} v_1|^2 + \ell^{-1} \int_{\partial B_1} v_0^2) \frac{d\ell}{\ell},$$

which are an immediate consequence of linear algebra, since for the Hilbert space L^2 and the symmetric and positive semidefinite operator $-\Delta$ endowed with Neumann boundary conditions, both identities take the form of

$$\int_0^\infty \min_{u=u_0+u_1} (\ell(u_1|A|u_1) + \ell^{-1}|u_0|^2) \frac{d\ell}{\ell} = \int_0^\infty (u|A(\ell^2 A + 1)^{-1}|u) d\ell = C(u|A^{\frac{1}{2}}|u)$$

for some generic universal constant C . Equipped with (62) and (63), the argument for (60) is straightforward: If T denotes the a_{hom} -harmonic extension operator of boundary data v , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1} \|\nabla\|^{\frac{3}{2}} T v|^2 \\ & \stackrel{(62)}{\sim} \int_0^\infty \min_{Tv=u_0+u_1} (\ell \int_{B_1} |\nabla^2 u_1|^2 + \ell^{-1} \int_{B_1} |\nabla u_0|^2) \frac{d\ell}{\ell} \\ & \leq \int_0^\infty \min_{v=v_0+v_1} (\ell \int_{B_1} |\nabla^2 T v_1|^2 + \ell^{-1} \int_{B_1} |\nabla T v_0|^2) \frac{d\ell}{\ell} \\ & \stackrel{(55),(59)}{\lesssim} \int_0^\infty \min_{v=v_0+v_1} (\ell \int_{\partial B_1} \|\nabla^{tan}\|^{\frac{3}{2}} v_1|^2 + \ell^{-1} \int_{\partial B_1} \|\nabla^{tan}\|^{\frac{1}{2}} v_0|^2) \frac{d\ell}{\ell} \\ & \stackrel{(63)}{\sim} \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla^{tan} v|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (60) with Hölder's and Sobolev's inequality (where $p = \frac{2d}{d-1}$ so that $\frac{d}{p} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{d}{2}$) in form of

$$\left(\int_{B_1 - B_{1-\rho}} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left(\int_{B_1} \|\nabla|^{\frac{3}{2}} u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right),$$

we obtain (54).

Step 3. Representation of the homogenization error with the use of σ .

We now come to the core of the proof. Writing the Dirichlet integral in polar coordinates as $\int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 = \int_0^R \int_{\partial B_r} |\nabla u|^2 dr$, we see that there exists a radius $R' \in (\frac{1}{2}R, R)$ such that

$$(64) \quad \int_{\partial B_{R'}} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2.$$

Let u_{hom} be the a_{hom} -harmonic extension of u on the above-chosen ball $B_{R'}$, that is,

$$(65) \quad -\nabla \cdot a_{hom} \nabla u_{hom} = 0 \text{ in } B_{R'}, \quad u_{hom} = u \text{ on } \partial B_{R'}.$$

We want to study the homogenization error $u - (u_{hom} + \partial_i u_{hom} \phi_i)$, where we use Einstein's summation convention. In order to keep notation lean, we assume w. l. o. g. that the spatial average of (ϕ, σ) on B_R vanishes. In order to enforce vanishing boundary data on $\partial B_{R'}$, for given $\rho \leq \frac{1}{4}R'$ we introduce the cut-off function η for $B_{R'-2\rho}$ in $B_{R'-\rho}$, and thus think of the length ρ as a boundary layer thickness, which will be optimized at the end. We thus consider

$$v := u - (u_{hom} + \eta \partial_i u_{hom} \phi_i).$$

Our first task is to derive a formula for $-\nabla \cdot a \nabla v$ with help of σ . For the convenience of the reader, we reproduce the standard argument. Applying the gradient, we obtain by Leibniz' rule

$$(66) \quad \nabla v = \nabla u - (\nabla u_{hom} + \eta \partial_i u_{hom} \nabla \phi_i + \phi_i \nabla (\eta \partial_i u_{hom})).$$

Applying $-\nabla \cdot a$, this yields because of (29)

$$\begin{aligned} & -\nabla \cdot a \nabla v \\ &= \nabla \cdot (a \nabla u_{hom} + \eta \partial_i u_{hom} a \nabla \phi_i) + \nabla \cdot \phi_i a \nabla (\eta \partial_i u_{hom}) \\ &= \nabla \cdot ((1 - \eta) a \nabla u_{hom} + \eta \partial_i u_{hom} a (\nabla \phi_i + e_i)) + \nabla \cdot \phi_i a \nabla (\eta \partial_i u_{hom}). \end{aligned}$$

Using $-\nabla \cdot a (\nabla \phi_i + e_i) = 0$, cf. (13), this simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & -\nabla \cdot a \nabla v \\ &= \nabla \cdot ((1 - \eta) a \nabla u_{hom}) + \nabla (\eta \partial_i u_{hom}) \cdot a (\nabla \phi_i + e_i) + \nabla \cdot \phi_i a \nabla (\eta \partial_i u_{hom}). \end{aligned}$$

Writing $\nabla (\eta \partial_i u_{hom}) \cdot a_{hom} e_i = \nabla \cdot (\eta \partial_i u_{hom} a_{hom} e_i) = \nabla \cdot (\eta a_{hom} \nabla u_{hom})$, and appealing to (65) in form of $\nabla \cdot (\eta a_{hom} \nabla u_{hom}) = -\nabla \cdot ((1 - \eta) a_{hom} \nabla u_{hom})$, we see that the

above turns into

$$\begin{aligned} & -\nabla \cdot a \nabla v \\ &= \nabla \cdot ((1 - \eta)(a - a_{hom}) \nabla u_{hom}) \\ & \quad + \nabla(\eta \partial_i u_{hom}) \cdot (a(\nabla \phi_i + e_i) - a_{hom} e_i) + \nabla \cdot \phi_i a \nabla(\eta \partial_i u_{hom}). \end{aligned}$$

Using $\nabla \cdot \sigma_i = q_i = a(\nabla \phi_i + e_i) - a_{hom} e_i$, cf. (14), and the skew symmetry of σ_i , cf. (12), in form of

$$\nabla w \cdot (\nabla \cdot \sigma_i) = \partial_j w \partial_k \sigma_{ijk} \stackrel{(12)}{=} \partial_k (\partial_j w \sigma_{ijk}) = \partial_k (\sigma_{ijk} \partial_j w) \stackrel{(12)}{=} -\nabla \cdot (\sigma_i \nabla w),$$

we may rewrite the above as

$$(67) \quad -\nabla \cdot a \nabla v = \nabla \cdot ((1 - \eta)(a - a_{hom}) \nabla u_{hom} + (\phi_i a - \sigma_i) \nabla(\eta \partial_i u_{hom})).$$

Step 4. Estimate based on the representation formula (67).

Because of the boundary condition in (65) and thanks to the cut-off function η , v vanishes on $\partial B_{R'}$. Hence we obtain from testing the above with v and using uniform ellipticity of a :

$$\lambda^2 |\nabla v|_{R'}^2 \leq \int_{B_{R'}} |(1 - \eta)(a - a_{hom}) \nabla u_{hom} + (\phi_i a - \sigma_i) \nabla(\eta \partial_i u_{hom})|^2.$$

By boundedness of a and a_{hom} , cf. (1) and (3), this implies with help of the triangle inequality in $L^2(B_R)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla v|^2 &\lesssim \int_{B_{R'}} (1 - \eta)^2 |\nabla u_{hom}|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{B_{R'}} |\sigma|^2 |\nabla(\eta \nabla u_{hom})|^2 + \int_{B_{R'}} |\phi|^2 |\nabla(\eta \nabla u_{hom})|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where \lesssim means up to a generic constant that only depends on d and λ . In view of (66) and another application of the triangle inequality, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla u - (\nabla u_{hom} + \eta \partial_i u_{hom} \nabla \phi_i)|^2 &\lesssim \int_{B_{R'}} (1 - \eta)^2 |\nabla u_{hom}|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{B_{R'}} |\sigma|^2 |\nabla(\eta \nabla u_{hom})|^2 + \int_{B_{R'}} |\phi|^2 |\nabla(\eta \nabla u_{hom})|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since η is cut-off for $B_{R'-2\rho}$ in $B_{R'-\rho}$, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{R'-2\rho}} |\nabla u - \partial_i u_{hom}(e_i + \nabla \phi_i)|^2 &\lesssim \int_{B_{R'} - B_{R'-2\rho}} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{B_{R'-\rho}} |(\sigma, \phi)|^2 (|\nabla^2 u_{hom}|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2). \end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality in $L^2(B_r)$, we have for all radii $r \leq \frac{R'}{2}$, which because of $\rho \leq \frac{R'}{4}$ implies $r \leq R' - 2\rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - \partial_i u_{hom}(0)(e_i + \nabla \phi_i)|^2 \\ & \leq \int_{B_{R'-2\rho}} |\nabla u - \partial_i u_{hom}(e_i + \nabla \phi_i)|^2 + \int_{B_r} |\nabla u_{hom} - \nabla u_{hom}(0)|^2 |\text{id} + \nabla \phi|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\xi = \nabla u_{hom}(0)$, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi)|^2 \\ & \lesssim \int_{B_r} |\text{id} + \nabla \phi|^2 |\nabla u_{hom} - \nabla u_{hom}(0)|^2 \\ & \quad + \int_{B_{R'-\rho}} |(\phi, \sigma)|^2 (|\nabla^2 u_{hom}|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2) + \int_{B_{R'} - B_{R'-2\rho}} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2 \\ & \lesssim r^2 \sup_{B_r} |\nabla^2 u_{hom}|^2 \int_{B_r} |\text{id} + \nabla \phi|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(\sup_{B_{R'-\rho}} (|\nabla^2 u_{hom}|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2) \right) \int_{B_R} |(\phi, \sigma)|^2 + \int_{B_{R'} - B_{R'-2\rho}} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Step 5. Proof of (30).

