

STOCHASTIC ESTIMATES FOR THE THIN-FILM EQUATION WITH THERMAL NOISE

RISHABH S. GVALANI AND MARKUS TEMPELMAYR

ABSTRACT. We construct and derive uniform stochastic estimates on the renormalised model for a class of fourth-order conservative quasilinear singular SPDEs in arbitrary dimension $d \geq 1$ and in the full subcritical regime of noise regularity. The prototype of the class of equations we study is the so-called thin-film equation with thermal noise, also commonly referred to in the literature as the stochastic thin-film equation. We derive an explicit expression for the form of the counterterm as a function of the film mobility which is in surprising agreement with the form conjectured in [GGKO22, Remark 9.1].

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Outline of the paper	4
2. Set up and main result	5
2.1. Ansatz for the counterterm	5
2.2. The centered model	9
2.3. Main result	16
2.4. Analysis of the counterterm	18
3. Proof of Theorem 2.12	21
3.1. Strategy of the proof	21
3.2. Inductive structure of the proof	29
3.3. BPHZ-choice of the renormalisation constant	35
3.4. Annealed Schauder theory	40
3.5. Reconstruction	47
3.6. Algebraic arguments	50
3.7. Three-point arguments	52
3.8. Averaging	54
4. Proof of Theorem 2.16	55
Appendix A. Proof of qualitative smoothness	63
Appendix B. Proof of analyticity	67
References	71

1. Introduction

We would like to study the following class of quasilinear singular stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) posed on \mathbb{R}^{1+d}

$$(1.1) \quad Lu = \nabla \cdot (a(u)\nabla \Delta u) + \nabla \cdot (b(u)\xi),$$

Date: September 28, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 60H17; Secondary 60L30.

Key words and phrases. Quasilinear singular SPDEs, Regularity Structures, BPHZ renormalisation, viscous thin-films.

where L is given by the following fourth-order parabolic operator

$$L := \partial_0 + \Delta^2, \quad \Delta := \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i^2,$$

with the gradient ∇ and divergence $\nabla \cdot$ also defined with respect to x_i for $i = 1, \dots, d$, and where a, b are prescribed scalar-valued nonlinearities and ξ is some \mathbb{R}^d -valued rough, random forcing. We denote by $x = (x_0, \dots, x_d)$ a typical element of \mathbb{R}^{1+d} with x_0 denoting the time-like coordinate and x_i for $i = 1, \dots, d$ the space-like coordinates. One can check that L satisfies some natural scaling invariance with respect to the scaling $\mathfrak{s} = (4, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^{1+d}$, i.e. given some Schwartz function f , we have for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$(1.2) \quad (Lf^\epsilon)(x) = \epsilon^{|L|} (Lf)(\hat{x}),$$

where $|L| = 4$ is the order of the operator L ,

$$(1.3) \quad \hat{x} = (\hat{x}_0, \dots, \hat{x}_d) := (\epsilon^{\mathfrak{s}_0} x_0, \dots, \epsilon^{\mathfrak{s}_d} x_d),$$

and $f^\epsilon(x) := f(\hat{x})$. One should think of ξ as being some ensemble of tempered distributions with a prescribed law. We are specifically interested in the case in which the solution v of

$$(1.4) \quad Lv = \nabla \cdot \xi,$$

is almost surely C^α with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. This implies, by standard Schauder theory, that ξ should at least be in the negative Hölder space $C^{\alpha-3}$. Note that we measure Hölder regularity with respect to the appropriately \mathfrak{s} -scaled Carnot–Carathéodory metric on \mathbb{R}^{1+d} associated to the operator L , see (2.4). We also impose that the ensemble ξ satisfies the following scaling invariance in law

$$(1.5) \quad \hat{\xi}(x) := \epsilon^{3-\alpha} \xi(\hat{x}) \sim \xi(x),$$

where \sim denotes equality in law. The equation (1.1) is singular in the sense that given some $u \in C^\alpha$ with $\alpha < 3/2$ the products $a(u)\nabla\Delta u$ and $b(u)\xi$ cannot be defined in a canonical manner; to avoid case distinctions we will restrict ourselves to the more singular case $\alpha < 1$. What gives us some hope is the fact that (1.1) is locally *subcritical* for $\alpha > 0$. To be more precise, consider $u^\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^{-\alpha} u(\hat{x})$. Then, using (1.2) and (1.5), we formally compute

$$(1.6) \quad (Lu^\epsilon)(x) = \epsilon^{4-\alpha} (Lu)(\hat{x}) = \nabla \cdot (a(\epsilon^\alpha u^\epsilon) \nabla \Delta u^\epsilon)(x) + \nabla \cdot (b(\epsilon^\alpha u^\epsilon) \hat{\xi})(x).$$

From the above rough calculation, we can see that, if a vanishes and b is order one for small u , then as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, u^ϵ , the *fine-scale* version of u , solves the linear equation (1.4). There has been a flurry of research activity in recent years in the study of subcritical singular SPDEs starting with the seminal works of Hairer [Hai13, Hai14], who developed the theory of regularity structures to treat such equations and Gubinelli, Imkeller, and Perkowski [GIP15] who studied these equations using the approach of paracontrolled calculus. Focusing on regularity structures, by now there exists a more or less automated machinery to deal with any semilinear and subcritical singular SPDE with its different aspects contained in the works by Hairer [Hai14], Bruned, Hairer, and Zambotti [BHZ19], Bruned, Chandra, Chevyrev, and Hairer [BCCH21], and Chandra and Hairer [CH16]. The contents of this paper are focused on obtaining uniform estimates for the so-called model which is covered in the semilinear case, using a Feynman-diagrammatic approach, by [CH16] and, using the spectral gap inequality and Malliavin calculus, by Hairer and Steele [HS23]. We also mention the work by Kunick and Tzatsoulis [KT22] which, to our knowledge, is the first paper to use a spectral gap-based approach to derive these stochastic estimates in the tree-based setting, albeit in the very specific case of the dynamical φ_2^4 -model.

In the direction of quasilinear singular SPDEs, the first results go back to Otto and Weber [OW19b, OW19a] who used a rough paths-based approach to treat certain quasilinear singular SPDEs but not in the full subcritical regime. We also mention the works by Bailleul, Debussche, and Hofmanova [BDH19], Furlan and Gubinelli [FG19], Gerencsèr and Hairer [GH19], and Gerencsèr [Ger20]. All of these works share the drawback of not being able to treat the full subcritical regime of regularity and often (as in [BDH19, GH19, Ger20]) rely on transforming the quasilinear SPDE to a semilinear one and using the, by now well-developed, semilinear theory. We refer the reader to the recent work by Bailleul, Hoshino and Kusuoka [BHK22] who study the solution theory for quasilinear SPDEs by working in a non-translation invariant setting. This has the drawback that the stochastic estimates are not known to be true in the full subcritical regime. Furthermore, they can only recover the correct translation-invariant form of the counterterm in a strict subset of the full subcritical regime.

The first works to treat a quasilinear SPDE, namely the equation

$$(1.7) \quad \partial_t u + a(u)\partial_x^2 u = \xi,$$

in the full subcritical regime $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and without transforming the SPDE are contained in the four papers by Otto, Sauer, Smith, and Weber [OSSW21], the second author together with Linares and Otto [LOT23] and Linares, Otto, and Tsatsoulis [LOTT21], respectively, and by the second author [Tem23]. The first of them derives a priori estimates for (1.7) in the full subcritical regime. The second one constructs the necessary algebraic objects, specifically the so-called structure group, and connects them to the ones introduced in [BHZ19] (see also the recent work of Bruned and Linares [BL23] for the analogous connection of the renormalisation group). The third one derives uniform stochastic estimates on the associated model, using Malliavin calculus-based tools and the spectral gap inequality, and the last one studies convergence and universality of the renormalised model.

In all four of these works, the authors work with a regularity structure indexed by multiindices unlike the tree-based one used in [Hai14, BHZ19, BCCH21, CH16, HS23]. This is also the setting we will adopt in this paper and the results of our paper can be thought of as generalising those of [LOTT21] to a much larger class of singular SPDEs, demonstrating the robustness of the method. We point the reader to the lecture notes [LO22, OST23] for an introduction to various aspects of the multiindex-based approach to regularity structures.

We now briefly discuss the main example of equation that we cover in the general class of equations of the form (1.1). Consider the so-called thin-film equation with thermal noise¹, i.e.

$$(TFE) \quad \partial_0 u = -\nabla \cdot (M(u)\nabla \Delta u) + \nabla \cdot (M^{\frac{1}{2}}(u)\xi),$$

where M is some sufficiently nice function of u and ξ is some rough, random forcing, typically space-time white noise. This equation governs the evolution of the height u of a thin, viscous film driven by capillarity, limited by viscosity, and forced by thermal fluctuations. It can be formally derived either in an ad-hoc manner by applying a fluctuation-dissipation ansatz to the deterministic thin-film equation (see [GGKO22, DMS05]) or from first principles by considering an appropriate rescaling of the equations of fluctuating hydrodynamics (see [GMR06]). Here the function M is referred to as the mobility of the film and is typically chosen to be a power law, i.e. $M(u) = u^m$, $m \geq 1$ or more precisely $M(u) = u^3 + \lambda^{3-m}u^m$, with the most physically interesting cases corresponding to $0 < m < 3$. The choice $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to imposing the no-slip boundary condition at the liquid-solid interface, while the choice $\lambda > 0$ and $0 < m < 3$ corresponds to the Navier-slip boundary condition at the interface (see, for example,

¹Also known in the literature as the stochastic thin-film equation.

the discussion in [GO02]). One can check that (TFE) can be cast into the form of (1.1) choosing $a(u) = 1 - M(u)$ and $b(u) = M^{\frac{1}{2}}(u)$.

We note that thin-film equations of the form (TFE) have received some attention in the mathematical literature but only outside the singular regime, i.e. with the noise ξ regular enough so that all products on the right hand side of (TFE) can be defined in a canonical manner. For $d = 1$, the first construction of non-negative martingale solutions to (TFE) in the regular regime with Itô noise and in the presence of an interface potential was given by Fischer and Grün in [FG18]. Gess and Gnann [GG20] constructed non-negative martingale solutions for (TFE) with regular Stratonovich noise, quadratic mobility ($m = 2$), and no interface potential. The question of existence for regular Stratonovich noise and $m = 3$ was settled in [DGGG21] by Dareiotis, Gess, Gnann, and Grün. We refer the reader to [MG22, Sau21] for constructions in higher dimensions with regular noise, to [GK22, DGGS23] for the study of solutions with compactly supported initial data, and to [GMR06, DOGKP19, GGKO22] for the study of numerical discretisations of this equation. To our knowledge, this work is the first to rigorously study the (TFE) in the physically interesting singular regime.

Remark 1.1. We note that we can just as easily consider a more general form of non-linearity, for example, by assuming a and b to be matrix-valued. As will become clear in the later sections, the main arguments for the model estimates are insensitive to the exact form of the right hand side of (1.1). What would be affected would be the exact form of the counterterm which is sensitive to the symmetries of the equation (see the discussion in Section 2.1). Thus, for the sake of both brevity and notational convenience, we work with scalar-valued nonlinearities.

Another rather straightforward generalisation is to replace our choice of L with an arbitrary parabolic operator. Choosing L as

$$L := \partial_0 - \Delta,$$

and replacing accordingly the nonlinear term $a(u)\nabla\Delta u$ by $a(u)\nabla u$ allows us to consider stochastic porous medium type equations of the form

$$\text{(PME)} \quad (\partial_0 - \Delta)u = \nabla \cdot (a(u)\nabla u + b(u)\xi).$$

In particular, this covers the so-called Dean–Kawasaki equation in its full subcritical regime by setting $a \equiv 0$ and $b(u) = u^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to obtain

$$\text{(DKE)} \quad (\partial_0 - \Delta)u = \nabla \cdot (u^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi).$$

In this case, all the proofs carry over *mutatis mutandis*. Of course, even though our model estimates are agnostic to the precise choice of multiplicative nonlinearity, it is likely that the corresponding solution theory will not hold true unless we regularise the nonlinearity appropriately.

We could also drop the divergence on the right hand side of (1.1) and replace $a(u)\nabla u$ by $a(u)\Delta u$ which would allow us to treat the quasilinear multiplicative stochastic heat equation

$$\text{(qSHE)} \quad (\partial_0 - \Delta)u = a(u)\Delta u + b(u)\xi$$

or, by choosing $a \equiv 0$, the so-called generalised parabolic Anderson model (gPAM). Again, the form of the estimates does not change but the form of the counterterm does. In the later sections of the paper, we will remark, whenever possible, on the modifications in our arguments necessary to treat these other equations.

1.1. Outline of the paper. As already hinted at in the introduction, in this paper we focus on deriving uniform stochastic estimates on the model of equations of the form (1.1) in the framework of multiindex-based regularity structures as introduced in [OSSW21] and studied in [LOT23, LOTT21]. In Section 2, we introduce numerous objects needed

to define the model associated to (1.1), starting by imposing a form for the counterterm based only on symmetries of the equation in Section 2.1. Once we have introduced the model, which can be realised as an infinite hierarchy of linear PDEs (see (2.18)), we present the main results of the paper in Theorem 2.12 which contains the uniform estimates on the model. As a consequence of our model estimates, we also obtain as a corollary (using the results of [Tem23]) in Corollary 2.13, convergence of the model as the mollification parameter goes to 0 and uniqueness of the limiting model. In Section 2.4, we carefully study the counterterm associated to (1.1) and provide diverging lower bounds on the renormalisation constants in Theorem 2.16. As a consequence, we show in Section 2.4.1 that, under appropriate conditions, the form of the counterterm agrees with the one conjectured in [GGKO22, Remark 9.1].

Section 3 is dedicated to the proof of the main result. We start by providing a bird's eye view of the structure of the proof in Section 3.1 by introducing the numerous intermediate objects we need to derive the estimates on the model. Since the model is represented by an infinite hierarchy of linear PDEs, we need to derive our estimates inductively. To this end, in Section 3.2, we introduce the ordering with respect to which we perform induction, while in Section 3.3 we explain how we choose our renormalisation constants in a manner which is consistent with this ordering. Section 3.4 is dedicated to the proofs of the various integration arguments which involve inverting the linear operator L , while Section 3.5 provides proofs of the reconstruction arguments needed to make sense of the, a priori, singular products. We conclude with Sections 3.6 to 3.8 where we provide the algebraic, three-point, and averaging arguments needed for the proof.