We now bring in the regularity for a_{hom} -harmonic maps like u_{hom} derived above in form of

$$(68) \quad \sup_{B_r} |\nabla^2 u_{hom}| \lesssim \left(\frac{1}{R'}\right)^2 \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2,$$

$$(69) \quad \sup_{B_{R'-\rho}} (|\nabla^2 u_{hom}|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2) \lesssim \frac{1}{\rho^2} \left(\frac{R'}{\rho}\right)^d \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2,$$

$$(70) \quad \int_{B_{R'} - B_{R'-2\rho}} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2 \lesssim \rho \int_{\partial B_{R'}} |\nabla^{tan} u_{hom}|^2.$$

In view of $2\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}R'$, estimate (70) is a slight reformulation of (53). Because of our restriction $r \leq \frac{R'}{2}$ we have $B_r \subset B_{\frac{R'}{2}}$ so that (68) follows immediately from (52). For (69) we note that by (52) we have $|\nabla^2 u_{hom}(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} |\nabla u_{hom}(x)|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\rho^2} \int_{B_\rho(x)} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2$; since for $x \in B_{R'-\rho}$ we have $B_\rho(x) \subset B_{R'}$, this implies (69). We combine the regularity estimates for u_{hom} with the elementary a priori estimate of u_{hom} in terms

of u :

$$(71) \quad \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla u_{hom}|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2,$$

$$\int_{\partial B_{R'}} |\nabla^{tan} u_{hom}|^2 \stackrel{(65)}{=} \int_{\partial B_{R'}} |\nabla^{tan} u|^2 \stackrel{(64)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{R} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2.$$

Note that (71) is an elementary consequence of testing (65) with $u_{hom} - u$ and using uniform ellipticity and boundedness of a , (2) and (1). The combination of regularity theory and a priori estimates yields (recall $R' \in (\frac{1}{2}R, R)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\xi + \phi_\xi)|^2 &\lesssim \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^2 \int_{B_r} |\text{id} + \nabla \phi|^2 \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^d \left(\left(\frac{R}{\rho}\right)^{d+2} \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |(\phi, \sigma)|^2 + \frac{\rho}{R} \right) \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that because of the only constraint $0 < \rho \leq \frac{1}{4}R'$ on the boundary layer width ρ and because of $R' \geq \frac{1}{2}$, the length ratio ratio $\frac{\rho}{R}$ may vary freely in $(0, \frac{1}{8}]$. Optimization in this ratio entails (by the choice of $\frac{\rho}{R} = \min\{(\frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |(\phi, \sigma)|^2)^{\frac{1}{d+3}}, \frac{1}{8}\}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi)|^2 &\leq C(d, \lambda) \left(\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^2 \int_{B_r} |\text{id} + \nabla \phi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^d \left(\left(\frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |(\phi, \sigma)|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{d+3}} + \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_R} |(\phi, \sigma)|^2 \right) \right) \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

To arrive at (30), we need a Caccioppoli estimate for ϕ , namely

$$(72) \quad \int_{B_r} |e_i + \nabla \phi_i|^2 \lesssim 1 + \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_{2r}} |\phi_i - \int_{B_{2r}} \phi_i|^2,$$

which follows from

$$\int_{B_r} |e_i + \nabla \phi_i|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_{2r}} |x_i + \phi_i - \int_{B_{2r}} (x_i + \phi_i)|^2,$$

and thus is indeed a consequence of (50) since $u(x) = x_i + \phi_i(x)$ is a -harmonic, cf. (13). This yields (30) for $r \leq \frac{1}{4}R$ (since r was constrained by $r \leq \frac{1}{2}R'$ and $R' \geq \frac{1}{2}R$). The estimate (30) in the complementary range $r \in [\frac{1}{4}R, R]$ is trivial, we just choose $\xi = 0$ in this case.

Step 6. Proof of (32).

The upper bound is an easy consequence of (72). Here comes the argument for the lower bound: For a given ‘‘boundary layer thickness’’ $0 < \rho \leq \frac{r}{2}$ we consider a cut-off function η for $B_{r-\rho}$ in B_r . We obtain by Jensen’s inequality and integration

by parts

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_r} |\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi|^2 &\geq \int \eta |\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi|^2 \\
&\geq \left(\int \eta \right) \left| \xi + \frac{1}{\int \eta} \int \eta \nabla \phi_\xi \right|^2 \\
&= \left(\int \eta \right) \left| \xi - \frac{1}{\int \eta} \int (\phi_\xi - \int_{B_r} \phi_\xi) \nabla \eta \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By the properties of the cut-off function, we thus have on the one hand

$$\int_{B_r} |\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi|^2 \geq (1 - C \frac{\rho}{r}) \left| \xi - \frac{1}{\int \eta} \int (\phi_\xi - \int_{B_r} \phi_\xi) \nabla \eta \right|^2,$$

where C denotes a generic constant only depending on C , and on the other hand

$$\frac{1}{\int \eta} \left| \int (\phi_\xi - \int_{B_r} \phi_\xi) \nabla \eta \right| \leq C \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{B_r} |\phi - \int_{B_r} \phi| |\xi| \stackrel{(31)}{\leq} C \frac{r}{\rho} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} |\xi|.$$

This combines to

$$\int_{B_r} |\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi|^2 \geq (1 - C \frac{\rho}{r}) (1 - C \frac{r}{\rho} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 |\xi|^2.$$

Since we only need to treat the case of $\delta \ll 1$ (“ \ll ” in terms of constants only depending on d), we may optimize by choosing the length ratio $\frac{\rho}{r} = \delta^{\frac{1}{4}} \ll 1$, which yields (32).

3.3. Proof of Lemma 2. We split the proof into two steps.

Step 1. Proof of (20) and (21).

For the application of Lemma 3, we may replace the a -harmonic u by the a -harmonic $x \mapsto u(x) - (\xi \cdot x + \phi_\xi(x))$. Appealing to the bound (17), we may thus rephrase (30) in Lemma 3 as

$$\text{Exc}(r') \lesssim \left((1 + \delta) \left(\frac{r'}{R'} \right)^2 + (\delta^{\frac{1}{a+3}} + \delta) \left(\frac{R'}{r'} \right)^d \right) \text{Exc}(R') \quad \text{for any } r \leq r' \leq R' \leq R,$$

where \lesssim denotes \leq up to a generic constant depending only on d , λ , and eventually α . We now appeal to the smallness condition (17) in order to simplify the above to

$$(73) \quad \text{Exc}(r') \leq C_0 \left(\left(\frac{r'}{R'} \right)^2 + \kappa \left(\frac{R'}{r'} \right)^d \right) \text{Exc}(R'),$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is related to the small constant in (17) that still is at our disposal, and where C_0 denotes a constant only depending on d and λ , whose value we'd like to remember for the next argument, which is a standard argument in elliptic regularity theory, see for instance [8, Lemma 2.1]. In order to iterate (73), we now will choose θ (a placeholder for the ratio $\frac{r'}{R'}$) and $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$C_0(\theta^2 + \kappa\theta^{-d}) \leq \theta^{2\alpha}.$$

Rewriting this inequality in form of

$$\theta^{2(1-\alpha)} + \kappa\theta^{-(d+2\alpha)} \leq \frac{1}{C_0},$$

we see that this is possible for $\theta \ll 1$ and $\kappa \ll 1$ in terms of α and C_0 (and thus d and λ). In conclusion, we may choose the constant $C(d, \lambda, \alpha) = \frac{1}{\kappa^{d+3}}$ in (17) and

$$(74) \quad \theta = \theta(d, \lambda, \alpha) \sim 1$$

in such a way that we have

$$\text{Exc}(\theta R') \leq \theta^{2\alpha} \text{Exc}(R') \quad \text{for all } \frac{1}{\theta}r \leq R' \leq R,$$

which can be iterated to obtain for any non-negative integer n

$$\text{Exc}(\theta^n R) \leq (\theta^n)^{2\alpha} \text{Exc}(R) \quad \text{provided } r \leq \theta^n R.$$

Choosing now n such that $\theta^{n+1}R < r \leq \theta^n R$ and thus on the one hand $\theta^n \leq \theta^{-1} \frac{r}{R}$ while on the other hand $\text{Exc}(r) \leq \theta^{-d} \text{Exc}(\theta^n R)$, this implies

$$\text{Exc}(r) \leq \theta^{-(d+2\alpha)} \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{2\alpha} \text{Exc}(R).$$

Appealing to (74), this turns into (20). Clearly, (21) is an immediate consequence of (32), possibly further reducing the constant in (17).

Step 2. Proof of (22).

In view of the non-degeneracy condition (21), for any $\rho \geq r$, there exists a unique $\xi_\rho \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$(75) \quad \int_{B_\rho} |\nabla u - (\xi_\rho + \nabla \phi_{\xi_\rho})|^2 = \text{Exc}(\rho),$$

so that ξ_ρ can be interpreted as an effective gradient of u on scale ρ . We claim that the dependence of ξ_ρ on the scale ρ is well-controlled by the excess in the sense that for all $R \geq R' \geq r$

$$(76) \quad |\xi_r - \xi_{R'}|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(R') \leq \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla u|^2,$$

where here \lesssim denotes \leq up to a generic constant that only depends on d and $\alpha > 0$. By a dyadic argument which we will sketch presently, it is enough to consider two radii ρ and R' that are close in the sense of $r \leq \rho \leq R' \leq 2\rho$ and to show

$$(77) \quad |\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(R').$$

Here comes the dyadic argument: Let N be the non-negative integer with $2^{-(N+1)}R' < r \leq 2^{-N}R'$. By (77) for $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ we have

$$|\xi_r - \xi_{2^{-N}R'}|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(2^{-N}R'), \quad |\xi_{2^{-(n+1)}R'} - \xi_{2^{-n}R'}|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(2^{-n}R'),$$

and thus by the triangle inequality and since $\alpha > 0$, we obtain (76):

$$|\xi_r - \xi_{R'}|^2 \lesssim \left(\sum_{n=0}^N \sqrt{\text{Exc}(2^{-n}R')} \right)^2 \stackrel{(20)}{\lesssim} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N (2^{-n})^\alpha \sqrt{\text{Exc}(R')} \right)^2 \stackrel{\alpha > 0}{\lesssim} \text{Exc}(R').$$