In Section 4 we provide a proof of the form of the counterterm stated in Theorem 2.16. Appendices A and B contain auxiliary results which are essential for the main result, but are mainly technical and distract for the main ideas of the proof.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Lucas Broux, Benjamin Gess, Florian Kunick, and Felix Otto for many useful discussions during the course of this work.

2. Set up and main result

2.1. Ansatz for the counterterm. Since equation (1.1) is expected to be in need of a renormalisation, we a priori postulate a counterterm on the level of the equation. To this end, we proceed as in [LOTT21]: we start from a general form of the counterterm, and successively reduce the number of degrees of freedom by imposing suitable and natural postulates on the solution. The difficulty lies then in showing that what remains after such a reduction is rich enough to allow us to obtain uniform (in a mollification parameter) stochastic estimates.

We will adhere to the following guiding principles: firstly, we aim for a deterministic counterterm that only depends on the law of the noise.² Secondly, since equation (1.1) is local and in conservative form, it is desirable to obtain a counterterm that is a local function of the solution u and conservative. As we expect a solution u to have Hölder regularity $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the counterterm can be a function of the solution u and the space-time point x , and a polynomial in its derivatives. Moreover, a meaningful counterterm should be of lower order.³ In particular we do not allow for derivatives ∂_0 . The most general counterterm of this form is the following

$$\nabla \cdot \left(\sum_{\beta} h_{\beta}(u, x) \bigotimes_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\nabla^k u)^{\otimes \beta(k)} \right),$$

²Otherwise, we could simply subtract the noise term $b(u)\xi$.

³Otherwise, we could subtract the problematic term $a(u)\nabla\Delta u$.

where β is a multiindex over $k \in \mathbb{N}$ restricted to

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k\beta(k) < |L| - 1 = 3,$$

h_β is a $(1 + \sum_k k\beta(k))$ -tensor applied to a $(\sum_k k\beta(k))$ -tensor, and ∇^k denotes the k -tensor $(\partial_{i_1} \cdots \partial_{i_k} u)_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^d$. In our setting the application of an m -tensor H to an n -tensor U with $m \geq n$, results in an $(m - n)$ -tensor given by

$$\left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^d H_{i_1, \dots, i_m} U_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \right)_{i_{n+1}, \dots, i_m=1}^d.$$

To restrict the counterterm to fewer degrees of freedom, we will now take symmetries of the law of the noise into account. As L is a constant coefficient operator, a solution u of (1.1) satisfies for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$

$$\xi \sim \xi(\cdot + v) \quad \implies \quad u \sim u(\cdot + v),$$

where we recall that \sim denotes equality in law. For a solution of the renormalised equation to preserve this property, we would need to restrict to functions h_β with no explicit space-time dependence. We now turn to reflection invariance. Observe that for the spatial reflection $Rx := (x_0, -x_1, \dots, -x_d)$, any solution u of (1.1) has the property

$$\xi \sim -\xi(R\cdot) \quad \implies \quad u \sim u(R\cdot).$$

For a solution of the renormalised equation to preserve this property, we need to restrict the counterterm to multiindices β such that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k\beta(k) \text{ is odd.}$$

Putting these two properties together, this leads to the reduced form of the counterterm

$$\nabla \cdot (h(u)\nabla u)$$

for a matrix-valued function h . Another invariance of solutions u of (1.1) is the following generalisation of the previous spatial reflection: consider space-like orthogonal transformations of \mathbb{R}^{1+d} of the form $Ox := (x_0, \bar{O}(x_1, \dots, x_d))$ for an orthogonal matrix $\bar{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Since a and b are scalar-valued, any solution u of (1.1) has the property

$$\xi \sim \bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot) \quad \implies \quad u \sim u(O\cdot).$$

This is preserved on the level of the renormalised equation, provided $h = \bar{O}^T h \bar{O}$. Since \bar{O} is an arbitrary orthogonal matrix, h has to be scalar-valued which we therefore assume. The last and most crucial postulate connects the counterterm with the nonlinearities of the equation. To do so, we no longer fix a pair of nonlinearities a, b , but consider all nonlinearities simultaneously. This point of view allows for the following invariance of equation (1.1): for any shift $v \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(2.1) \quad (u, a, b) \text{ satisfies (1.1)} \quad \implies \quad (u - v, a(\cdot + v), b(\cdot + v)) \text{ satisfies (1.1)}.$$

By looking at all nonlinearities at once, the counterterm inherits a functional dependence on a, b , i.e. $h[a, b](u)$. Preserving the above invariance on the level of the renormalised equation is guaranteed by postulating the following shift covariance: for any shift $v \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$h[a, b](u) = h[a(\cdot + v), b(\cdot + v)](u - v).$$

This is equivalent to the fact that the counterterm h coincides with a functional c of the nonlinearities a, b only, i.e.

$$(2.2) \quad h[a, b](u) = c[a(\cdot + u), b(\cdot + u)].$$

Informally speaking, this expresses the idea that the form of the counterterm should not depend on the choice of origin in u -space. Finally, since the deterministic dynamics

of (TFE) are locally well-posed, it is natural to ask that the equation has no counterterm if we set $b \equiv 0$. Given the shift covariance (2.2), this is tantamount to setting $c[a, 0] = 0$.

Remark 2.1 (Form of the counterterm for other equations). For the quasilinear stochastic heat equation (qSHE) in $1 + d$ dimensions, we have $L = (\partial_0 - \Delta)$, $|L| = 2$ and $\mathfrak{s} = (2, 1, \dots, 1)$. The restriction that the counterterm should be deterministic, local in u , and of lower order, leads to the following form

$$\sum_{\beta} h_{\beta}(u, x) \bigotimes_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\nabla^k u)^{\otimes \beta(k)},$$

where h_{β} is a $\sum_k k\beta(k)$ -tensor and β is restricted to $\sum_k k\beta(k) < |L| = 2$. To exploit the reflection invariance of the noise, we observe that $u \sim u(R \cdot)$ provided $\xi \sim \xi(R \cdot)$. Preserving this restricts to $\sum_k k\beta(k)$ being even, hence together with stationarity the counterterm reduces to exactly $h(u)$.

Similarly, for the stochastic porous medium equation (PME) in $1 + d$ dimensions, we have $L = (\partial_0 - \Delta)$, $|L| = 2$, and $\mathfrak{s} = (2, 1, \dots, 1)$. The restriction that the counterterm should be deterministic, local in u , conservative, and of lower order leads to the following general form,

$$\nabla \cdot \left(\sum_{\beta} h_{\beta}(u, x) \bigotimes_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\nabla^k u)^{\otimes \beta(k)} \right),$$

where we must have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k\beta(k) < |L| - 1 = 1,$$

Imposing the same symmetries as for (TFE), leads us to the conclusion that the counterterm must be 0.

The above discussion motivates the following assumption on the ensemble ξ .

Assumption 2.2 (Part I). The law \mathbb{E} of the tempered distribution ξ satisfies

- (i) $\xi(\cdot) \sim \xi(\cdot + v)$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}$,
- (ii) $\xi(\cdot) \sim \bar{O}^T \xi(O \cdot)$ for any space-like orthogonal transformation

$$Ox = (x_0, \bar{O}(x_1, \dots, x_d)),$$

for some orthogonal $\bar{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

Remark 2.3. Combining (i) and (ii) with $\bar{O} = -\text{id}$ of Assumption 2.2 we obtain $\xi \sim -\xi$, in particular $\mathbb{E}\xi = 0$.

Note that if an ensemble ξ satisfies Assumption 2.2, then $\xi * \rho$ still satisfies the assumption, provided $\rho = \rho(O \cdot)$.

We can summarise the renormalisation problem as follows. We consider a mollified noise $\xi_{\tau} := \xi * \psi_{\tau}$ for a suitably⁴ rescaled mollifier ψ satisfying Assumption 2.2, and we aim to find a scalar-valued function h (depending on τ and the choice of the mollifier ψ) satisfying (2.2) such that the solution manifold of the renormalised equation

$$(2.3) \quad Lu = \nabla \cdot (a(u)\nabla \Delta u) + \nabla \cdot (b(u)\xi_{\tau}) - \nabla \cdot (h(u)\nabla u)$$

stays under (quantitative) control as the mollification parameter τ tends to 0. We will make more precise what we mean by controlling the solution manifold in Section 2.3, see in particular Theorem 2.12.

To obtain this quantitative control on the solution manifold we will need an appropriate mixing assumption on the noise ensemble, which takes the form of a spectral gap (SG) inequality. We follow the discussion in [LOTT21, Section 2.1] and recall the main

⁴we will choose a specific ψ in (3.1)

objects involved, for a more in-depth discussion we refer the reader to the aforementioned reference. We measure distances with the parabolic Carnot–Carathéodory distance

$$(2.4) \quad |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}} := \sum_{i=0}^d |x_i - y_i|^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}_i}},$$

where $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathbb{N}^{1+d}$ is the scaling associated to the operator L . Equipped with this notion of distance, the effective dimension D of \mathbb{R}^{1+d} is given by

$$(2.5) \quad D = \sum_{i=0}^d \mathfrak{s}_i,$$

and we may define (parabolic) Hölder spaces with respect to this distance in the usual manner. Additionally, we can define anisotropic versions of Sobolev norms $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^s}$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, with the help of the space-time elliptic operator LL^* , as follows

$$(2.6) \quad \|G\|_{\dot{H}^s} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dx |(LL^*)^{\frac{s}{2|L|}} G(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Here, G is allowed to be vector-valued (or even matrix-valued, cf. (2.8)). Furthermore, we define cylindrical functionals

$$F[\xi] = f(\langle \xi, \zeta_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \xi, \zeta_N \rangle)$$

for some $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and \mathbb{R}^d -valued Schwartz functions ζ_1, \dots, ζ_N , where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the pairing between a tempered distribution and a Schwartz function. For such cylindrical functionals we may define

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial \xi}[\xi] = \sum_{i=1}^N \partial_i f(\langle \xi, \zeta_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \xi, \zeta_N \rangle) \otimes \zeta_i$$

as a map from \mathbb{R}^{1+d} to $\mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, and for suitable $\delta \xi : \mathbb{R}^{1+d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\mathbb{R}^n \ni \delta F(\delta \xi) := \left\langle \frac{\partial F}{\partial \xi}[\xi], \delta \xi \right\rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dx \frac{\partial F}{\partial \xi}[\xi](x) \delta \xi(x).$$

As will become clear in the later sections, we will only consider $n \in \{1, d\}$. Having introduced this notion of derivative, we are in a position to formulate our final assumption on the ensemble ξ .

Assumption 2.2 (Part II). The law \mathbb{E} of the tempered distribution ξ satisfies

(iii) for $\alpha \in (\max\{0, \frac{3}{2} - \frac{D}{4}\}, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and $s := \alpha - 3 + D/2$ the spectral gap inequality

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbb{E} |F - \mathbb{E}F|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{\partial F}{\partial \xi} \right\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^2,$$

for all integrable cylindrical functionals F . In addition, we assume that the operator (2.7), which is defined on cylindrical functions, is closable with respect to the topologies of $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{2}}|\cdot|^2$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^2$.

Assuming that the constant in (2.8) is equal to 1 is no restriction by a suitable rescaling of space-time. Note that if an ensemble ξ satisfies (2.8) with constant 1, then $\xi * \rho$ satisfies (2.8) with constant $\|\rho\|_{L^1}$.

Remark 2.4. The spectral gap inequality (2.8) implies the corresponding p -version $\mathbb{E}|F - \mathbb{E}F|^p \lesssim_p \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{\partial F}{\partial \xi} \right\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^p$ for any $p \geq 2$, which we will frequently use in form of

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |F|^p \lesssim_p |\mathbb{E}F| + \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \frac{\partial F}{\partial \xi} \right\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^p.$$

Indeed, the p -version follows formally by applying (2.8) to $F^{p/2}$ and using the chain rule; for a rigorous proof see e.g. [IORT23, Proposition 5.1]. Furthermore, the closability of (2.7) extends to the topologies of $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}|\cdot|^p$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^p$.

Remark 2.5. Let $\xi_t(y) := \xi * \psi_t(y)$ with ψ_t defined in (3.1). Then ξ_t is a cylindrical functional with derivative $\psi_t(y - \cdot)$, which is centered by Remark 2.3, and an application of (2.9) yields

$$(2.10) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}|\xi_t(y)|^p \lesssim_p \|\psi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha-3}.$$

Hence, the Kolmogorov's continuity theorem tells us that indeed ξ has a modification which has Hölder continuous realisations for any exponent less than $\alpha - 3$. Thus, this motivates our choice of $s = \alpha - 3 + D/2$ in the spectral gap inequality (2.8).

Remark 2.6. The only assumptions which are essential for our proof are Assumption 2.2 (i) and (iii). Assumption 2.2 (ii) is made mainly for the sake of convenience to reduce the complexity of the counterterm. A careful inspection of our proof shows that the more complex setting can also be treated in this framework. Let us briefly comment on the restriction of α in Assumption 2.2 (iii): $\alpha > 0$ is dictated by subcriticality and used several times in the proof, $\alpha > 3/2 - D/4$ is necessary for reconstruction, see (3.14), and $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ is related to the failure of Schauder theory for integer exponents, see Lemma 3.11 and Remark 3.12, while $\alpha < 1$ is assumed just for convenience to simplify the norms we work with and avoid case distinctions.

Remark 2.7 (Spectral gap assumption for other equations). For the stochastic porous medium equation (PME) and the Dean–Kawasaki equation (DKE), we would choose $s = \alpha - 1 + D/2$ in the spectral gap assumption (2.8). By a similar argument to the one in Remark 2.5, the resulting Hölder regularity of the noise would be arbitrarily close to but less than $\alpha - 1$. Similarly, for the quasilinear stochastic heat equation (qSHE), we would choose $s = \alpha - 2 + D/2$ and obtain noise of Hölder regularity arbitrarily close to but less than $\alpha - 2$. In the former case, α would be restricted to $\alpha \in (0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, while in the latter it would be restricted to $\alpha \in (\max\{0, 1 - \frac{D}{4}\}, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$; in both cases we have $D = 2 + d$.⁵

2.2. The centered model. In this section, we are after a parameterisation of the whole solution manifold. This is tantamount to defining the so-called centered model in the language of regularity structures. Again, we will closely follow the strategy of [LOTT21, Section 2.2] and start with a discussion of the linear equation. If a and b are constant, we obtain from (2.2) that the corresponding counterterm h is constant. As we shall see in Lemma 3.11, for fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$ and under a suitable growth condition there is a unique solution v of the linear equation (1.4) satisfying $v(x) = 0$. Therefore, a canonical parameterisation for solutions u of (2.3) for $a = 0$, $b = 1$ is given by $u = v + p$, where p satisfies $Lp = 0$. Such p are analytic, and following [LOTT21], we extend this parameterisation to all analytic functions p by asking that $Lp = 0$ to hold true modulo analytic functions. We postulate that this parameterisation persists for analytic a and b that are sufficiently close to 0 and 1, respectively. Since the constant part of the solution can be recovered by shifting a and b , see (2.1), we observe that even analytic p with $p(0) = 0$ provide a sufficiently rich parameterisation. A natural choice for coordinates on this space is therefore given by

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbf{n}}[p] := \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!} \frac{\partial^{\mathbf{n}} p}{\partial x^{\mathbf{n}}}(0), \quad \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\},$$

⁵As in Remark 2.6, the restriction $\alpha > 0$ is for subcriticality, $\alpha < 1$ to avoid case distinctions, and $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ due to the failure of Schauder theory; the analogous consideration that leads to (3.14) yields $2\alpha > 1 - D/2$ for the former case (which is weaker than $\alpha > 0$ due to $D = 2 + d \geq 3$), and $2\alpha > 2 - D/2$ for the latter case (which is more stringent than $\alpha > 0$ in $D = 2 + d = 2 + 1$).

which together with

$$(2.11) \quad \mathbf{a}_k[a] := \frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k a}{du^k}(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}_\ell[b] := \frac{1}{\ell!} \frac{d^\ell b}{du^\ell}(0), \quad k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

is expected to provide a complete parameterisation of the above mentioned solution manifold. From now on we shall always assume $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d}$ and we will usually refrain from writing the corresponding set. Additionally, we will write $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

To approach the centered model Π_x , the previous discussion suggests, at least on a formal level, to make the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} & u(y) - u(x) \\ &= \sum_{\beta} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) \prod_k \left(\frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k a}{du^k}(u(x)) \right)^{\beta(k)} \prod_{\ell} \left(\frac{1}{\ell!} \frac{d^\ell b}{du^\ell}(u(x)) \right)^{\beta(\ell)} \prod_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!} \frac{\partial^{\mathbf{n}} p}{\partial x^{\mathbf{n}}}(x) \right)^{\beta(\mathbf{n})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we sum over multiindices $\beta : \mathbb{N}_0 \dot{\cup} \mathbb{N}_0 \dot{\cup} (\mathbb{N}_0^{1+d} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$.

Notation. We remark here that we shall denote by k an element of the first copy of \mathbb{N}_0 corresponding to the nonlinearity a , and by ℓ an element of the second copy of \mathbb{N}_0 corresponding to the nonlinearity b .

Recall that for $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ we have $u - u(x) = v + p$. Choosing $p = 0$ and denoting the unit vectors⁶ in directions k, ℓ, \mathbf{n} by $e_k, f_\ell, g_{\mathbf{n}}$, respectively, we deduce $\Pi_{x f_0} = v$. Keeping $a = 0$ and $b = 1$, but letting p vary, we learn for multiindices β satisfying $\beta(k) = 0 = \beta(\ell)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$(2.12a) \quad \Pi_{x\beta} = \begin{cases} (\cdot - x)^{\mathbf{n}} & \text{if } \beta = g_{\mathbf{n}}, \\ v & \text{if } \beta = f_0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By using the monomials

$$\mathbf{z}^\beta := \prod_k \mathbf{a}_k^{\beta(k)} \prod_{\ell} \mathbf{b}_\ell^{\beta(\ell)} \prod_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\beta(\mathbf{n})},$$

the above power series ansatz can be more compactly written as

$$(2.13) \quad u(y) - u(x) = \sum_{\beta} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) \mathbf{z}^\beta [a(\cdot + u(x)), b(\cdot + u(x)), p(\cdot + x) - p(x)].$$

This allows to work with the space of formal power series $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k]_k, [\mathbf{b}_\ell]_\ell, [\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{n}}]_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}}]$, and define $\Pi_x = \sum_{\beta} \Pi_{x\beta} \mathbf{z}^\beta$. Also c from (2.2) as a functional of a, b can be identified with a power series $c = \sum_{\beta} c_{\beta} \mathbf{z}^\beta$. From the equation (2.3), one can then (formally!) derive the following hierarchy of PDEs for the coefficients $\Pi_{x\beta}$:

$$(2.14a) \quad L\Pi_{x\beta} = \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta}^- \quad \text{up to analytic functions, where}$$

$$(2.14b) \quad \Pi_{x\beta}^- := \left(\sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k \nabla \Delta \Pi_x + \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell \xi_\tau - \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m \nabla \Pi_x (D^{(\mathbf{0})})^m c \right)_\beta.$$

To see this, we first note that, with the shorthand notation $a' := a(\cdot + u(x))$, $b' := b(\cdot + u(x))$ and $p' := p(\cdot + x) - p(x)$, the above ansatz (2.13) can be rewritten as $u(y) - u(x) = \Pi_x[a', b', p'](y)$. Then, clearly the left hand side of (2.3) equals $L\Pi_x[a', b', p']$. For the first term on the right hand side of (2.3), we note that $a(u) = a'(u - u(x)) =$

⁶e.g. $e_k : \mathbb{N}_0 \dot{\cup} \mathbb{N}_0 \dot{\cup} (\mathbb{N}_0^{1+d} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfies $e_k(k') = \delta_k^{k'}$ for k' in the first copy of \mathbb{N}_0 , $e_k(\ell') = 0$ for ℓ' in the second copy of \mathbb{N}_0 , and $e_k(\mathbf{n}') = 0$ for $\mathbf{n}' \in \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$

$a'(\Pi_x[a', b', p'])$, which by (2.11), yields $a(u) = (\sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k)[a', b', p']$. Hence, this term can be written as

$$(\nabla \cdot \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k \nabla \Delta \Pi_x)[a', b', p'].$$

For the second term on the right hand side of (2.3), we proceed in a similar manner to obtain that it equals

$$(\nabla \cdot \sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell \xi)[a', b', p'].$$

For the last term on the right hand side of (2.3), we have to work a little bit harder. Using (2.2), we know that the counterterm is of the form $c[a(\cdot + u), b(\cdot + u)]$. To express this as a functional of a and b we first consider the infinitesimal generator $D^{(0)}$ of u -shift on (a, b) -space, defined as follows

$$(D^{(0)}c)[a, b] := \frac{d}{dv} \Big|_{v=0} c[a(\cdot + v), b(\cdot + v)].$$

Iterating this definition, we obtain

$$((D^{(0)})^m c)[a, b] = \frac{d^m}{dv^m} \Big|_{v=0} c[a(\cdot + v), b(\cdot + v)],$$

and hence by Taylor's theorem

$$c[a(\cdot + v), b(\cdot + v)] = \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{1}{m!} v^m (D^{(0)})^m c \right)[a, b].$$

Since $h[a, b](u) = c[a(\cdot + u), b(\cdot + u)] = c[a'(\cdot + \Pi_x[a', b', p']), b'(\cdot + \Pi_x[a', b', p'])]$, we obtain

$$h[a, b](u) = \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m (D^{(0)})^m c \right)[a', b', p'],$$

which finally tells us that the last term on the right hand side of (2.3) equals

$$\left(\nabla \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m \nabla \Pi_x (D^{(0)})^m c \right)[a', b', p'].$$

Since a, b, p were arbitrary, this concludes the argument for (2.14a).

We remark for later use that $D^{(0)}$ is a derivation, and by (2.11) it satisfies $D^{(0)}\mathbf{a}_k = (k+1)\mathbf{a}_{k+1}$ and $D^{(0)}\mathbf{b}_\ell = (\ell+1)\mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}$. Moreover, it satisfies $D^{(0)}\mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} = 0$, on $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]$ it therefore has to coincide with the derivation

$$(2.15) \quad D^{(0)} = \sum_k (k+1)\mathbf{a}_{k+1} \partial_{\mathbf{a}_k} + \sum_\ell (\ell+1)\mathbf{b}_{\ell+1} \partial_{\mathbf{b}_\ell}.$$

Note that its matrix components $(D^{(0)})_\beta^\gamma$, defined by

$$D^{(0)}\mathbf{z}^\gamma = \sum_\beta (D^{(0)})_\beta^\gamma \mathbf{z}^\beta,$$

are given by

$$(2.16) \quad (D^{(0)})_\beta^\gamma = \sum_k (k+1)\gamma(k)\delta_\beta^{\gamma - \mathbf{e}_k + \mathbf{e}_{k+1}} + \sum_\ell (\ell+1)\gamma(\ell)\delta_\beta^{\gamma - \mathbf{f}_\ell + \mathbf{f}_{\ell+1}},$$

and that the sums over k, ℓ are finite for fixed β . Furthermore, for fixed β there are only finitely many γ with $(D^{(0)})_\beta^\gamma \neq 0$, hence (2.15) extends from $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]$ to $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$. For later use, we mention the following consequence of (2.16)

$$(2.17) \quad (D^{(0)})_\beta^\gamma \neq 0 \implies \begin{cases} \sum_k \beta(k) = \sum_k \gamma(k), \\ \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) = \sum_\ell \gamma(\ell), \\ \sum_k k\beta(k) + \sum_\ell \ell\beta(\ell) = 1 + \sum_k k\gamma(k) + \sum_\ell \ell\gamma(\ell), \\ \beta(\mathbf{n}) = \gamma(\mathbf{n}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.8. Let us point out that for fixed β the sums over k, ℓ, m in (2.14b) are finite sums and are thus well-defined. Although (2.14) looks like a nonlinear equation, it is, in fact, an infinite hierarchy of linear equations,

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} L\Pi_{x\beta} &= \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta}^- \quad \text{up to analytic functions,} \\ \Pi_{x\beta}^- &= \sum_k \sum_{e_k + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{k+1} = \beta} \Pi_{x\beta_1} \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_k} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{x\beta_{k+1}} \\ &\quad + \sum_\ell \sum_{f_\ell + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_\ell = \beta} \Pi_{x\beta_1} \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_\ell} \xi_\tau \\ &\quad - \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{m+2} = \beta} \Pi_{x\beta_1} \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_m} \nabla \Pi_{x\beta_{m+1}} ((D^{(0)})^m c)_{\beta_{m+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

As follows from Lemma 3.7 (i), this is indeed a hierarchy. To illustrate the complexity of this hierarchy, we enumerate a few examples⁷ of the equations solved by components $\Pi_{x\beta}$:

$$\begin{aligned} L\Pi_{xf_0} &= \nabla \cdot \xi_\tau, \\ L\Pi_{xf_0+f_1} &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_0} \xi_\tau - \nabla \Pi_{xf_0} c_{f_1}), \\ L\Pi_{xf_1+g_n} &= \nabla \cdot ((\cdot - x)^n \xi_\tau - \nabla (\cdot - x)^n c_{f_1}), \\ L\Pi_{xe_1+2f_0} &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_0} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xf_0} - \nabla \Pi_{xf_0} c_{e_1+f_0}), \\ L\Pi_{xe_1+f_0+g_n} &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_0} \nabla \Delta (\cdot - x)^n + (\cdot - x)^n \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xf_0} - \nabla (\cdot - x)^n c_{e_1+f_0}), \\ L\Pi_{x2f_1+g_n} &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_1+g_n} \xi_\tau - \nabla (\cdot - x)^n c_{2f_1} - \nabla \Pi_{xf_1+g_n} c_{f_1}), \\ L\Pi_{xf_0+f_2+g_n} &= \nabla \cdot (2(\cdot - x)^n \Pi_{xf_0} \xi_\tau - \nabla (\cdot - x)^n c_{f_0+f_2} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\Pi_{xf_0} \nabla (\cdot - x)^n (D^{(0)}c)_{f_2}}_{=2c_{f_1}} - (\cdot - x)^n \nabla \Pi_{xf_0} \underbrace{(D^{(0)}c)_{f_2}}_{=2c_{f_1}}), \\ L\Pi_{xe_2+2f_0+g_n} &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_0}^2 \nabla \Delta (\cdot - x)^n + 2(\cdot - x)^n \Pi_{xf_0} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xf_0} - \nabla (\cdot - x)^n c_{e_2+2f_0} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\Pi_{xf_0} \nabla (\cdot - x)^n (D^{(0)}c)_{e_2+f_0}}_{=2c_{e_1+f_0}} - (\cdot - x)^n \nabla \Pi_{xf_0} \underbrace{(D^{(0)}c)_{e_2+f_0}}_{=2c_{e_1+f_0}}), \\ L\Pi_{x2e_1+2f_0+g_n} &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xe_1+2f_0} \nabla \Delta (\cdot - x)^n + (\cdot - x)^n \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xe_1+2f_0} \\ &\quad + \Pi_{xe_1+f_0+g_n} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xf_0} + \Pi_{xf_0} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xe_1+f_0+g_n} \\ &\quad - \nabla (\cdot - x)^n c_{2e_1+2f_0} - \nabla \Pi_{xe_1+f_0+g_n} c_{e_1+f_0} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\Pi_{xf_0} \nabla (\cdot - x)^n (D^{(0)}c)_{2e_1+f_0}}_{=c_{e_0+e_1+f_0}} - (\cdot - x)^n \nabla \Pi_{xf_0} \underbrace{(D^{(0)}c)_{2e_1+f_0}}_{=c_{e_0+e_1+f_0}}), \\ L\Pi_{xe_1+f_0+f_1+g_n} &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_0+f_1} \nabla \Delta (\cdot - x)^n + (\cdot - x)^n \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xf_0+f_1} \\ &\quad + \Pi_{xf_0} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xf_1+g_n} + \Pi_{xf_1+g_n} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{xf_0} + \Pi_{xe_1+f_0+g_n} \xi_\tau \\ &\quad - \nabla (\cdot - x)^n c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} - \nabla \Pi_{xf_1+g_n} c_{e_1+f_0} - \nabla \Pi_{xe_1+f_0+g_n} c_{f_1} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\Pi_{xf_0} \nabla (\cdot - x)^n (D^{(0)}c)_{e_1+f_1}}_{=c_{e_0+f_1}+c_{e_1+f_0}} - (\cdot - x)^n \nabla \Pi_{xf_0} \underbrace{(D^{(0)}c)_{e_1+f_1}}_{=c_{e_0+f_1}+c_{e_1+f_0}}). \end{aligned}$$