We now turn to the argument for (77): Thanks to the non-degeneracy condition (21) on scale ρ and applied to $\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}$, we have

$$|\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_\rho} |(\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}) + \nabla \phi_{\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}}|^2,$$

which by linearity we may rewrite as

$$|\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_\rho} |(\xi_\rho + \nabla \phi_{\xi_\rho}) - (\xi_{R'} + \nabla \phi_{\xi_{R'}})|^2,$$

so that by the triangle inequality in $L^2(B_\rho)$, and using $\rho \sim R'$, we obtain

$$|\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_\rho} |\nabla u - (\xi_\rho + \nabla \phi_{\xi_\rho})|^2 + \int_{B_{R'}} |\nabla u - (\xi_{R'} + \nabla \phi_{\xi_{R'}})|^2.$$

By definition (75), and using once more $\rho \sim R'$ this turns as desired into

$$|\xi_\rho - \xi_{R'}|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(\rho) + \text{Exc}(R') \lesssim \text{Exc}(R').$$

We now may conclude the argument for (22) by noting that both sides of the non-degeneracy condition (21) yield by definition of the excess, by definition (75), and with help of the L^2 -triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_R|^2 + \text{Exc}(R) &\lesssim \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2, \\ \int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 &\lesssim |\xi_r|^2 + \text{Exc}(r) \stackrel{(20)}{\lesssim} |\xi_r|^2 + \text{Exc}(R), \end{aligned}$$

which by the triangle inequality in \mathbb{R}^d combine to

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim |\xi_r - \xi_R|^2 + \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2,$$

so that together with (76) we obtain (22).

3.4. Proof of Corollary 1. The important ingredient next to Lemma 2, that we need to establish based on stationarity and ergodicity, is the following:

$$(78) \quad \lim_{r \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r} |(\phi, \sigma) - \int_{B_r} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 = 0 \quad \text{for a. e. } a.$$

This statement for ϕ (in a more involved form) is a key ingredient for the quenched invariance principle, see [24]. We now argue that the same argument can be used to establish this property for σ — to keep notation lean, we just focus on σ . We consider one of the components σ_{jk} of the tensor field σ and drop the indices. The key property of the random, typically non-stationary field $\sigma(a, x)$ is that

$$\nabla \sigma \quad \text{is stationary and of zero expectation and finite variance,}$$

see (11) in the statement of Lemma 1. This implies by von Neumann's mean ergodic theorem

$$(79) \quad \lim_{L \uparrow \infty} \langle |\fint_{B_L} \nabla \sigma|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0,$$

which is an easy consequence of the density of $\{D\phi \mid \phi = \phi(a), \langle \phi^2 \rangle < \infty\}$ in $\{g \mid g = g(a), D_j g_k = D_k g_j, \langle g \rangle = 0\}$ w. r. t. $\langle |g|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ guaranteed by our assumption of ergodicity, see for instance [26] or [17, Proposition 1.6].

The other ingredient is the maximal ergodic theorem [27] and [17, Corollary 2.2]: For a stationary random variable $g(a, x)$ and an exponent $1 \leq q < 2$

$$\left\langle \sup_{\rho > 0} \fint_{B_\rho} |g|^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C(q) \langle |g|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We apply this estimate to $g = \nabla \sigma$ and to $g = \fint_{B_L} \nabla \sigma$, yielding

$$(80) \quad \left\langle \sup_{\rho > 0} \fint_{B_\rho} |\nabla \sigma|^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C(q) \langle |\nabla \sigma|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(d, \lambda, q),$$

$$(81) \quad \left\langle \sup_{\rho > 0} \fint_{B_\rho} \left| \fint_{B_L(x)} \nabla \sigma^q dx \right| \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C(q) \langle |\fint_{B_L} \nabla \sigma|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The last ingredient is a deterministic estimate for an exponent $\frac{2d}{d+2} \leq q < 2$ and two radii $L \leq \rho$

$$(82) \quad \left(\frac{1}{\rho^2} \fint_{B_\rho} (\sigma - \fint_{B_\rho} \sigma)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left(\frac{L}{\rho} \right)^{1-\theta} \left(\fint_{B_{2\rho}} |\nabla \sigma|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\fint_{B_\rho} \left| \fint_{B_L(x)} \nabla \sigma^q dx \right| \right)^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

where $\theta := d(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}) \in (0, 1]$ and where \lesssim stands for \leq up to a generic constant that only depends on d and q . By scaling, we may assume that $\rho = 1$, for which (82) turns into

$$(83) \quad \left(\int_{B_1} (\sigma - \fint_{B_1} \sigma)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim L^{1-\theta} \left(\int_{B_2} |\nabla \sigma|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\int_{B_1} \left| \fint_{B_L(x)} \nabla \sigma^q dx \right| \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Here comes the argument for (83): By the triangle inequality we have

$$(84) \quad \left(\int_{B_1} (\sigma - \fint_{B_1} \sigma)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\int_{B_1} (\delta \sigma_L - \fint_{B_1} \delta \sigma_L)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{B_1} (\sigma_L - \fint_{B_1} \sigma_L)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we introduced the abbreviation $\delta \sigma_L := \sigma - \sigma_L$ and $\sigma_L(x) := \fint_{B_L(x)} \sigma$. By Jensen's inequality (where we use $q \geq \frac{2d}{d+2}$) and Sobolev's estimate (with vanishing

mean value and where we use $q < d$) we get for the second r. h. s. term in (84)

$$(85) \quad \left(\int_{B_1} (\sigma_L - \fint_{B_1} \sigma_L)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\int_{B_1} |\sigma_L - \fint_{B_1} \sigma_L|^{\frac{dq}{d-q}} \right)^{\frac{d-q}{dq}} \\ \lesssim \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla \sigma_L|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \left(\int_{B_1} |(\nabla \sigma)_L|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

For the first r. h. s. term in (84), we use Hölder's and Jensen's inequality, followed by above Sobolev's estimate and the convolution estimate (where we use $L \leq \rho$)

$$(86) \quad \left(\int_{B_1} (\delta \sigma_L - \fint_{B_1} \delta \sigma_L)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq \left(\int_{B_1} |\delta \sigma_L - \fint_{B_1} \delta \sigma_L|^{\frac{dq}{d-q}} \right)^{\theta \frac{d-q}{dq}} \left(\int_{B_1} |\delta \sigma_L|^q \right)^{(1-\theta) \frac{1}{q}} \\ \stackrel{L \leq 1}{\lesssim} \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla \delta \sigma_L|^q \right)^{\theta \frac{1}{q}} L^{1-\theta} \left(\int_{B_2} |\nabla \sigma|^q \right)^{(1-\theta) \frac{1}{q}} \stackrel{L \leq 1}{\lesssim} L^{1-\theta} \left(\int_{B_2} |\nabla \sigma|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Inserting (85) & (86) into (84) yields (83).

We now may conclude (78) by combining these ingredients. We fix a $\frac{2d}{d+2} < q < 2$ and take the supremum of (82) over all $\rho \geq r$ and then applying $\langle (\cdot)^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}}$ we obtain for $L \leq r$

$$\left\langle \left(\sup_{\rho \geq r} \frac{1}{\rho^2} \fint_{B_\rho} |\sigma - \fint_{B_\rho} \sigma|^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{2}{q}} \lesssim \left(\frac{L}{r} \right)^{1-\theta} \left\langle \sup_{\rho > 0} \fint_{B_\rho} |\nabla \sigma|^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} + \left\langle \sup_{\rho > 0} \fint_{B_\rho} |(\nabla \sigma)_L|^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

With help of (80) & (81) this yields

$$\left\langle \left(\sup_{\rho \geq r} \frac{1}{\rho^2} \fint_{B_\rho} |\sigma - \fint_{B_\rho} \sigma|^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{2}{q}} \lesssim \left(\frac{L}{r} \right)^{1-\theta} + \langle |(\nabla \sigma)_L|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $\theta < 1$ and by (79), this implies

$$\lim_{r \uparrow \infty} \left\langle \left(\sup_{\rho \geq r} \frac{1}{\rho^2} \fint_{B_\rho} |\sigma - \fint_{B_\rho} \sigma|^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{2}{q}} = 0.$$

Since $r \mapsto \sup_{\rho \geq r} \frac{1}{\rho^2} \fint_{B_\rho} |\sigma - \fint_{B_\rho} \sigma|^2$ is monotone, this yields the desired (78).

Finally, we now give the argument for the almost-sure Liouville property: By (78), we may restrict to those coefficient fields a 's for which $\lim_{r \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^2} \fint_{B_r} (|\phi - \fint_{B_r} \phi| + |\sigma - \fint_{B_r} \sigma|)^2 = 0$. Hence there exists a radius $r < \infty$ such that (17) holds for α . Now we are given an a -harmonic function u with (23). By Caccioppoli's estimate (50), this can be upgraded to

$$(87) \quad \lim_{R \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \fint_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 = 0,$$

which in turn trivially yields

$$(88) \quad \lim_{R \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \text{Exc}(R) = 0.$$

By (20) this implies for all $\rho \geq r$

$$(89) \quad \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{B_\rho} |\nabla u - (\xi + \nabla \phi_\xi)|^2 = \text{Exc}(\rho) = 0,$$

that is

$$(90) \quad \forall \rho < \infty \quad \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \nabla u = \xi + \nabla \phi_\xi \quad \text{a. e. in } B_\rho,$$

which upgrades to

$$(91) \quad \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \nabla u = \xi + \nabla \phi_\xi \quad \text{a. e. in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and thus in turn implies (24).

3.5. Proof of Corollary 2. In view of the non-degeneracy condition (21), for any $\rho \geq r_*(\pm x)$, there exists a unique $\xi_{\rho, \pm} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$(92) \quad \int_{B_\rho(x_\pm)} |\nabla u - (\xi_{\rho, \pm} + \nabla \phi_{\xi_{\rho, \pm}})|^2 = \text{Exc}(B_\rho(x_\pm)),$$

so that $\xi_{\rho, \pm}$ can be interpreted as an effective gradient of u at $\pm x$ on scale ρ . Recall that we use the shorthand notation $\xi_\pm = \xi_{r_*, \pm}$. As in (76) in the proof of Lemma 2 we have that the dependence of $\xi_{\rho, \pm}$ on the scale ρ is well-controlled by the excess in the sense that we have for all $r \geq r_*(\pm x)$

$$(93) \quad |\xi_\pm - \xi_{r, \pm}|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(B_r(\pm x)),$$

where here and in the remainder of the proof, \lesssim denotes \leq up to a generic constant that only depends on d , λ , and α .

We set for abbreviation

$$(94) \quad r := \max\{4|x|, 2r_*(x), r_*(-x)\} \quad \text{so that } \frac{r}{4} \geq |x|, \frac{r}{2} \geq r_*(x), r \geq r_*(-x).$$

We now claim that on this scale r (which up to the cut-off r_* is essentially the distance between the points x and $-x$), the difference of the corresponding effective gradients $\xi_{r,+}$ and $\xi_{r,-}$ is well-controlled by the excess on that scale in the sense of

$$(95) \quad |\xi_{r,+} - \xi_{r,-}|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(B_r(x)) + \text{Exc}(B_r(-x)).$$

Indeed, by the non-degeneracy condition (21) and thanks to (94), we have

$$|\xi_{r,+} - \xi_{r,-}|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} |(\xi_{r,+} - \xi_{r,-}) + \nabla \phi_{\xi_{r,+} - \xi_{r,-}}|^2.$$

By linearity of $\nabla \phi_\xi$ in ξ , the triangle inequality, and $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x) \stackrel{(94)}{\subset} B_r(\pm x)$, this yields

$$|\xi_{r,+} - \xi_{r,-}|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla u - (\xi_{r,+} + \nabla \phi_{\xi_{r,+}})|^2 + \int_{B_r(-x)} |\nabla u - (\xi_{r,-} + \nabla \phi_{\xi_{r,-}})|^2,$$

which turns into (95) by definition of ξ_r and of the excess.

By the triangle inequality, estimates (93) and (95) combine to

$$(96) \quad |\xi_+ - \xi_-|^2 \lesssim \text{Exc}(B_r(x)) + \text{Exc}(B_r(-x)).$$

Since by (94) we have $r \geq r_*(\pm x)$, and by assumption on R we have $r \leq R$, we may apply Lemma 2 to the effect of

$$\text{Exc}(B_r(x)) + \text{Exc}(B_r(-x)) \lesssim \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{2\alpha} (\text{Exc}(B_{\frac{R}{2}}(x)) + \text{Exc}(B_{\frac{R}{2}}(-x))).$$

Since by assumption $R \geq 4|x|$ we have in particular $B_{\frac{R}{2}}(\pm x) \subset B_R$ so that trivially by definition of the excess,

$$\text{Exc}(B_{\frac{R}{2}}(x)) + \text{Exc}(B_{\frac{R}{2}}(-x)) \lesssim \text{Exc}(B_R).$$

The combination of the three last estimates turns into (27).

3.6. Proof of Corollary 3. We follow the basic strategy of obtaining sensitivity estimates without explicit Green's function estimates from [11, Step 4 in Proof of Lemma 3]. The new additional ingredient is that we use the $C^{1,0}$ -regularity of harmonic functions on length scales larger than the minimal radius r_* , see (22) in Lemma 2. We split the proof into several steps. In the first step we use (22) to establish two near-optimal *localized* energy estimate, which however are limited on scales $r \geq r_*$. We also shall need a suboptimal localized energy estimate which has the advantage of holding on any scale; it will be established in the second step. We conclude in the third and four steps for $r \geq r_*$, and then address the case $r \leq r_*$ in the last step.

Step 1. Optimal localized energy estimates on scales $r \geq r_*$

We note that (17) yields by Caccioppoli's estimate, cf. (72) in the proof of Lemma 3,

$$(97) \quad \int_{B_R} |\nabla \phi_i + e_i|^2 \lesssim 1 \quad \text{for all } R \geq r.$$

We claim that for any decay exponent $\gamma < d$ and a (decaying) function $u(x)$ and a (decaying) vector field $g(x)$ related by

$$(98) \quad -\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = \nabla \cdot g$$

we have

$$(99) \quad \int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda, \gamma) \int \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1\right)^{-\gamma} |g|^2.$$

For this argument, we may by scaling assume that $r = 1$ in (22) and (99). We start by noting that it is enough to establish the estimate

$$(100) \quad \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left(\int_{B_1} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{(2^n)^d} \int_{2^{n-1} < |x| \leq 2^n} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where in this paragraph, \lesssim denotes a constant only depending on d , λ , and γ . Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B_1} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{(2^n)^d} \int_{2^{n-1} < |x| \leq 2^n} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \left(\int_{B_1} (|x| + 1)^{-\gamma} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (2^n)^{\frac{\gamma-d}{2}} \left(\int_{2^{n-1} < |x| \leq 2^n} (|x| + 1)^{-\gamma} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \stackrel{\gamma < d}{\lesssim} \left(\int (|x| + 1)^{-\gamma} |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

so that (100) yields (99). By the triangle inequality in L^2 and existence & uniqueness of decaying solutions for (98), it is enough to establish (100) under the additional assumption of

$$(101) \quad g(x) = 0 \quad \text{unless } x \in B_1,$$

or that for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(102) \quad g(x) = 0 \quad \text{unless } 2^{n-1} < |x| \leq 2^n.$$

Note that in case of (101), estimate (100) turns into the energy estimate for (98), that is, $\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \int |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int |g|^2$, a consequence of uniform ellipticity. In case of (102), (100) turns into

$$(103) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{R^d} \int |g|^2,$$

where $R := 2^{n-1}$ and we are given the additional information of

$$(104) \quad -\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R.$$

Again, by the energy estimate we have $\int |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int |g|^2$. On the other hand, by assumption we may apply Lemma 2 in form of (22), so that thanks to (104) we have $\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim R^{-d} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2$. The combination of the two last estimates yields (103).

In order to also treat σ , we need one further upgrade of (99): For any two decay exponent $\gamma' < \gamma < d$ and a (decaying) function $u(x)$ and a (decaying) vector field $g(x)$ related by (98) we have

$$(105) \quad \int \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda, \gamma, \gamma') \int \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |g|^2.$$

This will be established just appealing to (99), but on all scales $\rho \geq r$. By scale invariance of the assumptions used to establish (105), we may w. l. o. g. assume $r = 1$, so that our starting point is

$$\int_{B_\rho} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int \left(\frac{|x|}{\rho} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |g|^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \geq 1,$$

which we use in the weaker form of

$$(106) \quad \int_{\rho \leq |x| < 2\rho} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \rho^{\gamma'} \int (|x| + 1)^{-\gamma'} |g|^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \geq 1,$$

and where in this paragraph, \lesssim stands for a generic constant only depending on $(d, \lambda, \gamma, \gamma')$. We multiply (106) by $\rho^{-\gamma}$ and obtain

$$\int_{\rho \leq |x| < 2\rho} |x|^{-\gamma} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \rho^{\gamma' - \gamma} \int (|x| + 1)^{-\gamma'} |g|^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \geq 1.$$

Because of $\gamma' < \gamma$, we may sum this over $\rho = 2^n$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, to the effect of

$$\int_{|x| \geq 1} |x|^{-\gamma} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int (|x| + 1)^{-\gamma'} |g|^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \geq 1.$$

Combined with (106) for $\rho = 1$ this yields (105) with $r = 1$.

Step 2. Uniform suboptimal energy estimate.

Next to the fine estimate (22) on an a -harmonic function, which only holds for balls with radius larger than the minimal radius, we need a much coarser estimate that holds for every balls: There exists a decay exponent $\varepsilon(d, \lambda) > 0$ such that for any a -harmonic function $u(x)$, that is,

$$-\nabla \cdot a \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

we have

$$(107) \quad \int_{B_\rho(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda) \left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{\varepsilon d} \int_{B_R(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \leq R \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This is a standard argument due to Kjell-Ove Widman which has been popularized under the name of “hole filling”, see for instance [8, p.81]. It has been used in stochastic homogenization in [18, Lemma 6., Step 2] (without referring to Widman). For convenience of the reader, we sketch the argument: By translational and scaling invariance of the assumptions used to establish (107), it is enough to establish the existence of an $\theta(d, \lambda) < 1$ with

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \theta^N \int_{B_{2^N}} |\nabla u|^2 \quad \text{for all } N \in \mathbb{N},$$

which again by scale invariance and iteration amounts to showing

$$(108) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \theta \int_{B_2} |\nabla u|^2.$$

Here comes the “hole filling” trick: (108) with $\theta = \frac{C}{C+1}$ can be obtained from

$$(109) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C \int_{B_2 - B_1} |\nabla u|^2,$$

where $C(d, \lambda) < \infty$. This estimate is a consequence of Caccioppoli's estimate, cf. (50) with $R = 2$, $\rho = 1$, and $c = \fint_{B_2-B_1} u$ in the proof of Lemma 3, that is,

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_2-B_1} |u - \fint_{B_2-B_1} u|^2,$$

and the Poincaré inequality on the annulus $B_2 - B_1$:

$$\int_{B_2-B_1} |u - \fint_{B_2-B_1} u|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_2-B_1} |\nabla u|^2,$$

where \lesssim denotes $\leq C(d, \lambda)$.

Step 3. Proof of the sensitivity estimate (39) for $r \geq r_*$.