From Remark 2.8, we can already notice that for some multiindices β we have $\Pi_{x\beta} = 0$, for example $\beta \in \{0, 2f_0, \dots\}$. This motivates the following definition. We call a

⁷we list those components that are relevant for $\alpha > 1/2$, see (4.1)

multiindex *populated*, if and only if

$$(2.19) \quad 1 + \sum_k k\beta(k) + \sum_\ell \ell\beta(\ell) = \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \beta(\mathbf{n}) \quad \text{and} \\ \left(\beta \text{ is purely polynomial, i.e. } \beta = g_{\mathbf{n}} \text{ for some } \mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) > 0 \right).$$

We can motivate the above condition through the following scaling argument. Consider (TFE) with some smooth ensemble ξ and define $u_\lambda = \lambda u$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Then, it is easy to check that u_λ solves the same equation as u but with nonlinearities $a_\lambda = a(\lambda^{-1} \cdot)$ and $b_\lambda = \lambda b(\lambda^{-1} \cdot)$ and parameterisation $p_\lambda = \lambda p$. Thus, using the formal power series expansion (2.13) for the solution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(u(y) - u(x)) &= u_\lambda(y) - u_\lambda(x) \\ &= \sum_\beta \Pi_{x\beta}(y) z^\beta [a_\lambda(\cdot + u_\lambda(x)), b_\lambda(\cdot + u_\lambda(x)), p_\lambda(\cdot + x) - p_\lambda(x)] \\ &= \sum_\beta \lambda^{-\sum_k k\beta(k) - \sum_\ell (\ell-1)\beta(\ell) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \beta(\mathbf{n})} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) z^\beta [a(\cdot + u(x)), b(\cdot + u(x)), p(\cdot + x) - p(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

The first part of the population condition (2.19) follows from equating the powers of λ of the above expression and (2.13) multiplied by λ . For the second part of (2.19), we impose that $\Pi_{x\beta}$ is a multilinear map of the noise of rank at least 1, unless β is purely polynomial. Let u_λ denote the solution obtained by choosing the noise $\lambda\xi$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Clearly, this is the same as considering the solution obtained by choosing the nonlinearity $b_\lambda = \lambda b$. Using the power series expansion of the solution, we have

$$\sum_\beta \Pi_{x\beta}[\lambda\xi](y) z^\beta [a, b, p] = \sum_\beta \Pi_{x\beta}[\xi](y) z^\beta [a, b_\lambda, p] = \sum_\beta \lambda^{\sum_\ell \beta(\ell)} \Pi_{x\beta}[\xi](y) z^\beta [a, b, p].$$

From the above expression, clearly $\sum_\ell \beta(\ell) > 0$ for all β not purely polynomial since, otherwise, the associated $\Pi_{x\beta}$ is not multilinear with rank at least 1.

Analogous, we will restrict $c \in \mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell]]$ a priori by the following population condition

$$(2.20) \quad c_\beta \neq 0 \quad \implies \quad \sum_k k\beta(k) + \sum_\ell \ell\beta(\ell) = \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) > 0.$$

We will see in Section 3.3 that c -components violating this condition will not play any role in renormalisation. One can also motivate this population constraint using the same scaling argument as for $\Pi_{x\beta}$. If we insist that, even in the presence of the counterterm, u_λ as defined earlier is a solution (with $a_\lambda, b_\lambda, p_\lambda$), then we must have

$$h[a_\lambda, b_\lambda](u_\lambda) = h[a, b](u).$$

The first part of condition (2.20) then follows by using the power series expansion for the counterterm and enforcing the above identity. For the second part of (2.20), we consider the $c[a, b_\lambda]$ for $b_\lambda = \lambda b$ with $\lambda > 0$. Then, using the power series expansion of c , we have

$$c[a, b_\lambda] = \sum_\beta c_\beta z^\beta [a, b_\lambda] = \sum_\beta \lambda^{\sum_\ell \beta(\ell)} c_\beta z^\beta [a, b].$$

Since by assumption $c[a, 0] = 0$, each component of the above power series for which $c_\beta \neq 0$ must converge to 0 as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Thus, we must have $\sum_\ell \beta(\ell) > 0$.

We therefore postulate

$$\Pi_{x\beta} \neq 0 \quad \implies \quad \beta \text{ populated,}$$

and consider Π_x as taking values in

$$\Gamma^* := \{ \pi \in \mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_n]] \mid \pi_\beta \neq 0 \implies \beta \text{ populated} \}.$$

For later use, we introduce the polynomial part $\bar{\mathbb{T}}^*$ of \mathbb{T}^* by

$$\bar{\mathbb{T}}^* := \left\{ \pi \in \mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]] \mid \pi_\beta \neq 0 \implies \beta \text{ purely polynomial} \right\}.$$

This induces the decomposition of \mathbb{T}^* into

$$\mathbb{T}^* = \bar{\mathbb{T}}^* \oplus \tilde{\mathbb{T}}^*.$$

Analogous to Π_x , we want to consider Π_x^- as a \mathbb{T}^* valued map, where we note the following: For $\pi, \pi' \in \mathbb{T}^*$, one can check that $\sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \pi^\ell$ is again in \mathbb{T}^* , and the same holds true for $\sum_m \pi^m \pi' (D^{(0)})^m c$ due to the population constraint (2.20) of c and the mapping properties (2.17) of $D^{(0)}$. Moreover, due to the presence of the factors \mathbf{b}_ℓ and c , these products belong in fact to $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^*$. As opposed to that, $\sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \pi^k \pi'$ is in general not⁸ an element of \mathbb{T}^* . However, in case it is an element of \mathbb{T}^* , then due to the presence of the factor \mathbf{a}_k it is automatically contained in $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^*$. We therefore introduce the projection P from $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$ to $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^*$ in the definition of Π_x^- , to obtain the $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^*$ valued map

$$(2.21) \quad \Pi_x^- = P \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k \nabla \Delta \Pi_x + \sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell \xi_\tau - \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m \nabla \Pi_x (D^{(0)})^m c,$$

which is consistent with (2.14b).

Remark 2.9. Via the hierarchy (2.14a) we can associate $\Pi_{x,\beta}$ to trees, as is usually done in the theory of regularity structures [Hai14]. Neglecting the counterterm, $\beta(k)$ equals the number of nodes without decoration and with $k+1$ outgoing edges, k of them with L^{-1} -decoration and one of them with $L^{-1} \nabla \Delta$ -decoration, $\beta(\ell)$ equals the number of nodes with a noise decoration and with ℓ outgoing edges with L^{-1} -decoration, and $\beta(\mathbf{n})$ equals the number of nodes with an \mathbf{n} -th monomial decoration and without children. Hence the total number of nodes is given by $\sum_k \beta(k) + \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \beta(\mathbf{n})$, while the number of edges is given by $\sum_k (k+1)\beta(k) + \sum_\ell \ell \beta(\ell) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} 0\beta(\mathbf{n})$. The population condition $1 + \sum_k k\beta(k) + \sum_\ell \ell \beta(\ell) = \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \beta(\mathbf{n})$ is then equivalent to saying that the number of edges differs from the number of nodes by 1, i.e. β corresponds to a tree, and $\Pi_{x,\beta}$ equals the linear combination of all trees with this given configuration. For more details and proofs we refer the reader to [LOT23, Section 7].

We turn to the *homogeneity* $|\beta|$ of a multiindex β which we define as follows

$$(2.22) \quad |\beta| := \alpha(1 + [\beta]) + |\beta|_p,$$

where

$$(2.23) \quad [\beta] := \sum_k k\beta(k) + \sum_\ell \ell \beta(\ell) - \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \beta(\mathbf{n}), \quad |\beta|_p := \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} |\mathbf{n}| \beta(\mathbf{n}), \quad |\mathbf{n}| := \sum_{i=0}^d \mathfrak{s}_i \mathbf{n}_i.$$

The appearance of the homogeneity is best seen from the following formal scaling argument. Recall from (1.6) that if u is a solution to (1.1), then u^ε is a solution to (1.1) provided a, b and ξ are replaced by $\hat{a} := a(\varepsilon^\alpha \cdot)$, $\hat{b} := b(\varepsilon^\alpha \cdot)$ and $\hat{\xi}$ given by (1.5). Notice that this persists for the renormalised equation, provided h is replaced by $\hat{h} := \varepsilon^2 h(\varepsilon^\alpha \cdot)$. On the parameterisation p , we now impose the same scaling as on u , i.e. $\hat{p}(x) := \varepsilon^{-\alpha} p(\hat{x})$ with \hat{x} given in (1.3). From this we obtain $\varepsilon^{-\alpha} u[a, b, p, \xi](\hat{y}) = u^\varepsilon(y) = u[\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{p}, \hat{\xi}](y)$. Using $\varepsilon^\alpha \mathbf{z}^\beta [\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{p}] = \varepsilon^{|\beta|} \mathbf{z}^\beta [a, b, p]$ in (2.13), we read off

$$\Pi_{\hat{x}, \beta}[\hat{\xi}](\hat{y}) = \varepsilon^{|\beta|} \Pi_{x, \beta}[\hat{\xi}](y).$$

⁸consider e.g. $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{n}_1}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{n}_2} \in \mathbb{T}^*$, then $\mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{n}_1} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{n}_2} \notin \mathbb{T}^*$

Notation. We denote the set of all homogeneities by

$$\mathbf{A} := \{|\beta| \mid \beta \text{ populated}\}.$$

As a subset of $\alpha\mathbb{N}_0 + \mathbb{N}_0$ this set is bounded from below and locally finite. Furthermore, by $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ from Assumption 2.2 (iii), we have

$$(2.24) \quad |\beta| \in \mathbf{A} \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \quad \implies \quad \beta \text{ is purely polynomial.}$$

Remark 2.10. Note that by (2.19) and (2.23) we have for populated multiindices $1 + [\beta] = \sum_{\ell} \beta(\ell) > 0$, in particular $[\beta] \geq 0$. This is exactly the population condition in [LOTT21, (2.23)].

Remark 2.11 (Hierarchy, population and homogeneity for other equations). For the quasilinear heat equation (qSHE), (2.12) still holds true, where v of (2.12b) now satisfies $(\partial_0 - \Delta)v = \xi$. Similarly, one can obtain the hierarchy

$$(\partial_0 - \Delta)\Pi_x = \Pi_x^- = P \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k \Delta \Pi_x + \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell} \xi_{\tau} - \sum_{m} \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m (D^{(0)})^m c.$$

The population condition (2.19) is the same, however (2.20) changes to $c_{\beta} = 0$ unless β is populated. The reason is that there is no additional term $\nabla \Pi_x$ multiplying c on the right hand side of the hierarchy of equations. Also the homogeneity given by (2.22) stays the same. For the generalised porous medium equation (PME), (2.12) stays the same with v from (2.12b) satisfying (1.4), and the hierarchy is given by

$$(\partial_0 - \Delta)\Pi_x = \nabla \cdot \Pi_x^- = \nabla \cdot \left(P \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k \nabla \Pi_x + \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell} \xi_{\tau} \right).$$

The population condition (2.19) as well as the homogeneity (2.22) persist.

Before stating the main theorem, we introduce the recentering maps Γ_{xy}^* . Since the following is not equation dependent at all, we just collect the main properties needed from [LOTT21, Section 2.2.6]. In Section 3.1.6 we construct a group \mathbf{G}^* that contains these maps Γ_{xy}^* . Let us also mention that it is possible to find a space \mathbf{T} and a group \mathbf{G} , such that $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{G})$ is a regularity structure in the sense of [Hai14, Definition 2.1], such that \mathbf{T}^* is the algebraic dual of \mathbf{T} , and such that Γ_{xy}^* is dual to some $\Gamma_{yx} \in \mathbf{G}$. A detailed discussion of this can be found in [LOT23, Section 5.3] and [LOTT21, Section 2.6].

We aim for linear maps $\Gamma_{xy}^* \in \text{End}(\mathbf{T}^*)$ that recenter the model in the sense of

$$(2.25) \quad \Pi_x = \Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y + \Pi_x(y),$$

and satisfy

$$(2.26) \quad \Gamma_{xy}^* = \Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_{xx}^* = \text{id}.$$

Moreover, we impose triangularity with respect to the homogeneity

$$(2.27) \quad (\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id})_{\beta}^{\gamma} \neq 0 \quad \implies \quad |\gamma| < |\beta|,$$

and for purely polynomial multiindices

$$(2.28) \quad (\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{\gamma} = \begin{cases} \binom{\mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{m}} (y-x)^{\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{m}} & \text{if } \gamma = g_{\mathbf{m}} \text{ for some } \mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{n}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{n}$ has to be understood componentwise.

2.3. Main result. The main result Theorem 2.12 establishes the existence of Π_x and Γ_{xy}^* that satisfy, along with all the postulates from above, suitable stochastic estimates which are uniform in the mollification parameter τ . For convenience, we choose to mollify by $\xi_\tau := \xi * \psi_\tau$ with the semigroup ψ_τ defined in (3.1), however no substantial changes occur when choosing a different kernel ρ , as long as ρ satisfies $\rho = \rho(O \cdot)$ with O given in Assumption 2.2.