For the sake of notation, we suppress the index i . Recall that we only consider $a \in \Omega'$ (that is, such that $\phi(a, x)$ and $\sigma(a, x)$ have sublinear growth). We now momentarily fix an element D of the partition and denote by a_D another coefficient field that coincides with the given a outside of D . We denote by $(\nabla\phi_D, \nabla\sigma_{jkD})$ the curl-free fields pertaining to the coefficient a_D , which are uniquely determined (since $a_D \in \Omega'$). By sublinearity the differences $\phi - \phi_D$ and $\sigma - \sigma_D$ are decaying and from (13) & (15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (110) \quad -\nabla \cdot a \nabla(\phi - \phi_D) &= \nabla \cdot (a - a_D)(\nabla\phi_D + e), \\ -\Delta(\sigma_{jk} - \sigma_{jkD}) &= \partial_j(a(\nabla\phi + e) - a_D(\nabla\phi_D + e))_k \\ &\quad - \partial_k(a(\nabla\phi + e) - a_D(\nabla\phi_D + e))_j. \end{aligned}$$

Given a family $\{c_D\}_D$ of scalars indexed by the elements of the partition, we combine this to

$$\begin{aligned} (111) \quad -\nabla \cdot a \nabla \sum_D c_D(\phi - \phi_D) &= \nabla \cdot \sum_D c_D(a - a_D)(\nabla\phi_D + e), \\ -\Delta \sum_D c_D(\sigma_{jk} - \sigma_{jkD}) &= \partial_j \sum_D c_D(a(\nabla\phi + e) - a_D(\nabla\phi_D + e))_k \end{aligned}$$

$$(112) \quad -\partial_k \sum_D c_D(a(\nabla\phi + e) - a_D(\nabla\phi_D + e))_j.$$

Because of (111), we get from (99) and (105) applied to $u = \sum_D c_D(\phi - \phi_D)$ and $g = \sum_D c_D(a - a_D)(\nabla\phi_D + e)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_r} |\nabla \sum_D c_D(\phi - \phi_D)|^2 + \int \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1\right)^{-\gamma} |\nabla \sum_D c_D(\phi - \phi_D)|^2 \\ &\lesssim \int \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1\right)^{-\gamma'} \left| \sum_D c_D(a - a_D)(\nabla\phi_D + e) \right|^2 \\ (113) \quad &\leq \sum_D c_D^2 \sup_{x \in D} |a - a_D|^2 \int_D \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1\right)^{-\gamma'} |\nabla\phi_D + e|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used that $a - a_D$ is supported on D and that the D 's are disjoint. Using once more $a(\nabla\phi + e) - a_D(\nabla\phi_D + e) = a\nabla(\phi - \phi_D) + (a - a_D)(\nabla\phi_D + e)$

(and that $(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1)^{-\gamma} \leq (\frac{|x|}{r} + 1)^{-\gamma'}$), we see that the above string of inequalities may be sharpened to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} \left| \sum_D c_D (\nabla \phi - \nabla \phi_D) \right|^2 \\ & + \int \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma} \left| \sum_D c_D (a(\nabla \phi + e) - a_D(\nabla \phi_D + e)) \right|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_D c_D^2 \sup_{x \in D} |a - a_D|^2 \int_D \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |\nabla \phi_D + e|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now turn to (112) and apply (99) to $a = \text{id}$, $u = \sum_D c_D (\sigma_{jk} - \sigma_{jkD})$ and $g = \sum_D c_D (a(\nabla \phi + e) - a_D(\nabla \phi_D + e))_k e_j - \sum_D c_D (a(\nabla \phi + e) - a_D(\nabla \phi_D + e))_j e_k$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} \left| \sum_D c_D (\nabla \sigma_{jk} - \nabla \sigma_{jkD}) \right|^2 \\ & \lesssim \int \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma} \left| \sum_D c_D (a(\nabla \phi + e) - a_D(\nabla \phi_D + e)) \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The combination of the last two estimates yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} \left| \sum_D c_D (\nabla \phi - \nabla \phi_D) \right|^2 + \int_{B_r} \left| \sum_D c_D (\nabla \sigma_{jk} - \nabla \sigma_{jkD}) \right|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_D c_D^2 \sup_{x \in D} |a - a_D|^2 \int_D \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |\nabla \phi_D + e|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which by the boundedness property (37) of the functional F yields

$$\begin{aligned} & r^d \left| \sum_D c_D (F \nabla \phi - F \nabla \phi_D) \right|^2 + r^d \left| \sum_D c_D (F \nabla \sigma_{jk} - F \nabla \sigma_{jkD}) \right|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_D c_D^2 \sup_{x \in D} |a - a_D|^2 \int_D \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |\nabla \phi_D + e|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of $\{c_D\}_D$ this implies by duality

$$\begin{aligned} & r^d \sum_D |F \nabla \phi - F \nabla \phi_D|^2 + r^d \sum_D |F \nabla \sigma_{jk} - F \nabla \sigma_{jkD}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sup_D \left(\sup_{x \in D} |a - a_D|^2 \int_D \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |\nabla \phi_D + e|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now think of a_D as being of the form $a_D = a + t \delta a_D$ with $|t| \ll 1$ and δa_D bounded and supported in D . Dividing by t^2 and letting sending t to zero yields by

definition of $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & r^d \sum_D \left| \int_D \frac{\partial F \nabla \phi}{\partial a} : \delta a_D \right|^2 + r^d \sum_D \left| \int_D \frac{\partial F \nabla \sigma_{jk}}{\partial a} : \delta a_D \right|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sup_D \left(\sup_{x \in D} |\delta a_D|^2 \int_D \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which by duality gives

$$\begin{aligned} & r^d \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \phi}{\partial a} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \sigma_{jk}}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \\ (114) \lesssim & \sup_D \left(\int_D \left(\frac{|x|}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \right) \leq \sup_D \left(\left(\frac{\text{dist} D}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\gamma'} \int_D |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now post-process the r. h. s. of (114) using the coarseness condition (38) on the partition and the suboptimal estimate (107) for the a -harmonic function $u(x) = \phi(x) + e \cdot x$. Let x denote a point in D closest to the origin, then for $\rho := \text{diam} D$ and $R := \text{dist} D = |x|$ we have $\rho \stackrel{(38)}{\leq} (R+1)^\beta \leq R+1$ so that we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_D |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \leq \int_{B_\rho(x)} |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \stackrel{(38),(107)}{\lesssim} \left(\frac{1}{R+1} \right)^{\varepsilon d(1-\beta)} \int_{B_{R+1}(x)} |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{R+1} \right)^{\varepsilon d(1-\beta)} \int_{B_{2R+1}} |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \stackrel{(107)}{\lesssim} \left(\frac{1}{R+r_*+1} \right)^{\varepsilon d(1-\beta)} \int_{B_{\max\{2R+1, r_*\}}} |\nabla \phi + e|^2 \\ & \stackrel{(97)}{\lesssim} (R+r_*+1)^{d(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))} \stackrel{r \geq r_* \geq 1}{\lesssim} (R+r)^{d(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence with the choice of $\gamma' := d(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta)) < d$, (114) assumes the following form

$$r^d \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \phi}{\partial a} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \sigma_{jk}}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \lesssim r^{d(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))},$$

which yields (39) for $r \geq r_*$.

Step 4. Proof of the sensitivity estimate (39) for $r \leq r_*$.

By Step 3 we may apply (39) for radius r_* to the linear functional

$$\tilde{F}u := \left(\frac{r}{r_*} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} Fu.$$

The pre-factor is adjusted so that the bound (37) for F and radius r turns into

$$|\tilde{F}u|^2 = \left(\frac{r}{r_*} \right)^d |Fu|^2 \leq \left(\frac{r}{r_*} \right)^d \int_{B_r} |u|^2 \leq \int_{B_{r_*}} |u|^2,$$

that is, the bound (37) for \tilde{F} and the radius r_* under consideration. By homogeneity of the sensitivity measure, (39) for \tilde{F} and radius r_* then takes the form of

$$\left(\frac{r}{r_*}\right)^d \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \phi}{\partial a} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial F \nabla \sigma_{jk}}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \lesssim r_*^{-\varepsilon d(1-\beta)},$$

which yields (39) for F and radius r in the treated case of $r \leq r_*$.

3.7. Proof of Proposition 1. We split the proof into five steps. We first prove an $L^p(\langle \cdot \rangle)$ -version of the spectral gap with precise p -dependence. We then apply this version of (SG) to the gradient of the generalized correctors. In Step 3 we argue that one can turn bounds on the averaged gradient of the correctors into bounds on the linear growth of the corrector. This allows one in Step 4 to control the minimal radius r^* by the averaged gradient of the correctors. We then conclude in Step 5 that this buckles and yields the desired exponential moment bounds.

Step 1. p-(SG).

We claim that our assumption (40) entails for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$(115) \quad \langle (\zeta - \langle \zeta \rangle)^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \frac{Cp^2}{\rho} \langle \left(\sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \right)^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

with a (generic) universal constant C . $L^p(\langle \cdot \rangle)$ -versions like (115) have crucially been used in earlier work [10, Lemma 2], however without quantifying the p -dependence, which is unavoidable in the proof of this proposition and desirable anyway. The main point is to apply (40) to ζ^p ; we claim that we have by Leibniz' rule:

$$(116) \quad \langle \zeta^{2p} \rangle \leq C \langle \zeta^p \rangle^2 + \left(\frac{Cp^2}{\rho}\right)^p \langle \left(\sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \right)^p \rangle.$$

Indeed, we start from

$$(117) \quad \langle \zeta^{2p} \rangle \leq \langle \zeta^p \rangle^2 + \frac{1}{\rho} \langle \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta^p}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \rangle$$

and $\frac{\partial \zeta^p}{\partial a} = p\zeta^{p-1} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a}$, which entails

$$\sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta^p}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 = p^2 \zeta^{2(p-1)} \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2,$$

so that Hölder's inequality yields

$$\langle \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta^p}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \rangle \leq p^2 \langle \zeta^{2p} \rangle^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \langle \left(\sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right| \right)^2 \right)^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Hence we obtain (116) from (117) by Young's inequality.

It remains to argue how to pass from (116) to (115). The case of $p = 1$ is the original inequality (115). In case of $p \geq 2$, with help of Hölder's inequality on

$\zeta^p = (\zeta^p)^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}(\zeta^p)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$ with exponents $(\frac{2(p-1)}{p-2}, \frac{2(p-1)}{p})$ in form of

$$\langle \zeta^p \rangle^2 \leq \langle \zeta^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}} \langle \zeta^2 \rangle^{2-\frac{p-2}{p-1}} = \left(\frac{1}{C} \langle \zeta^{2p} \rangle \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}} (C^{p-2} \langle \zeta^2 \rangle^p)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$$

for any $C > 0$, and Young's inequality, (116) turns into

$$\langle \zeta^{2p} \rangle \leq C^p \langle \zeta^2 \rangle^p + \left(\frac{Cp^2}{\rho} \right)^p \left\langle \left(\sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right|^2 \right)^p \right) \right\rangle + \frac{1}{C} \langle \zeta^{2p} \rangle,$$

the last r. h. s. of which we absorb in the l. h. s. for C large enough. We assume w. l. o. g. that $\langle \zeta \rangle = 0$; using the original inequality (115) on the first r. h. s. term $\langle \zeta^2 \rangle^p$, followed by Jensen's inequality in form of $\langle \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right|^2 \right)^p \rangle \leq \langle \left(\sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a} \right|^2 \right) \right)^p \rangle$, we obtain (115).

Step 2. Application of p-(SG) to the gradient of the generalized corrector.

We shall apply the spectral gap estimate in its version (115) to the gradient of the corrector averaged over some scale $r \geq 1$, namely, $\zeta := \mathcal{f}_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma)$, and will use Corollary 3 to estimate the r. h. s. of (115). We claim that this yields

$$(118) \quad \left\langle \left| \mathcal{f}_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma) \right|^{2p} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, \beta, \rho) p^2 \left\langle \left(\frac{(r + r_*)^{1-\varepsilon(1-\beta)}}{r} \right)^{dp} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

with the ε from Corollary 3. Note that because of stationarity and vanishing expected value of $\nabla(\phi, \sigma)$, see (11) in the statement of Lemma 1, and which is the source of all cancellations, we have $\langle \mathcal{f}_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma) \rangle = 0$. Hence in view of spectral gap in form of (115), it is enough to appeal to Corollary 3 which yields

$$(119) \quad \sum_D \left(\int_D \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial a} \mathcal{f}_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma) \right|^2 \right) \lesssim \left(\frac{(r + r_*)^{1-\varepsilon(1-\beta)}}{r} \right)^d,$$

where \lesssim means up to a constant only depending on d , λ , and β .

Step 3. From averaged gradient bounds to the control of linear growth.

In order to pass from the averaged gradient $\mathcal{f}_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma)$ to the measure of linear growth $\frac{1}{r^2} \mathcal{f}_{B_r} |(\phi, \sigma) - \mathcal{f}_{B_r}(\phi, \sigma)|^2$, and thus eventually to r_* , we need the interpolation estimate for two radii $1 \leq r' \leq r$

$$(120) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r^2} \mathcal{f}_{B_r} |(\phi, \sigma) - \mathcal{f}_{B_r}(\phi, \sigma)|^2 \\ & \leq C(d) \left(\frac{r'}{r} \right)^2 \mathcal{f}_{B_{2r'}} |\nabla(\phi, \sigma)|^2 + \mathcal{f}_{B_r} \left| \mathcal{f}_{B_{r'}(x)} \nabla(\phi, \sigma) \right|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

and the a priori estimate in form of

$$(121) \quad \mathcal{f}_{B_{2r}} |\nabla(\phi, \sigma)|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda) \left(1 + \frac{1}{r^2} \mathcal{f}_{B_{4r}} |(\phi, \sigma) - \mathcal{f}_{B_{4r}}(\phi, \sigma)|^2 \right).$$

We start by addressing (121); let \lesssim denote \leq up to a constant that only depends on (d, λ) . The part related to $\nabla\phi$ is established in (72) in the proof of Lemma 3. The argument for

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla\sigma|^2 \leq C(d, \lambda) \left(1 + \int_{B_{2r}} |\nabla\phi|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_{2r}} |\sigma - \int_{B_{2r}} \sigma|^2 \right)$$

follows from performing a Caccioppoli argument on the constant-coefficient equation $-\Delta\sigma_{ijk} = \partial_j q_{ik} - \partial_k q_{ij}$, where $q_i = a(\nabla\phi_i + e_i) - a_{hom}e_i$ is already estimated via $\nabla\phi$. We now turn to (120), which is a simple version of (83) in the proof of Corollary 1 and holds for any function $u(x)$. By scaling, we may assume $r = 1$ in (120), so that the estimate turns into

$$(122) \quad \int_{B_1} (u - \int_{B_1} u)^2 \lesssim r^2 \int_{B_2} |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{B_1} \left| \int_{B_r(x)} \nabla u \right|^2 dx,$$

for all $0 < r \leq 1$ and where \lesssim denotes up to a constant only depending on d . In terms of the convolved function $u_r(x) := \int_{B_r(x)} u$, we may split the estimate into the two elementary ones:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} (u_r - \int_{B_1} u_r)^2 &\lesssim \int_{B_1} |\nabla u_r|^2, \\ \int_{B_1} ((u - u_r) - \int_{B_1} (u - u_r))^2 &\leq \int_{B_1} (u - u_r)^2 \lesssim r^2 \int_{B_2} |\nabla u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The first estimate is Poincaré's inequality with mean value zero, the second estimate is the convolution estimate which relies on Jensen and the elementary estimate $\int_{B_1} (u(x) - u(x+z))^2 dx \leq |z|^2 \int_{B_2} |\nabla u|^2$ for $|z| \leq 1$.

Step 4. Estimate of the minimal radius r_* .

We now use stationarity, together with the deterministic estimates (120) & (121) to estimate the minimal radius r_* in terms of the averaged gradient $\int_{B_r} \nabla(\phi, \sigma)$ in the following stochastic sense: For all radii $r \geq C(d, \lambda)$ and all integrability exponents $p \geq 1$ we have

$$(123) \quad \langle I(r_* \geq r) \rangle \leq C^p(d, \lambda) \int_{\frac{r}{C(d, \lambda)}}^{\infty} \left\langle \left| \int_{B_\rho} \nabla(\phi, \sigma) \right|^{2p} \right\rangle \frac{d\rho}{\rho}.$$

For notational convenience, we introduce the random variable $X(r) := \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r} |(\phi, \sigma) - \int_{B_r} (\phi, \sigma)|^2$ and the stationary random variable $Y(r, x) := \int_{B_r(x)} \nabla(\phi, \sigma)$. With these abbreviations, the combination of (120) & (121) turns into

$$(124) \quad X(r) \lesssim \left(\left(\frac{r'}{r} \right)^2 (1 + X(4r)) + \int_{B_r} |Y(r', x)|^2 dx \right),$$

where \lesssim means up to a constant only depending on d and λ . Suppose $r \gg 1$ (in terms of d and λ) is such that

$$(125) \quad r_* \geq r.$$

Then by definition (36) of the minimal radius, there exists $\rho \geq r$ such that

$$X(\rho) \gtrsim 1 \quad \text{but} \quad X(\rho') \lesssim 1 \quad \text{for all } \rho' \geq \rho.$$

Since in view of its form, $r \mapsto X(r)$ cannot decrease by more than a factor 2^d on a dyadic interval, we even have

$$X(\rho') \gtrsim 1 \quad \text{and} \quad X(4\rho') \lesssim 1 \quad \text{for all } \rho' \in (\rho, 2\rho).$$

Hence using (124) with radius r replaced by $\rho' \in (\rho, 2\rho)$, we obtain for all $1 \leq \rho'' \leq \rho'$

$$1 \lesssim \left(\frac{\rho''}{\rho'}\right)^2 + \int_{B_{\rho'}} |Y(\rho'', x)|^2 dx.$$

Hence, using that $\rho' \geq \rho \geq r \gg 1$, there exists a (generic) constant $C = C(d, \lambda)$ such that

$$\int_{B_{\rho'}} |Y\left(\frac{\rho'}{C}, x\right)|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{C},$$

and thus by Jensen for every $p \geq 1$

$$\int_{B_{\rho'}} |Y\left(\frac{\rho'}{C}, x\right)|^{2p} dx \geq \frac{1}{C^p}.$$

Since this lower bound holds in a dyadic interval $\rho' \in (\rho, 2\rho)$ for some $\rho \geq r$, we may write this as

$$(126) \quad \int_r^\infty \int_{B_\rho} |Y\left(\frac{\rho}{C}, x\right)|^{2p} dx \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \geq \frac{1}{C^p}.$$

The set-version of the implication (125) \implies (126) reads

$$I(r_* \geq r) \leq C^p \int_r^\infty \int_{B_\rho} |Y\left(\frac{\rho}{C}, x\right)|^{2p} dx \frac{d\rho}{\rho}.$$

Taking the expectation and appealing to the stationarity of $x \mapsto Y(r, x)$ yields (123).

Step 5. Buckling and estimate of exponential moments of r_* .

We now combine the stochastic estimate (118), which relies on spectral gap, with the stochastic estimate (123), which relies on stationarity, and claim that we obtain for all $r \geq 1$

$$(127) \quad \langle I(r_* \geq r) \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, \beta, \rho) p^2 \left(\frac{1}{r^{\varepsilon(1-\beta)d}} + \frac{1}{r^d} \langle (r_*^{d(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))})^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \right),$$

which we rather will use in form after taking the square root:

$$(128) \quad \langle I(r_* \geq r) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, \beta, \rho) p \left(\frac{1}{r^{\varepsilon(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}}} + \frac{1}{r^{\frac{d}{2}}} \langle (r_*^{d(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))})^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \right).$$

Indeed, inserting (118) into (123), we obtain for all $r \gg C(d, \lambda)$

$$\langle I(r_* \geq r) \rangle \leq (pC)^{2p} \int_{\frac{r}{C}}^\infty \left\langle \left(\frac{(\rho + r_*)^{d(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))}}{\rho^d} \right)^p \right\rangle \frac{d\rho}{\rho},$$

where C denotes a generic constant that only depends on $(d, \lambda, \beta, \rho)$. We appeal to the triangle inequality in $(\int \langle (\cdot)^p \rangle \frac{d\rho}{\rho})^{\frac{1}{p}}$ to obtain as desired

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle I(r_* \geq r) \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq (pC)^2 \left(\left(\int_{\frac{r}{C}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\rho^{p\varepsilon d(1-\beta)}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{\frac{r}{C}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\rho^{pd}} \langle r_*^{pd(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))} \rangle \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \\ & \leq (pC)^2 \left(\frac{1}{r^{\varepsilon(1-\beta)d}} + \frac{1}{r^d} \langle r_*^{pd(1-\varepsilon(1-\beta))} \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the range $1 \leq r \leq C(d, \lambda)$, (127) is trivial.