Analogous to [OSSW21], we expect that this provides exactly the right construction to feed into an a priori estimate and develop a solution theory for (1.1), which we aim to address in future work.

Theorem 2.12. *Under Assumption 2.2 (i)–(iii) the following holds for every $\tau > 0$ and $\xi_\tau := \xi * \psi_\tau$ with ψ_τ defined in (3.1).*

There exists a deterministic $c \in \mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell]]$ satisfying (2.20) and

$$(2.29) \quad c_\beta \neq 0 \quad \implies \quad |\beta| < 2 + \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad [\beta] \text{ is even,}$$

such that for every populated β and for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$ there exists a random $\Pi_{x\beta} \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ such that almost surely

$$(2.30) \quad L\Pi_{x\beta} = \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta}^- \quad \text{unless } \beta \text{ is purely polynomial,}$$

with Π_x^- defined in (2.21), and which is given by (2.12a) for β purely polynomial.

Moreover, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$ there exists a random $\Gamma_{xy}^ \in \text{End}(\mathbb{T}^*)$ such that almost surely we have (2.25), (2.26), (2.27) and (2.28).*

Finally, we have for all $p < \infty$

$$(2.31) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\Pi_{x\beta}(y)|^p \lesssim |x - y|_s^{|\beta|},$$

$$(2.32) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |(\Gamma_{xy}^*)_\beta^\gamma|^p \lesssim |x - y|_s^{|\beta| - |\gamma|},$$

where here and in the sequel, \lesssim means $\leq C$ with a constant C only depending on α, β, p and $\|\psi\|_{L^1}$, but being independent of x, y and $\tau > 0$.

As a consequence of the results and techniques in [Tem23] (see in particular [Tem23, Remark 1.6]), the estimates of Theorem 2.12 imply the following result.

Corollary 2.13 (Uniqueness, convergence, and invariance). *We have the following:*

1. *Existence and uniqueness: Given a noise ξ which satisfies Assumption 2.2, there exists a unique model (Π, Γ^*) for (TFE) in the sense of [Tem23, Definition 1.1].*
2. *Convergence and universality: Given a sequence of noises ξ_n which satisfy Assumption 2.2 uniformly in n and that converge in law (resp. in L^p , almost surely) to ξ , the corresponding models (Π_n, Γ_n^*) converge component-wise in law (resp. in L^p , almost surely) to (Π, Γ^*) , the unique limiting model associated to ξ .*
3. *Invariance: Given a noise ξ which satisfies Assumption 2.2, the corresponding model satisfies almost surely the following natural invariances for all populated β :*
 - a. $\Pi_x[\xi(\cdot + h)](y) = \Pi_{x+h}[\xi](y + h),$
 - b. $\Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi(R \cdot)](y) = (-1)^{|\beta|p} \Pi_{Rx\beta}[\xi](Ry),$
 - c. $\Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi](y) = (-1)^{\sum_\ell \beta(\ell)} \Pi_{x\beta}[\xi](y),$
 - d. $\Pi_{x\beta}[\hat{\xi}](y) = \varepsilon^{-|\beta|} \Pi_{\hat{x}\beta}[\xi](\hat{y})$ and $(\Gamma_{xy}^*[\hat{\xi}])_\beta^\gamma = \varepsilon^{-|\beta| + |\gamma|} (\Gamma_{\hat{x}\hat{y}}^*[\xi])_\beta^\gamma$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, where \hat{x}, \hat{y} and $\hat{\xi}$ are defined in (1.3) and (1.5), respectively.

The notion of convergence for Item 2 of Corollary 2.13 is described more precisely in [Tem23, Theorem 1.4].

⁹ ψ is introduced in Section 3.4

Remark 2.14 (Qualitative smoothness). We stress once more that the estimates (2.31) of Π_x and (2.32) of Γ_{xy}^* in Theorem 2.12 are uniform in the mollification scale $\tau > 0$ from (2.3), and even carry over to the limiting model, cf. Corollary 2.13. As long as $\tau > 0$, we have additional qualitative smoothness properties that degenerate as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, but which are useful to prove Theorem 2.12. More precisely, the counterterm c is bounded by¹⁰

$$(2.33) \quad |c_\beta| \lesssim (\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau})^{|\beta|-\alpha-2},$$

which matches the lower bound obtained in Theorem 2.16 in the case of $d = 1$, $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and for a special choice of mollifier. In line with this, we have boundedness of up to fourth-order derivatives of Π_x ,

$$(2.34) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(y)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq |\mathbf{n}| \leq 4.$$

Furthermore, we have the following annealed and weighted $C^{4,\alpha}$ -estimate on Π_x ,

$$(2.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(z)|^p \\ \lesssim (\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^\alpha \quad \text{for all } |\mathbf{n}| \leq 4, \end{aligned}$$

and the analogous annealed and weighted $C^{1,\alpha}$ -estimate on Π_x^- ,

$$(2.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}^-(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}^-(z)|^p \\ \lesssim (\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau})^{-3-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^\alpha \quad \text{for all } |\mathbf{n}| \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The former yields by an application of Kolmogorov's continuity theorem the in Theorem 2.12 claimed regularity $\Pi_{x\beta} \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ almost surely.

The proof of Remark 2.14 is a generalisation of the one of [LOTT21, Remark 2.3]; for completeness we provide the proof in Appendix A.

Remark 2.15 (Analyticity in a_0). The constants c_β from Theorem 2.12 give via (2.2) and (2.11) back the counterterm h ,

$$h(u(x)) = \sum_{\beta} c_{\beta} \left(\prod_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k a}{du^k}(u(x)) \right)^{\beta(k)} \left(\prod_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{1}{\ell!} \frac{d^\ell b}{du^\ell}(u(x)) \right)^{\beta(\ell)},$$

where due to (2.29) the sum is restricted to multiindices $|\beta| < 2 + \alpha$. Despite this restriction, some care has to be taken in this expression: for fixed β , the products $\prod_{k \geq 0}$ and $\prod_{\ell \geq 0}$ are effectively finite and thus well defined, since β vanishes for all but finitely many k, ℓ ; however the sum over β is infinite due to the degeneracy of $[\cdot]$ (and hence $|\cdot|$) and the degeneracy of the population constraint (2.20) in e_0 . By a simple resummation, we observe

$$h(u(x)) = \sum_{\hat{\beta}: \hat{\beta}(k=0)=0} \sum_{\hat{k} \geq 0} c_{\hat{\beta} + \hat{k} e_0} a(u(x))^{\hat{k}} \left(\prod_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k a}{du^k}(u(x)) \right)^{\beta(k)} \left(\prod_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{1}{\ell!} \frac{d^\ell b}{du^\ell}(u(x)) \right)^{\beta(\ell)},$$

where $\hat{\beta}$ is again restricted to $|\hat{\beta}| < 2 + \alpha$ and the sum over $\hat{\beta}$ is thus finite. It is therefore left to argue why the sum over \hat{k} is convergent, which we do in the following.

Instead of deriving the model Π_x from the renormalised equation (2.3), we consider

$$(\partial_0 + (1 - a_0)\Delta^2)u = \nabla \cdot ((a(u) - a_0)\nabla \Delta u + b(u)\xi_\tau - h(u)\nabla u)$$

with $a_0 = a(0)$. In the power series ansatz (2.13), this amounts to restricting to multi-indices $\hat{\beta}$ satisfying $\hat{\beta}(k=0) = 0$, and the coefficients $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}$ inherit a dependence on a_0 through

$$(2.37) \quad (\partial_0 + (1 - a_0)\Delta^2)\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}} = \nabla \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-,$$

¹⁰the presence of $\sqrt[\mathfrak{s}]{\tau}$ is due to the scaling of the specific choice of mollifier ψ_τ

where $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-$ is defined as in (2.14b) with the difference that the sum over k starts from $k = 1$ and $D^{(0)}$ is replaced by $\hat{D}^{(0)} := \mathbf{a}_1 \partial_{a_0} + \sum_{k \geq 1} (k+1) \mathbf{a}_{k+1} \partial_{\mathbf{a}_k} + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell+1) \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1} \partial_{\mathbf{b}_\ell}$. Hence for all the $\hat{\cdot}$ -objects the coordinate functional \mathbf{a}_0 is replaced by an additional parameter $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ through the differential operator in (2.37). We now show that this dependence of $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}$ (and $\hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}}$) on a_0 is analytic as long as $a_0 < 1$. For this, it is convenient to allow for complex $a_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and show differentiability in the parameter a_0 in the half plane $\text{Re}(a_0) < 1$. Furthermore, we introduce yet another model $\bar{\Pi}$: it is defined in complete analogy with the model Π (thus containing an \mathbf{a}_0 component), with the only difference that $\bar{\Pi}$ and $\bar{\Pi}^-$ are related by the same differential operator as are $\hat{\Pi}$ and $\hat{\Pi}^-$, i.e.

$$(2.38) \quad (\partial_0 + (1 - a_0)\Delta^2)\bar{\Pi}_{x\beta} = \nabla \cdot \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta}^-.$$

The reason to introduce this further model is, that on the one hand we clearly have

$$(2.39) \quad \bar{\Pi}_x(a_0 = 0) = \Pi_x, \quad \bar{c}(a_0 = 0) = c,$$

and on the other hand, as we shall argue below, it relates to the model $\hat{\Pi}$ by

$$(2.40a) \quad \frac{1}{k!} \partial_{a_0}^k \hat{\pi}_{\hat{\beta}} = \bar{\pi}_{\hat{\beta} + k e_0} \quad \text{for} \quad \pi = \begin{cases} c, \\ \Pi_x, \end{cases}$$

for all $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where here and in the following we understand (2.40b) with respect to the norm

$$(2.41) \quad \sup_{y: y \neq x} |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{-|\hat{\beta}|} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\Pi_{x\hat{\beta}}(y)|^p.$$

Hence, the $\hat{\cdot}$ -objects are indeed analytic in a_0 by (2.40), and the combination of (2.40) and (2.39) shows that the above mentioned sum over $\hat{k} \geq 0$ is indeed convergent, and moreover

$$\sum_{\hat{k} \geq 0} c_{\hat{\beta} + \hat{k} e_0} a(u(x))^{\hat{k}} = \hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}}(a(u(x))).$$

The proof of (2.40) is again a generalisation of the one of [LOTT21, Remark 2.7]; for completeness we provide the proof in Appendix B.

2.4. Analysis of the counterterm. In this section, we will perform a more careful analysis of the counterterm needed to renormalise the thin-film equation (TFE). For the sake of simplicity, we focus on the case $d = 1$ and $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. As we shall see later in this section, the leading order structure of the counterterm remains the same in any dimension $d \geq 1$ and for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Additionally, we work with the alternative model $\hat{\Pi}$ described in Remark 2.15 such that our multiindices have no e_0 component but $\hat{\Pi}_{x\beta}$ is an analytic function of a_0 . As mentioned above, the corresponding hierarchy of linear PDEs can then be written as in (2.37) as

$$L\hat{\Pi}_{x\beta} = \nabla \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta}^-,$$

where the operator $L := (\partial_0 + (1 - a_0)\Delta^2)$ depends on a_0 . To avoid unnecessarily heavy notation, we suppress the $\hat{\cdot}$ on $\hat{\Pi}$ for the remainder of this section and define $m_0 := 1 - a_0$. We will show in this section that the counterterms in (TFE) behave like $(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}$ to leading order, when the noise ξ is regularised to ξ_τ , by mollifying with some smooth φ (to be chosen in Theorem 2.16) at length scale $\sqrt[8]{\tau} > 0$.

Note that by stationarity Assumption 2.2 (i), the law \mathbb{E} of the tempered distribution ξ is spatially homogeneous, i.e. there exists a tempered distribution C such that for any Schwartz functions f, g

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, f \rangle \langle \xi, g \rangle] = \langle C * f, g \rangle.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_\tau(x)\xi_\tau(y)] = F(x-y) := \langle C(x-y+\cdot) * \varphi_\tau, \varphi_\tau \rangle,$$

where F is a Schwartz function which is even in space. We now state the main result of this section in which we will provide diverging lower bounds on the renormalisation constants of certain multiindices.

Theorem 2.16. *Let Assumption 2.2 be satisfied with $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, and let $d = 1$. Then, we have*

$$(2.42) \quad c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{(2\pi k_1)^4}{(2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2(2\pi k_1)^8} \left(\frac{4m_0^2(2\pi k_1)^8}{(2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2(2\pi k_1)^8} - 2 \right) \mathcal{F}F(k),$$

$$(2.43) \quad c_{2f_1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1}{(2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2(2\pi k_1)^8} (-2\pi i k_0 + m_0(2\pi k_1)^4) \partial_{k_1} \mathcal{F}F(k),$$

and

$$(2.44) \quad c_{2e_1+2f_0} = -3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{m_0(2\pi k_1)^{12}}{((2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2(2\pi k_1)^8)^2} \mathcal{F}F(k),$$

where we denote the operation of taking the Fourier transform by \mathcal{F} . All other renormalisation constants are zero. Assume furthermore that

$$\mathcal{F}C(k) = \frac{1}{((2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2(2\pi k_1)^8)^{\frac{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}{4}}}.$$

Then, if $\varphi_\tau = \psi_{\frac{\tau}{2}}$, we have

$$c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} = C_{\alpha,1} m_0^{-\frac{5}{4}} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2},$$

where $C_{\alpha,1}$ is a constant independent of τ and m_0 , such that

$$(2.45) \quad \lim_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{1}{2}} C_{\alpha,1} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{5}{8}\right)}{9\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Similarly, we have that

$$c_{2f_1} = C_{\alpha,2} m_0^{-\frac{1}{4}} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2},$$

where $C_{\alpha,2}$ is a constant independent of τ and m_0 , such that

$$(2.46) \quad \lim_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{1}{2}} C_{\alpha,2} = -\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{5}{8}\right)}{36\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}},$$

and

$$c_{2e_1+2f_0} = C_{\alpha,3} m_0^{-\frac{9}{4}} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}$$

where $C_{\alpha,3}$ is a constant independent of τ and m_0 , such that

$$(2.47) \quad \lim_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{1}{2}} C_{\alpha,3} = -\frac{5\Gamma\left(\frac{5}{8}\right)}{6\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Alternatively, if

$$(2.48) \quad |\mathcal{F}\varphi_\tau(k)|^2 = e^{-\tau(2\pi k_1)^8 - \tau^\eta(2\pi k_0)^2}$$

for some $\eta > 1$, then

$$c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} = C_{\alpha,1} m_0^{-\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2} + O\left((\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(3+2\alpha)}\right),$$

where, again, $C_{\alpha,1}$ is a constant independent of τ and m_0 , such that

$$(2.49) \quad \lim_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{1}{2}} C_{\alpha,1} = 0.$$

Similarly, we have that

$$c_{2f_1} = C_{\alpha,2} m_0^{-\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2} + O\left(m_0 (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(3+2\alpha)}\right),$$

where $C_{\alpha,2}$ is a constant independent of τ and m_0 , such that

$$(2.50) \quad \lim_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{1}{2}} C_{\alpha,2} = -\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{9}{8}\right)}{2\pi},$$

and

$$c_{2e_1+2f_0} = C_{\alpha,3} m_0^{-\frac{2\alpha+7}{4}} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2} + O\left(m_0 (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(11+2\alpha)}\right),$$

where $C_{\alpha,3}$ is a constant independent of τ and m_0 , such that

$$(2.51) \quad \lim_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{1}{2}} C_{\alpha,3} = -\frac{3\Gamma\left(\frac{9}{8}\right)}{4\pi}.$$

We relegate the proof of the above theorem to Section 4.

Remark 2.17. In the specific case in which the ensemble ξ is Gaussian, the choice of C in the above theorem amounts to specifying the corresponding Cameron–Martin space as \dot{H}^{-s} for $s = \alpha - 1/2$, where \dot{H}^s are the L -dependent anisotropic Sobolev spaces defined in (2.6).

Remark 2.18. The choice of mollifier made in (2.48) may seem odd at first sight but it is quite natural considering the effect we are trying to capture. Setting $\eta = 1$ would correspond to natural anisotropic parabolic scaling between space and time which would mean that the mollifier treats space and time on equal footing when acting on a given distribution. However if $\eta > 1$, as we have chosen in (2.48), the mollifier smooths out more in space than in time. Thus, this choice of mollifier mimics a spatial discretisation of the SPDE (1.1). We will see that it will play a role in the next subsection.

2.4.1. Structure of the counterterm. In this subsection, we will discuss the form of the counterterm that arises from the choice of renormalisation constants we have obtained in Theorem 2.16. We know from the discussion in Remark 2.15 that the function $h(\cdot)$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} h(u(x)) &= c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} (a(u(x))) a'(u(x)) b(u(x)) b'(u(x)) + c_{2f_1} (a(u(x))) (b'(u(x)))^2 \\ &\quad + c_{2e_1+2f_0} (a(u(x))) (a'(u(x)))^2 (b(u(x)))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied Theorem 2.16. For the specific case of the thin-film equation, we have $a(u) = 1 - M(u)$ and $b(u) = M^{\frac{1}{2}}(u)$ which leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} h(u) &= -\frac{1}{2} c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} (a(u)) (M'(u))^2 + \frac{1}{4} c_{2f_1} (a(u)) \frac{(M'(u))^2}{M(u)} \\ &\quad + c_{2e_1+2f_0} (a(u)) M(u) (M'(u))^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the choice of mollifier with $|\hat{\varphi}_\tau(k)|^2 = e^{-\tau(2\pi k_1)^8 - \tau^\eta(2\pi k_0)^2}$ in (2.48) and $\eta > 1$ (see the discussion in Remark 2.18), we know from Theorem 2.16 that

$$\begin{aligned} h(u) &= -(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2} \frac{C_{\alpha,1}}{2} (M(u))^{-\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}} (M'(u))^2 \\ &\quad + (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2} \frac{C_{\alpha,2}}{4} (M(u))^{-\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}} \frac{(M'(u))^2}{M(u)} \\ &\quad + (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2} C_{\alpha,3} (M(u))^{-\frac{2\alpha+7}{4}} M(u) (M'(u))^2 \\ &\quad + O\left(\sqrt[8]{\tau}^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(3+2\alpha)}\right) (M'(u))^2 \\ &\quad + O\left(\sqrt[8]{\tau}^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(11+2\alpha)}\right) (M(u))^2 (M'(u))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to leading order, the counterterm is of the form

$$(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2} \left(\frac{C_{\alpha,2}}{4} + C_{\alpha,3} - \frac{C_{\alpha,1}}{2} \right) \partial_x ((M(u))^{-\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}} (M'(u))^2 \partial_x u).$$

Even though we cannot derive uniform estimates on the model as in Theorem 2.12 for the case $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ (see Remark 3.12), we can formally write down the leading order form of the counterterm in this case as

$$-\frac{7\Gamma\left(\frac{9}{8}\right)}{8\pi} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{-1} \partial_x \left(\frac{(M'(u))^2}{M(u)} \partial_x u \right),$$

which in the case $M(u) = u^m, m \geq 0$ reduces up to an order one constant to

$$(2.52) \quad -(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{-1} \partial_x (u^{m-2} \partial_x u).$$

We note that the above term shows up with a “good” sign in the renormalised SPDE, i.e. it shows up as $(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{-1} \partial_x (u^{m-2} \partial_x u)$ on the right hand side of the equation. This implies that it has a smoothing effect (at least for strictly positive u) which blows up as the regularisation parameter τ goes to 0. For the case $m = 2$, as can be seen from the expression in (2.52), the term takes an even simpler linear form and the counterterm can be formally thought of as $\infty \times \partial_x^2 u$.

Surprisingly, the above term agrees exactly with the form of a correction term that shows up in the discretisation discussed in [GGKO22]. In [GGKO22], the authors derive a spatial discretisation for the SPDE (1.1) for $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, based on its formal gradient flow structure, which leaves invariant a discrete version of the thermodynamically correct invariant measure, the so-called conservative Brownian excursion. Representing the discretisation as an SDE leads to a correction term whose formal limit as N (the number of lattice points) tends to ∞ is exactly of the form (2.52), at least for power mobilities $M(u) = u^m$. We refer the reader to [GGKO22, Remark 9.1] where the origin of this correction term and its formal limit are discussed in more detail.

The fact that the form of the counterterm seems to agree with the form of the correction term in [GGKO22] lends credence to the hypothesis that the discretisation has the counterterm “built in”. Indeed, numerical experiments suggest that the discretisation in [GGKO22] converges to a nontrivial limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (see, in particular, [GGKO22, Section 11.4]).

3. Proof of Theorem 2.12

3.1. Strategy of the proof. In this section, we give an overview of the proof of Theorem 2.12 and discuss the main steps involved, which are integration, reconstruction, algebraic-, and three-point arguments. We refer the reader to Section 3.2 for the precise logical order in which we go through these steps in the inductive proof.

3.1.1. Integration and semigroup convolution. We start with a discussion on the estimate (2.31) on $\Pi_{x\beta}$. This will be a consequence of the corresponding estimate on $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ via a Schauder-type argument, see Corollary 3.13 (Integration I), which we refer to as integration argument in the sequel. Since we expect $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ to be a tempered distribution in the absence of any mollification of the noise, we test against a test function in order to be able to obtain a stable estimate as the mollification is removed. It is convenient to express this weak estimate by testing against a semigroup ψ_t ; more precisely, we choose ψ_t to be the Green’s function associated to the symmetric and uniformly elliptic operator $LL^* = -\partial_0^2 + \Delta^4$, i.e. ψ_t is the unique solution of

$$(3.1) \quad \partial_t \psi_t + LL^* \psi_t = 0,$$

such that $\psi_{t=0} = \delta_{x=0}$. It is straightforward to check that ψ_t is a Schwartz function and satisfies the following natural scaling invariance

$$(3.2) \quad \psi_t(x) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt[s]{t})^D} \psi_1 \left(\frac{x_0}{(\sqrt[s]{t})^{s_0}}, \dots, \frac{x_d}{(\sqrt[s]{t})^{s_d}} \right),$$

where $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathbb{N}^{1+d}$ is the scaling associated to L and D is the effective dimension, see (2.5). As $\psi_{t=1}$ is a Schwartz function, the following bound holds for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\int dz |\partial^{\mathfrak{n}} \psi_1(y-z)| (1 + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\theta} \lesssim (1 + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\theta},$$

which by the scaling invariance of ψ_t from (3.2) implies the moment bound

$$(3.3) \quad \int dz |\partial^{\mathfrak{n}} \psi_t(y-z)| (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\theta} \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{-|\mathfrak{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\theta}.$$

One can also check that ψ_t satisfies the following semigroup property

$$(3.4) \quad \psi_t * \psi_s = \psi_{t+s},$$

for all $s, t \geq 0$. Finally, given a tempered distribution f , we define

$$f_t := \psi_t * f.$$

With this notation in hand, the estimate on $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ we aim for is

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha}.$$

Note that the appearance of $\sqrt[s]{\cdot}$ in (3.5) is dictated by the scaling (3.2).

3.1.2. Reconstruction. Estimating $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ before $\Pi_{x\beta}$ is at the core of an inductive argument, as this allows to use estimates on $\Pi_{x\beta'}$ for β' “smaller”¹¹ than β to estimate $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ via the hierarchy (2.18). In case of $|\beta| > 3$, this is indeed a rather straightforward task, and is carried out in Lemma 3.16 (Reconstruction I).

3.1.3. Malliavin derivative and dualisation. The situation is much more complex in the case of $|\beta| < 3$. It is here that we will leverage an improvement at the level of the Malliavin derivative as we shall explain now. For these multiindices, we apply the p -version of the spectral gap inequality (2.9) to $F = \Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)$, which results in

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)|^p \lesssim |\mathbb{E} \Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)| + \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \frac{\partial \Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)}{\partial \xi} \right\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^p.$$

Although $\Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)$ is not a cylindrical function, it can be approximated by such objects and so the application of (2.9) is justified; for a precise version of this approximation argument we refer to [LOTT21, Section 7].

To estimate the first term on the right hand side, we will fix the counterterm c by the so-called BPHZ-choice of renormalisation. We give a detailed account of the choice of c and how to use it to estimate $\mathbb{E} \Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)$ by the right hand side of (3.5) in Section 3.3, see in particular (3.55).

To estimate the Malliavin derivative, we actually establish the stronger

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\delta \Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)|^{q'} \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} \bar{w}$$

for all $1 < q' < q \leq 2$, where we have introduced the notation

$$\bar{w} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz \mathbb{E}^{\frac{2}{q}} |(LL^*)^{\frac{s}{2|L|}} \delta \xi(z)|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

¹¹in a sense to be made precise in Section 3.2

Note that by $q \leq 2$ we can appeal to Minkowski's inequality to see

$$\bar{w} \leq \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q}} \|\delta\xi\|_{\dot{H}^s}^q,$$

which together with $|\mathbb{E}\delta\Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)| \leq \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\delta\Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)|^{q'}$ shows that (3.6) is by duality indeed a strengthening of

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \frac{\partial\Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)}{\partial\xi} \right\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^p \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{s})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |x-y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha},$$

with $p \geq 2$ being the Hölder-conjugate exponent of $q \leq 2$. The reason for introducing $1 < q'$ is that we will appeal to Hölder's inequality within the proof of (3.6), where one factor will involve a Malliavin derivative δ , and the other factor(s) are controlled in probabilistic L^p -norms for $p < \infty$. Thus, the implicit constants in estimates like (3.6) on Malliavin derivatives depend in addition to α, β, p , and $\|\psi\|_{L^1}$, also on $1 < q' < q$.

Remark 3.1 (Qualitative smoothness II). Analogous to Remark 2.14 we have qualitative smoothness of the Malliavin derivative of Π_x and Π_x^- . More precisely, we have boundedness of up to fourth-order derivatives of $\delta\Pi_x$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \delta\Pi_{x\beta}(y)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{s})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |x-y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} \bar{w} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq |\mathbf{n}| \leq 4,$$

the following annealed and weighted $C^{4,\alpha}$ -estimate on $\delta\Pi_x$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \delta\Pi_{x\beta}(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \delta\Pi_{x\beta}(z)|^p \\ & \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{s})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |x-y|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} |y-z|_s^\alpha \bar{w} \quad \text{for all } |\mathbf{n}| \leq 4, \end{aligned}$$

and the analogous annealed and weighted $C^{1,\alpha}$ -estimate on $\delta\Pi_x^-$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \delta\Pi_{x\beta}^-(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \delta\Pi_{x\beta}^-(z)|^p \\ & \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{s})^{-3-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |x-y|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} |y-z|_s^\alpha \bar{w} \quad \text{for all } |\mathbf{n}| \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

By an application of Kolmogorov's continuity theorem, this justifies pointwise evaluation of derivatives of $\delta\Pi_x$ and $\delta\Pi_x^-$. The proof of these estimates follows the one of Remark 2.14, which we therefore omit.

3.1.4. Improved modeledness. We now outline the proof of (3.6). Note that when we pass from ξ to the direction $\delta\xi$ we obtain a gain in regularity from $\alpha-3$ to $s = \alpha-3+D/2$, cf. Remark 2.5. One may ask if a similar gain in regularity can be expected at the level of $\delta\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ for arbitrary $|\beta| < 3$. This, however, is unreasonable as $\Pi_{x\beta}$ (and hence $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$) is multilinear in the noise ξ . What is reasonable, is a gain in modeledness of $\delta\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ of order $D/2$ around a secondary base point z , after it has been appropriately recentered by some $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$. In fact, we will only track a gain of regularity of order $\kappa < D/2$, and claim that there exists a $d\Gamma_{xz}^* \in \text{End}(\mathbb{T}^*)$ such that

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_\beta(y)|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim |y-z|_s^{\kappa+\alpha} (|y-z|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)), \end{aligned}$$

and the analogous estimate for $\delta\Pi_x^-$,

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_\beta(y)|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{s})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_s)^\kappa (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)). \end{aligned}$$

We choose to work with L^∞ -based norms, as they behave well under multiplication, whereas the gain of regularity we observe at the level of $\delta\xi$ is on L^2 -based norms. The price to pay is to include the weights

$$(3.9) \quad w_x(z) := |x-z|_s^{-\kappa} \bar{w} + w(z),$$

where

$$w(z) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dy |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{-2\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{\frac{2}{q}} \left| (LL^*)^{\frac{s}{2(1+L)}} \delta\xi(y) \right|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Importantly, $w(z)$ behaves well under (square) averaging,

$$(3.10) \quad \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz |\psi_t(y - z)| w^2(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \min(w(y), (\sqrt[4]{t})^{-\kappa} \bar{w}),$$

which is a consequence of the moment bound

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz |\psi_t(y - z)| |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{-2\kappa} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{-2\kappa}$$

and relies on $\kappa < D/2$. Furthermore, as a consequence of (3.10) and the bound of negative moments we have

$$(3.11) \quad \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz |\psi_t(y - z)| w_x^2(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \min(w_x(y), (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-\kappa} \bar{w}).$$

These weights could be avoided by working with Besov norms, e.g. as done in [HS23] and [BOT23].