We finally argue that because of $\varepsilon d(1-\beta) > 0$, (128) buckles and yields an exponential moment bound. For this purpose, it is convenient to change coordinates according to $s_* = r_*^{\varepsilon(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}}$, to replace p by $\frac{p}{2}$ in the estimate for $p \in 2\mathbb{N}$, take the square-root, and use the abbreviation $q := \frac{1}{\varepsilon(1-\beta)}$ in which case (128) turns into

$$(129) \quad \langle I(s_* \geq s) \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, \beta, \rho) p \left(\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{s^q} \langle (s_*^{q-1})^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \quad \text{for all } p \in 2\mathbb{N}, s \geq 1.$$

We shall argue in the following way (this should be justified via approximation): We assume that $s_* = r_*^{\varepsilon(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}}$ has exponential moments in the sense that there exists *some* constant $1 \leq \Lambda < \infty$ with

$$(130) \quad \langle I(s_* > s) \rangle \leq \exp\left(-\frac{s}{\Lambda}\right) \quad \text{for } s \geq \Lambda$$

and will then argue that (129) implies

$$\Lambda \leq C(d, \lambda, \beta, \rho).$$

We first notice that (130) implies the (algebraic) moment bounds

$$(131) \quad \langle s_*^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq Cp\Lambda \quad \text{for all } p \geq \frac{1}{C},$$

where C denotes a generic constant only depending on $(d, \lambda, \beta, \rho)$. Indeed, (130) can be trivially extended to the whole s -range:

$$\langle I(s_* > s) \rangle \leq \exp\left(1 - \frac{s}{\Lambda}\right) \quad \text{for } s \geq 0,$$

so that for integer $p \in \mathbb{N}$, (131) can be seen by integrations by part:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s_*^p \rangle &= \int_0^{\infty} \langle I(s_* > s) \rangle \frac{d}{ds} s^p ds \\ &\leq e \int_0^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{s}{\Lambda}\right) \frac{d}{ds} s^p ds \\ &= e \int_0^{\infty} \Lambda^{p-1} \exp\left(-\frac{s}{\Lambda}\right) \frac{d^p}{ds^p} s^p ds \\ &= ep! \Lambda^p \leq e(p\Lambda)^p. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (131) for a non-integer p can be obtained via Jensen from the next larger integer. We now insert (131) into (129) and thus obtain for all $p \in 2\mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq 1$

$$(132) \quad \langle I(s_* \geq s) \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq Cp \left(\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{s^q} ((q-1)p\Lambda)^{q-1} \right) \leq C \frac{p}{s} \left(1 + \left(\frac{p\Lambda}{s} \right)^{q-1} \right).$$

Written in this form, we see that we may free ourselves from the integer constraint $p \in 2\mathbb{N}$ and replace it by $p \geq 1$ at the expense of a constant. Using that $\Lambda \geq 1$, we rewrite (132) in terms of $\Lambda' := C\Lambda^{\frac{q-1}{q}}$ as

$$\langle I(s_* \geq s) \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \Lambda' \frac{p}{s} \quad \text{for } s \geq p\Lambda' \text{ and } p \geq 1.$$

By optimizing in p through the choice of $p = \frac{s}{e\Lambda'}$, this implies

$$(133) \quad \langle I(s_* > s) \rangle \leq \exp\left(-\frac{s}{e\Lambda'}\right) \quad \text{for } s \geq e\Lambda'.$$

We are done since we may assume that Λ was minimal with the property (130), so that (133) implies $\Lambda \leq e\Lambda' = C\Lambda^{\frac{q-1}{q}}$ and thus $\Lambda \leq C$ as desired.

3.8. Proof of Lemma 4. We split the proof into several steps. We start by recalling an inequality for the variance of a random variable in our (continuum) Gaussian setting. We then use it to reduce our estimate to a deterministic one, turn to the construction of a partition, and then prove the desired deterministic estimate by considering the far-field and the near-field regimes separately.

Step 1. Gaussian inequality for the variance.

Starting point is the following representation of the variance in terms of the vertical derivative:

$$(134) \quad \langle (\zeta - \langle \zeta \rangle)^2 \rangle \leq \left\langle \int \int c(x-x') \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a}(x) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a}(x') dx' dx \right\rangle.$$

Here is how to convince oneself of the validity of (134): By an approximation argument, it is enough to establish (134) only for those ζ that depend on a only via the spatial averages of a on the partition $\{\ell(z + [0, 1]^d)\}_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ of \mathbb{R}^d into cubes of some size $\ell > 0$ (which we think of being small). Let us introduce the following notation for these averages:

$$(135) \quad a(z) := \int_{\ell(z+[0,1]^d)} a \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

In this case, the functional derivative $\{\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a}\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ and the partial derivative $\{\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a(z)}\}_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ of ζ are related via

$$(136) \quad \ell^d \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a}(x) = \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a(z)} \quad \text{for } x \in \ell(z + [0, 1]^d).$$

We infer from (135) that $\{a(z)\}_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is again a centered and Gaussian random field (which now is stationary w. r. t. the action of \mathbb{Z}^d) and thus characterized by its

covariance

$$(137) \quad c_\ell(z - z') := \int_{\ell(z+[0,1]^d)} \int_{\ell(z'+[0,1]^d)} c(x - x') dx' dx.$$

We thus may appeal to the discrete counterpart of (134), namely

$$(138) \quad \langle (\zeta - \langle \zeta \rangle)^2 \rangle \leq \left\langle \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{z' \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_\ell(z - z') \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a(z)} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial a(z')} \right\rangle.$$

By (136) & (137), formula (138) is identical to (134). Since in the Gaussian case, the covariance operator given by the kernel $\{c(z - z')\}_{z, z' \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is the inverse of the Hamiltonian seen as a quadratic form, inequality (138) is just the Brascamp-Lieb inequality [5] reduced to the Gaussian case (but applied in an infinite-dimensional setting).

Step 2. Reduction to a deterministic estimate and its reformulation

In view of identity (134), in order to obtain (43), we have to construct a partition $\{D\}$ with (38) for some $1 > \beta > \beta'$ such that for any field $v(x)$

$$(139) \quad \int \int c(x - x') v(x) v(x') dx' dx \lesssim \sum_D \left(\int_D |v| \right)^2,$$

where \lesssim denotes up to a constant only depending on (d, β, β') . In terms of the (covariance) operator C by which we denote the convolution with the kernel $c(x)$, estimate (139) assumes the more compact form

$$\int v C v \lesssim \sum_D \left(\int_D |v| \right)^2,$$

which by duality follows from

$$(140) \quad \sum_D (\sup_{x \in D} |Cv|)^2 \lesssim \sum_D \left(\int_D |v| \right)^2.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \int v C v &= \sum_D \int_D v C v \\ &\leq \sum_D \left(\int_D |v| \right) (\sup_{x \in D} |Cv|) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_D \left(\int_D |v| \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_D (\sup_{x \in D} |Cv|)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

There is an easy upper bound for the constant in (140) in terms of $\{c_Q\}_Q$:

$$(141) \quad \sum_D (\sup_{x \in D} |Cv|)^2 \leq \left(\sup_D \sum_{D'} c_{DD'} \right)^2 \sum_D \left(\int_D |v| \right)^2,$$

where

$$(142) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{DD'} &:= \sup_{x \in D, x' \in D'} |c(x - x')| \\ &\stackrel{(42)}{\leq} \sup_{x \in D, x' \in D'} (|x - x'| + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \leq (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the argument for (141) amounts to the convolution estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_D (\sup_{x \in D} |Cv|)^2 \\ &= \sum_D \left(\sup_{x \in D} \left| \sum_{D'} \int_{D'} c(x - x') v(x') dx' \right| \right)^2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{definition (142)}}{\leq} \sum_D \left(\sum_{D'} c_{DD'} \int_{D'} |v| \right)^2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Jensen}}{\leq} \sum_D \left(\left(\sum_{D'} c_{DD'} \right) \left(\sum_{D'} c_{DD'} \left(\int_{D'} |v|^2 \right) \right) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sup_D \sum_{D'} c_{DD'} \right) \left(\sup_{D'} \sum_D c_{DD'} \right) \sum_{D'} \left(\int_{D'} |v|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Fix some $1 > \beta > \beta'$. In view of (141) & (142), we are thus left with the purely geometric problem of constructing partition $\{D\}$ of \mathbb{R}^d that satisfies the refinement condition (38) with β while being coarse enough to have

$$(143) \quad \sum_{D'} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \lesssim 1,$$

where \lesssim stands for $\leq C$ with the generic constant C only depending on (d, β, β') .

Step 3. Construction of the partition.

As is well-known from the construction of local grid refinements in numerical analysis, given a $\beta \leq 1$, we may construct $\{D\}$ in such a way that (38) is saturated and that the sets are round, both only in terms of scaling in the sense of

$$(144) \quad \text{diam}D \gtrsim |D|^{\frac{1}{d}} \gtrsim (\text{dist}D)^\beta,$$

where $|D|$ denotes the volume of D . Furthermore, we assume that $|D| \gtrsim 1$. One way of achieving this is to start from the (elementary) Whitney decomposition of the open set $\mathbb{R}^d - \{0\}$, which is based on dyadic cubes. This decomposition coarsens geometrically away from the origin and thus is too coarse for (38) with $\beta < 1$. Since the Whitney decomposition has infinitely many cubes close to the origin, we finally take the union of all sets close to the origin. Then one considers the family of all refinements of this decomposition that satisfy (38) and takes a maximal element in this family. We shall show that (38) together with (144) implies (143). As a

preparation, we show that (38) & (144) imply the following statement on numbers of D 's:

$$(145) \quad \#\{D \mid \text{dist}D \leq R\} \lesssim (R+1)^{d(1-\beta)} \quad \text{for all radii } R,$$

$$(146) \quad \#\{D' \mid \text{dist}(D', D) \leq R\} \lesssim \frac{R^d}{(\text{dist}D + 1)^{d\beta}} + 1 \quad \text{for all } R \ll \text{dist}D.$$

Because of $\beta < 1$, for (145) it is enough to consider annuli:

$$(147) \quad \#\{D \mid R < \text{dist}D \leq 2R\} \lesssim (R+1)^{d(1-\beta)}.$$

In order to establish (147), we first argue that these sets D are contained in a ball of order R :

$$(148) \quad \text{dist}D \leq 2R \implies D \subset B_{4R+1}.$$

This bound follows from the fact that for $x \in D$ we have $|x| \leq \text{dist}D + \text{diam}D \stackrel{(38)}{\leq} 2\text{dist}D + 1$. To complement (148), we now note that because of (144), the sets D in (147) have volume bounded by below:

$$(149) \quad R < \text{dist}D \implies |D| \gtrsim R^{d\beta}.$$

Now because of disjointness of $\{D\}$, this implies as desired

$$\#\{D \mid R < \text{dist}D \leq 2R\} \lesssim \frac{|B_{4R+1}|}{R^{d\beta}},$$

establishing (147) and thus (145).