By averaging in the secondary base point and using (3.11), we show in Lemma 3.26 that (3.8) implies (3.6). This involves estimates on $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$, which we shall establish along the way, along with estimates on Γ_{xy}^* and $\delta\Gamma_{xy}^*$, that are also used in several other places. A discussion of Γ^* , $\delta\Gamma^*$, and $d\Gamma^*$ will follow in Sections 3.1.6 and 3.1.7. Before that, we shall explain how we derive the estimates (3.7) and (3.8).

3.1.5. Integration and Reconstruction for increments. As earlier for Π_x and Π_x^- , we will first establish (3.8) and obtain (3.7) from a Schauder-type argument based on

$$(3.12) \quad L(\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_{\beta} = \nabla \cdot (\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta},$$

see Lemma 3.15 (Integration III).

Estimating increments of $\delta\Pi_x^-$ before increments of $\delta\Pi_x$ allows again for an inductive argument, where the hierarchy (2.18) used in the case $|\beta| > 3$ is now replaced by the identity

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} Q(\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)(z) &= Q \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z) \nabla \Delta(\delta\Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)(z) \\ &\quad + Q \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell}(z) \delta\xi_{\tau}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Here, Q denotes the projection of a powerseries $\sum_{\beta} \pi_{\beta} \mathbf{z}^{\beta}$ to $\sum_{|\beta| < 3} \pi_{\beta} \mathbf{z}^{\beta}$, meaning that in (3.13) we are only interested in β -components with $|\beta| < 3$. On the one hand, the right hand side of (3.13) involves only β' components of Π_x and $\delta\Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z$ for β' “smaller” than β . On the other hand, the improved vanishing (3.7) at the secondary base point z and the improved regularity of $\delta\xi$ allow for a reconstruction argument, which requires $\alpha + (\kappa + \alpha - 3) > 0$. This is carried out in Lemma 3.17 (Reconstruction II), establishing (3.8).

At this point, we mention two further (artificial) restrictions on κ . To avoid case distinctions, it is convenient to not recenter to unnecessarily high order, and we will therefore assume $\kappa + \alpha < 3$. Similarly, to simplify some of the estimates later on, it is convenient to also assume $\kappa + 2\alpha < \min \mathbf{A} \cap (3, \infty)$. Altogether, this imposes

$$(3.14a) \quad 3 < \kappa + 2\alpha < \begin{cases} \frac{D}{2} + 2\alpha, \\ \min \mathbf{A} \cap (3, \infty). \end{cases}$$

(3.14b)

By the restriction $\alpha > \frac{3}{2} - \frac{D}{4}$ in Assumption 2.2 (iii), it is possible to choose κ satisfying (3.14a), while since \mathbf{A} is locally finite it is also possible to choose κ satisfying at the same time (the artificial) (3.14b). Since $3 < 3 + \alpha \in \mathbf{A}$, (3.14b) implies $\kappa + \alpha < 3$.

3.1.6. *The structure group.* We turn to a discussion of Γ_{xy}^* . To simplify some of the proofs, it will be convenient to strengthen $\Gamma_{xy}^* \in \text{End}(\mathbb{T}^*)$ as stated in Theorem 2.12 to $\Gamma_{xy}^* \in \text{Alg}(\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]) \cap \text{End}(\mathbb{T}^*)$. By this we mean that Γ_{xy}^* is a well-defined linear map from $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$ to itself, compatible with its algebra structure in the sense that for $\pi, \pi' \in \mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$

$$\Gamma_{xy}^*(\pi\pi') = (\Gamma_{xy}^*\pi)(\Gamma_{xy}^*\pi'),$$

and it preserves $\mathbb{T}^* \subset \mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$ in the sense that

$$\Gamma_{xy}^*\mathbb{T}^* \subset \mathbb{T}^*.$$

This deviates slightly from [LOTT21, Section 2.5] where Γ_{xy}^* is only defined¹² on the smaller \mathbb{T}^* . The reason for defining it on the larger $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$ is, that this allows to apply Γ_{xy}^* to c which, due to the constraint (2.20), is not an element of \mathbb{T}^* .

As in [LOTT21, Section 2.5] we start from a purely algebraic map $\{\pi^{(\mathbf{n})}\}_{\mathbf{n}} \mapsto \Gamma^*$ given by

$$(3.15) \quad \Gamma^* = \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_j} \pi^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots \pi^{(\mathbf{n}_j)} D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)},$$

where $D^{(\mathbf{0})}$ is given by (2.15) and $D^{(\mathbf{n})}$ for $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ is the derivation on $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$ defined by

$$(3.16) \quad D^{(\mathbf{n})} := \partial_{\mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}}.$$

For later use we note that

$$(3.17) \quad (D^{(\mathbf{n})})_\beta^\gamma = \gamma(\mathbf{n}) \delta_\beta^{\gamma - g_\mathbf{n}} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0},$$

hence

$$(3.18) \quad (D^{(\mathbf{n})})_\beta^\gamma \neq 0 \implies \begin{cases} \beta(k) = \gamma(k) \text{ for all } k, \\ \beta(\ell) = \gamma(\ell) \text{ for all } \ell, \\ \beta(\mathbf{n}') = \gamma(\mathbf{n}') - \delta_{\mathbf{n}'}^{\mathbf{n}}, \text{ for all } \mathbf{n}' \neq \mathbf{0}. \end{cases}$$

Despite the two infinite sums in (3.15), the following lemma shows that Γ^* is well-defined for a suitable choice of $\{\pi^{(\mathbf{n})}\}_{\mathbf{n}}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{\pi^{(\mathbf{n})}\}_{\mathbf{n}} \subset \mathbb{T}^*$ satisfying*

$$(3.19) \quad \pi_{\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})} \neq 0 \implies |\beta| > |\mathbf{n}|.$$

Then (3.15) defines $\Gamma^ \in \text{Alg}(\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]) \cap \text{End}(\mathbb{T}^*)$.*

Proof. We start by arguing that the matrix coefficients

$$(3.20) \quad (\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_j} \sum_{\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{j+1} = \beta} \pi_{\beta_1}^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots \pi_{\beta_j}^{(\mathbf{n}_j)} (D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)})_{\beta_{j+1}}^\gamma$$

are well-defined for all β, γ . From (2.17), (3.18) and (3.19) we see that if a summand is non-vanishing, then

$$(3.21) \quad [\gamma] = [\beta_{j+1}] - j, \quad |\gamma|_p = |\beta_{j+1}|_p + \sum_{i=1}^j |\mathbf{n}_i|, \quad \text{and} \quad |\beta_i| > |\mathbf{n}_i| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, j.$$

¹²at least, it is not mentioned that it actually is well-defined on the larger $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$

This implies $[\gamma] + |\gamma|_p \leq [\beta_{j+1}] - j + |\beta_{j+1}|_p + \sum_{i=1}^j |\beta_i|$, and since $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{j+1} = \beta$ and $|\cdot| - \alpha$ is additive

$$(3.22) \quad [\gamma] + |\gamma|_p \leq [\beta_{j+1}] - j + |\beta_{j+1}|_p + |\beta| - |\beta_{j+1}| + j\alpha.$$

As β is fixed, we obtain for a β -dependent constant C that $[\gamma] + |\gamma|_p \leq C - j(1 - \alpha)$. By $0 \leq [\cdot] + |\cdot|_p$, which follows from the definition (2.23), and by $1 - \alpha > 0$, we conclude that j is bounded. Hence the sum over $j \geq 0$ in (3.20) is finite, and by $|\mathbf{n}_i| < |\beta_i|$ also the sum over $\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_j$ is finite. Thus the coefficient $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ is well-defined.

To guarantee that these coefficients $\{(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma\}_{\beta, \gamma}$ define a linear map from $\mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}]]$ to itself, we have to show that for fixed β there are only finitely many γ with $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma \neq 0$. In case $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma \neq 0$, we learn from (3.22) that $[\gamma] + |\gamma|_p$ is bounded. This forces γ to assign only finitely many values to $k \neq 0, \ell \neq 0, \mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$, and to vanish for all but finitely many $k, \ell, \mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$. It remains to argue that also $\gamma(k=0)$ and $\gamma(\ell=0)$ can take only finitely many values. This follows from $(D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)})_{\beta_{j+1}}^\gamma \neq 0$, which by (2.16) and (3.18) implies $\gamma(k=0) \leq \beta_{j+1}(k=0) + j \leq \beta(k=0) + j$ and $\gamma(\ell=0) \leq \beta_{j+1}(\ell=0) + j \leq \beta(\ell=0) + j$.

The proof of multiplicativity of Γ^* follows from the derivation property of $D^{(\mathbf{n})}$ and does not rely on the domain of Γ^* at all. We therefore refer to [LO22, Lemma 3.12 (v)] for a proof.

We finally show that Γ^* preserves T^* . For this we shall argue that if γ is populated and $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma \neq 0$, then β is populated. For purely polynomial $\gamma = g_\mathbf{n}$ we observe that (3.15) immediately yields

$$(3.23) \quad \Gamma^* \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} + \pi^{(\mathbf{n})},$$

hence $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^{g_\mathbf{n}} = \delta_\beta^{g_\mathbf{n}} + \pi_\beta^{(\mathbf{n})}$. Since $\pi^{(\mathbf{n})} \in \mathsf{T}^*$, this is only non-vanishing for populated β . We turn to multiindices γ that are populated and not purely polynomial. Recall from (2.17) and (3.18) that $(D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)})_{\beta_{j+1}}^\gamma \neq 0$ implies $\sum_\ell \gamma(\ell) = \sum_\ell \beta_{j+1}(\ell)$. Since by assumption $\sum_\ell \gamma(\ell) > 0$, we obtain $\sum_\ell \beta(\ell) \geq \sum_\ell \beta_{j+1}(\ell) > 0$. Similarly, since γ is populated, we obtain from the first item of (3.21) that $[\beta_{j+1}] = [\gamma] + j = \sum_\ell \gamma(\ell) - 1 + j = \sum_\ell \beta_{j+1}(\ell) - 1 + j$. Hence $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma \neq 0$ yields

$$[\beta] = [\beta_1] + \dots + [\beta_{j+1}] = \sum_\ell (\beta_1(\ell) + \dots + \beta_{j+1}(\ell)) - 1 = \sum_\ell \beta(\ell) - 1,$$

where we used that β_1, \dots, β_j in (3.20) are populated. \square

From the proof of Lemma 3.2 we obtain in addition

$$(3.24) \quad \Gamma_{xy}^* \tilde{\mathsf{T}}^* \subset \tilde{\mathsf{T}}^*,$$

which we shall use in the sequel.

Remark 3.3. We note that Γ^* defined here coincides¹³ with the one constructed in [OST23, Lemma 3], since both maps are multiplicative and coincide on the coordinates $\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}$. Therefore, $\mathsf{G}^* := \{\Gamma^* \text{ as in Lemma 3.2}\}$ is a group (with respect to composition) and there exists a group G , called the structure group, such that G^* is the pointwise dual of G , cf. [OST23, Lemma 4].

In Section 3.2.2 (item (4) of the case $|\beta| > 3$) we shall argue that there is a choice of $\{\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})}\}_\mathbf{n}$ such that the associated Γ_{xy}^* (see (3.15)) satisfies (2.25), (2.26), (2.27), and (2.28). To estimate Γ_{xy}^* , we will mainly appeal to the exponential formula (3.15), see Lemma 3.18 (Algebraic argument I). This makes use of estimates on $\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ that we obtain in Lemma 3.22 (Three-point argument I), based on (2.25) involving two base points and

¹³up to the fact that there are no \mathbf{b}_ℓ components in [OST23]

one active point. To estimate $\delta\Gamma_{xy}^*$, which is the directional derivative of Γ_{xy}^* in the direction $\delta\xi$, we proceed similarly, see Lemma 3.19 (Algebraic argument II). It is based on estimates on $\delta\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})}$, which is the directional derivative of $\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ in the direction $\delta\xi$, that we establish in Lemma 3.23 (Three-point argument II).