We now turn to (146). On the one hand, by the triangle inequality, we have $\text{dist}D' \geq \text{dist}D - (\text{dist}(D', D) + \text{diam}D + \text{diam}D')$, which thanks to (38) turns into

$$\text{dist}D' + (\text{dist}D' + 1)^\beta \geq \text{dist}D - (\text{dist}D + 1)^\beta - \text{dist}(D', D).$$

Because of $\beta < 1$, if $\text{dist}(D', D) \ll \text{dist}D$, this implies $\text{dist}D' \gtrsim \text{dist}D$ so that we may conclude from (144)

$$(150) \quad |D'| \gtrsim (\text{dist}D + 1)^{d\beta} \quad \text{provided } \text{dist}(D', D) \ll \text{dist}D.$$

On the other hand, selecting an $x \in D$, we have by the triangle inequality

$$D' \subset B_{\text{dist}(D', D) + \text{diam}D' + \text{diam}D}(x).$$

In view of (38) for D and D' and since

$$\text{dist}D' \leq \text{dist}D + \text{dist}(D, D') + \text{diam}D \leq \text{dist}D + R + (\text{dist}D + 1)^\beta \lesssim \text{dist}D + 1,$$

this turns into

$$(151) \quad D' \subset B_{R+C(\text{dist}D+1)^\beta}(x)$$

for some universal constant $C < \infty$. From the two last statements (150) & (151) we infer as above by disjointness of the sets D'

$$\#\{D' \mid \text{dist}(D', D) \leq R\} \lesssim \frac{|B_{R+C(\text{dist}D+1)^\beta}(x)|}{(\text{dist}D + 1)^\beta},$$

which yields (146).

Equipped with (145) & (146), we now argue in favor of (143).

Step 4. Proof of (143).

We split (143) into a far field term

$$(152) \quad \sum_{D': \text{dist} D' \geq 4 \text{dist} D + 2} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \lesssim 1,$$

a near field term

$$(153) \quad \sum_{D': \text{dist}(D', D) \ll \text{dist} D} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \lesssim 1,$$

and an intermediate term

$$(154) \quad \sum_{D': \text{dist} D' \lesssim \text{dist} D + 1, \text{dist}(D', D) \gtrsim \text{dist} D} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \lesssim 1.$$

The intermediate term follows immediately from (145) and just uses the weak form $\beta \geq \beta'$ of the inequality. We first address the far-field estimate (152) and note that by the triangle inequality $\text{dist}(D, D') \geq \text{dist} D' - (\text{dist} D + \text{diam} D) \stackrel{(38)}{\geq} \text{dist} D' - (2 \text{dist} D + 1)$, so that the elements D' in the sum (152) satisfy $\text{dist}(D, D') \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist} D'$. Hence we see with help of a dyadic decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{D': \text{dist} D' \geq 4 \text{dist} D + 2} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{D'} (\text{dist} D' + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \\ & \lesssim 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{D': 2^{n-1} \leq \text{dist} D' < 2^n} (\text{dist} D' + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \\ (145) \quad & \lesssim 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (2^{n-1} + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} (2^n + 1)^{d(1-\beta)} \\ & \lesssim 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (2^n)^{d(\beta' - \beta)} \stackrel{\beta > \beta'}{\lesssim} 1. \end{aligned}$$

We finally turn to the near-field estimate (153). Let the dyadic radius $R = 2^N$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be so large that $R \sim \text{dist} D$ but still small enough so that (146) is valid.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{D': \text{dist}(D', D) < R} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{D': \text{dist}(D', D) \leq 1} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \\
& \quad + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{D': 2^{n-1} \leq \text{dist}(D, D') < 2^n} (\text{dist}(D, D') + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \\
(146) \quad & \lesssim 1 + \sum_{n=1}^N (2^{n-1} + 1)^{-d(1-\beta')} \left(\frac{(2^n)^d}{(\text{dist} D + 1)^{d\beta}} + 1 \right) \\
& \lesssim_{\beta' < 1} 1 + \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (2^n)^{d\beta'}}{(\text{dist} D + 1)^{d\beta}} \\
& \lesssim_{\beta' > 0} 1 + \frac{(2^N)^{d\beta'}}{(\text{dist} D + 1)^{d\beta}} \stackrel{2^N = R \sim \text{dist} D, \beta \geq \beta'}{\lesssim} 1.
\end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] S. N. Armstrong and C. K. Smart. Quantitative stochastic homogenization of convex integral functionals. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2014.
- [2] M. Avellaneda and F.-H. Lin. Compactness methods in the theory of homogenization. *Comm. Pure and Applied Math.*, 40(6):803–847, 1987.
- [3] M. Avellaneda and F.-H. Lin. Un théorème de Liouville pour des équations elliptiques à coefficients périodiques. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 309(5):245–250, 1989.
- [4] I. Benjamini, H. Duminil-Copin, G. Kozma, and A. Yadin. Disorder, entropy and harmonic functions. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2011.
- [5] H. J. Brascamp and H. Lieb. On extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prkopa-Leindler theorems, including inequalities for log concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation. *J. Functional Analysis*, 22(5):366–389, 1976.
- [6] J.G. Conlon and A. Naddaf. On homogenization of elliptic equations with random coefficients. *Elec. Journal of Probability*, 5:1–58, 2000. Paper no. 9.
- [7] E. De Giorgi, F. Colombini, and L. C. Piccinini. *Frontiere orientate di misura minima e questioni collegate*. Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 1972.
- [8] M. Giaquinta. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems*, volume 105 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, 1983.
- [9] A. Gloria and J.-C. Mourrat. Spectral measure and approximation of homogenized coefficients. *Probab. Theory. Relat. Fields*, 154(1), 2012.
- [10] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. Quantification of ergodicity in stochastic homogenization: optimal bounds via spectral gap on Glauber dynamics. *Invent. Math.*, 2014. DOI 10.1007/s00222-014-0518-z.
- [11] A. Gloria and F. Otto. Quantitative estimates on the periodic approximation of the corrector in stochastic homogenization. Proceedings of the CEMRACS’13 “Modelling and simulation of complex systems: stochastic and deterministic approaches”.
- [12] A. Gloria and F. Otto. Quantitative results on the corrector equation in stochastic homogenization. arXiv:1409.0801.
- [13] A. Gloria and F. Otto. An optimal variance estimate in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(3):779–856, 2011.

- [14] A. Gloria and F. Otto. An optimal error estimate in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(1):1–28, 2012.
- [15] V.V. Jikov, S.M. Kozlov, and O.A. Oleinik. *Homogenization of Differential Operators and Integral Functionals*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [16] S. M. Kozlov. Averaging of differential operators with almost periodic rapidly oscillating coefficients. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 107(149)(2):199–217, 317, 1978.
- [17] U. Krengel. *Ergodic theorems*, volume 6 of *de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. De Gruyter, 1985.
- [18] D. Marahrens and F. Otto. Annealed estimates on the Green’s function. MPI Preprint 69/2012.
- [19] J.-C. Mourrat. Variance decay for functionals of the environment viewed by the particle. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 47(11):294–327, 2011.
- [20] F. Murat. H-convergence. Séminaire d’Analyse fonctionnelle et numérique, Univ. Alger, multi-graphié, 1978.
- [21] F. Murat and L. Tartar. H-convergence. In A.V. Cherkaev and R.V. Kohn, editors, *Topics in the Mathematical Modelling of Composites Materials*, volume 31 of *Progress in nonlinear differential equations and their applications*, pages 21–44. Birkhäuser, 1997.
- [22] A. Naddaf and T. Spencer. Estimates on the variance of some homogenization problems. Preprint, 1998.
- [23] G.C. Papanicolaou and S.R.S. Varadhan. Boundary value problems with rapidly oscillating random coefficients. In *Random fields, Vol. I, II (Esztergom, 1979)*, volume 27 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, pages 835–873. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.
- [24] V. Sidoravicius and A.-S. Sznitman. Quenched invariance principles for walks on clusters of percolation or among random conductances. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 129(2):219–244, 2004.
- [25] L. Simon. Schauder estimates by scaling. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 5(5):391–407, 1997.
- [26] J. von Neumann. Proof of the quasi-ergodic hypothesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 18(1):70–82, 1932.
- [27] K. Yosida and S. Kakutani. Birkhoff’s ergodic theorem and the maximal ergodic theorem. *Proc. Imp. Acad., Tokyo*, 15:165–168, 1939.
- [28] V. V. Yurinskiĭ. Averaging of symmetric diffusion in random medium. *Sibirskii Matematicheskii Zhurnal*, 27(4):167–180, 1986.

(Antoine Gloria) DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES, BELGIUM, AND MEPHYSTO TEAM, INRIA LILLE - NORD EUROPE, VILLENEUVE D’ASCQ, FRANCE
E-mail address: `agloria@ulb.ac.be`

(Stefan Neukamm) MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, TU DRESDEN, GERMANY
E-mail address: `stefan.neukamm@tu-dresden.de`

(Felix Otto) MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES, LEIPZIG, GERMANY
E-mail address: `otto@mis.mpg.de`