3.1.7. *Ansatz for $d\Gamma^*$.* We now discuss $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$ and start by motivating an ansatz. By $\alpha < 1$, we infer from (3.14) that $\kappa + \alpha > 2$, and hence (3.7) implies on a purely qualitative level

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_\beta(y)|^{q'} = o(|y - z|_s^2).$$

Since $\partial^n \Pi_{x\beta}$ and $\partial^n \delta\Pi_{x\beta}$ are continuous functions for $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2$, see Remark 2.14 and Remark 3.1, this amounts to

$$(3.25) \quad \partial^n (\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_\beta(z) = 0 \quad \text{for } |\mathbf{n}| \leq 2.$$

Note that for $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$ this is automatically satisfied by

$$(3.26) \quad \Pi_x(x) = 0,$$

which is a consequence of the estimate (2.31) since $|\cdot| \geq \alpha > 0$. A first ansatz to obtain (3.25) for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2$ as well could be $d\Gamma_{xz}^* = \delta\Gamma_{xz}^*$. However, $\delta\Gamma_{xz}^*$ is not rich enough: to achieve second order vanishing around z we expect to need to recenter $\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z)$ by $(\cdot - z)^\mathbf{n}$ for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2$. By (2.12), this is only possible if $(\delta\Gamma_{xz}^*)_\beta^{g\mathbf{n}}$ does not vanish for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2$. As we will see in Lemma 3.7, $\delta\Gamma_{xz}^*$ is triangular with respect to the homogeneity $|\cdot|$, meaning that $(\delta\Gamma_{xz}^*)_\beta^{g\mathbf{n}} \neq 0$ implies $|g\mathbf{n}| < |\beta|$. Hence $\delta\Gamma_{xz}^*$ only allows for the appropriate recentering for multiindices $|\beta| > 2$. To achieve the recentering for multiindices $|\beta| \leq 2$ as well, we have to relax the population condition and give up the triangularity of $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$ with respect to the homogeneity, cf. (3.38). We therefore make the ansatz¹⁴

$$(3.27) \quad d\Gamma_{xz}^* = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} \Gamma_{xz}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})} Q,$$

where

$$(3.28) \quad d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{0})} := Q\delta\Pi_x(z) \in Q\tilde{\Gamma}^* \quad \text{and} \quad d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} \in Q\tilde{\Gamma}^* \quad \text{for } |\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2 \text{ to be chosen.}$$

Recall, that Q denotes the projection of a powerseries $\sum_\beta \pi_\beta z^\beta$ to $\sum_{|\beta| < 3} \pi_\beta z^\beta$. The reason for including Q in the definition of $d\Gamma^*$ will become clear in the proof of Lemma 3.15. Using the population constraint (3.28), one can check that

$$(3.29) \quad d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma^* \subset \tilde{\Gamma}^*,$$

the proof of which follows the same lines as the one of Lemma 3.2.

We will argue in Section 3.2.2 (item (10) of the case $|\beta| < 3$) that (3.25) indeed determines $d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2$. The estimate on $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$ is based on (3.27), see Lemma 3.21 (Algebraic argument IV), which is based on estimates on $d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ that we establish in Lemma 3.25 (Three-point argument IV). In addition to the plain estimate on $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$, when obtaining the improved vanishing (3.8) of increments of $\delta\Pi^-$ we will make use of an estimate on the increment $d\Gamma_{xy}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*$. This estimate on the increment is obtained in Lemma 3.20 (Algebraic argument III), based on the corresponding estimate on $d\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ obtained in Lemma 3.24 (Three-point argument III).

We next argue that the ansatz (3.27) allows for the crucial identity (3.13) to hold true.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$ be given by (3.27) with $d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ satisfying (3.28), and such that (3.25) holds true. Then, (3.13) holds true.*

¹⁴note the structural similarity to $\delta\Gamma_{xz}^* = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \delta\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} \Gamma_{xz}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})}$

Proof. By (3.26) we read off from (2.14b) that

$$\Pi_z^-(z) = \mathbf{a}_0 \nabla \Delta \Pi_z(z) + \mathbf{b}_0 \xi_\tau(z) - \nabla \Pi_z(z) c.$$

Since $|e_0 + \beta| = |\beta|$, cf. (2.22), we have $Q(\mathbf{a}_0 \nabla \Delta \Pi_z) = \mathbf{a}_0 \nabla \Delta Q \Pi_z$, and by the derivation property of $D^{(\mathbf{n})}$ and multiplicativity of Γ_{xz}^* , this yields

$$d\Gamma_{xz}^*(\mathbf{a}_0 \nabla \Delta \Pi_z) = (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \mathbf{a}_0) \nabla \Delta \Gamma_{xz}^* Q \Pi_z + (\Gamma_{xz}^* \mathbf{a}_0) \nabla \Delta d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z.$$

Furthermore, from the estimate (2.31) of Π we learn

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\nabla \Pi_{z\beta t}(z)|^p \leq \int dy |\nabla \psi_t(y)| \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\Pi_{z\beta}(z-y)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\beta|-1},$$

where we have used the moment bound (3.3) in the last inequality, which implies in particular $\nabla \Pi_{z\beta}(z) = 0$ a.s. for $|\beta| > 1$. Together with the fact that c_β is only non vanishing for $|\beta| < 2 + \alpha$, see (2.29), we obtain $Q(\nabla \Pi_z(z) c) = \nabla \Pi_z(z) c$ and hence

$$d\Gamma_{xz}^*(\nabla \Pi_z(z) c) = (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \nabla \Pi_z(z)) \Gamma_{xz}^* c + (\Gamma_{xz}^* \nabla \Pi_z(z)) d\Gamma_{xz}^* c.$$

Plugging into the exponential formula (3.15) the definition (2.15) of $D^{(0)}$ and the choice $\pi_{xz}^{(0)} = \Pi_x(z)$, see (3.39), we see

$$\Gamma_{xz}^* \mathbf{a}_{k'} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{k+k'}{k} \Pi_x^k(z) \mathbf{a}_{k+k'} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_{xz}^* \mathbf{b}_{\ell'} = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \binom{\ell+\ell'}{\ell} \Pi_x^\ell(z) \mathbf{b}_{\ell+\ell'}.$$

Using this, we can read off from the ansatz (3.27) of $d\Gamma^*$ and the chain rule for the Malliavin derivative

$$d\Gamma_{xz}^* \mathbf{a}_0 = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbf{a}_k \delta(\Pi_x^k(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad d\Gamma_{xz}^* \mathbf{b}_0 = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \mathbf{b}_\ell \delta(\Pi_x^\ell(z)).$$

Furthermore, since $c \in \mathbb{R}[[\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_\ell]]$, see Theorem 2.12, the same arguments yield

$$\Gamma_{xz}^* c = \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m(z) (D^{(0)})^m c \quad \text{and} \quad d\Gamma_{xz}^* c = \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \delta(\Pi_x^m(z)) (D^{(0)})^m c.$$

Altogether we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-(z) &= \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \delta(\Pi_x^k(z)) \nabla \Delta \Gamma_{xz}^* Q \Pi_z(z) + \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z) \nabla \Delta d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \delta(\Pi_x^\ell(z)) \xi_\tau(z) - (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \nabla \Pi_z(z)) \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m(z) (D^{(0)})^m c \\ &\quad - (\Gamma_{xz}^* \nabla \Pi_z(z)) \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \delta(\Pi_x^m(z)) (D^{(0)})^m c. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying the Malliavin derivative to (2.14b) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \Pi_z^- &= \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \delta(\Pi_x^k) \nabla \Delta \Pi_x + \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k \nabla \Delta \delta \Pi_x \\ &\quad + \sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \delta(\Pi_x^\ell) \xi_\tau + \sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell \delta \xi_\tau \\ &\quad - \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \delta(\Pi_x^m) \nabla \Pi_x (D^{(0)})^m c - \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m \nabla \delta \Pi_x (D^{(0)})^m c. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\delta \Pi_z^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)(z) &= Q \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \delta(\Pi_x^k(z)) \nabla \Delta (\Pi_x - \Gamma_{xz}^* Q \Pi_z)(z) \\ &\quad + Q \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z) \nabla \Delta (\delta \Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)(z) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + Q \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell}(z) \delta \xi_{\tau}(z) \\
& - Q \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \delta(\Pi_x^m(z)) \nabla(\Pi_x - \Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)(z) (D^{(0)})^m c \\
& - Q \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m(z) \nabla(\delta \Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)(z) (D^{(0)})^m c.
\end{aligned}$$

We shall argue that the first, fourth, and last right hand side term vanish. For the first term we use that $Q(\mathbf{a}_k \pi_1 \cdots \pi_{k+1}) = Q(\mathbf{a}_k(Q\pi) \cdots (Q\pi_{k+1}))$, which follows from

$$e_k + \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{k+1} = \beta \quad \implies \quad |\beta_1| + \cdots + |\beta_{k+1}| = |\beta|$$

and non-negativity of the homogeneity $|\cdot|$, and that $Q\Gamma_{xz}^*Q = Q\Gamma_{xz}^*$, which follows from the triangularity (2.27) of Γ_{xz}^* with respect to the homogeneity. Thus, by (2.25) the first right hand side term vanishes. The fourth right hand side term vanishes by (2.25) as well. The last right hand side term vanishes by (3.25), which finishes the proof of (3.13). \square

3.2. Inductive structure of the proof. The whole argument outlined above is carried out inductively. A natural choice for the ordering needed for induction is the length of a multiindex β . We consider instead the following weighted length

$$(3.30) \quad |\beta|_{\prec} := \sum_k \beta(k) + \sum_{\ell} \beta(\ell) + \lambda \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} |\mathbf{n}| \beta(\mathbf{n})$$

with $0 < \lambda < 1/2$. For ease of notation, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma \prec \beta & \iff |\gamma|_{\prec} < |\beta|_{\prec}, \\
\gamma \preceq \beta & \iff \gamma \prec \beta \text{ or } \gamma = \beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.5. The weight λ is necessary for $d\Gamma^*$ to be triangular with respect to this length, see (3.38). More generally, if the sum in the definition (3.27) of $d\Gamma^*$ is restricted to $|\mathbf{n}| \leq C$, then the upcoming Lemma 3.7 remains true, provided λ is restricted by $0 < \lambda < 1/C$ and 2 is replaced by C in the last item of (3.38).

Remark 3.6. The weight $|\mathbf{n}|$ allows for the following finiteness property, which makes \prec suitable for an inductive argument: For all β

$$(3.31) \quad \#\{\gamma \text{ populated} \mid \gamma \prec \beta\} < \infty.$$

Indeed, if $|\gamma|_{\prec}$ is bounded, then the term $\sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} |\mathbf{n}| \gamma(\mathbf{n})$ forces γ to assign only finitely many values to $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$, and to vanish for all but finitely many $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$. In particular, there are finitely many purely polynomial γ . If γ is populated and not purely polynomial, then by (2.19)

$$\sum_k (k+1)\gamma(k) + \sum_{\ell} (\ell+1)\gamma(\ell) = -1 + \sum_k \gamma(k) + 2 \sum_{\ell} \gamma(\ell) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \gamma(\mathbf{n}).$$

The right hand side of this expression is bounded by assumption, forcing γ also to assign only finitely many values to k, ℓ , and to vanish for all but finitely many k, ℓ .

Together with (3.31), the following lemma provides all triangular dependencies that allow for an inductive proof.

Lemma 3.7 (Triangularity).

- (i) $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ given by (2.18) does not depend on $\Pi_{x\beta'}$ unless $\beta' \prec \beta$. Furthermore, if $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ depends on $c_{\beta'}$, then we must have $\beta' + \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{n}^i} \prec \beta$, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, or

$\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} = \beta$, for some $1 \leq i \leq d$, where¹⁵ \mathbf{n}^i is the unit vector in the i -th direction.

(ii) For Γ^* defined in (3.15) and all γ (not necessarily populated),

$$(3.32) \quad (\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma} \text{ does not depend on } \pi_{\beta'}^{(\mathbf{n})} \text{ unless } \beta' \preceq \beta,$$

$$(3.33) \quad \text{if } \sum_{\ell} \gamma(\ell) > 0, \text{ then } (\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma} \text{ does not depend on } \pi_{\beta'}^{(\mathbf{n})} \text{ unless } \beta' \prec \beta.$$

Moreover,

$$(3.34) \quad (\Gamma^* - \text{id})_{\beta}^{\gamma} \neq 0 \implies \gamma \prec \beta \text{ and } |\gamma| < |\beta|,$$

$$(3.35) \quad (\delta\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma} \neq 0 \implies \gamma \prec \beta \text{ and } |\gamma| < |\beta|.$$

(iii) For $d\Gamma^*$ defined in (3.27) and γ populated,

$$(3.36) \quad (d\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{p.p.}} \text{ does not depend on } d\pi_{\beta'}^{(\mathbf{n})}, \Gamma_{\beta'}^*, \text{ unless } \beta' \prec \beta.$$

Moreover,

$$(3.37) \quad (d\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{p.p.}} \neq 0 \implies |\beta| \geq 2\alpha,$$

$$(3.38) \quad (d\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma} \neq 0 \implies \gamma \prec \beta \text{ and } |\gamma| \leq |\beta| + 2 - \alpha.$$

We provide the proof of Lemma 3.7 at the end of this section. In the following two subsections we outline the logical order of the induction.

3.2.1. Purely polynomial multiindices. Before we come to the induction proper, we construct and estimate all purely polynomial components of all objects involved in the proof of Theorem 2.12. For such $\beta = g_{\mathbf{n}}$, the estimate (2.31) of $\Pi_{xg_{\mathbf{n}}}$ is satisfied trivially, since $\Pi_{xg_{\mathbf{n}}}$ is according to (2.12a) defined by $(\cdot - x)^{\mathbf{n}}$. Because $\Pi_{xg_{\mathbf{n}}}^- = 0$ by (2.21), the estimate (3.5) of $\Pi_{xg_{\mathbf{n}}}^-$ is also true.

Similarly, the estimate (2.32) of $(\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{\gamma}$ also holds: By (3.24) we know that $(\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{\gamma}$ is only non-vanishing if $\gamma = g_{\mathbf{m}}$ for some $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{0}$, in which case it is, according to (2.28), defined by $\binom{\mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{m}}(y-x)^{\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{m}}$, with the implicit understanding that $\binom{\mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{m}} = 0$ if the componentwise $\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{n}$ is violated. The estimate (3.91) of $\pi_{xyg_{\mathbf{n}}}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ follows analogously, since the exponential formula (3.15) yields $(\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{g_{\mathbf{m}}} = (\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{m}} + \pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{m})})_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}$, which because of the previous argument leads us to define $\pi_{xyg_{\mathbf{n}}}^{(\mathbf{m})} = \binom{\mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{m}}(y-x)^{\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{m}}$ for¹⁶ $\mathbf{m} < \mathbf{n}$. Note that this choice is consistent with the population constraint (3.19).

The estimates (3.64), (3.6), (3.87), and (3.92) on $\delta\Pi_{xg_{\mathbf{n}}}$, $\delta\Pi_{xg_{\mathbf{n}}}^-$, $(\delta\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{\gamma}$, and $\delta\pi_{xyg_{\mathbf{n}}}^{(\mathbf{m})}$, respectively, hold true, since all these objects vanish as they are deterministic by the previous arguments.

From the mapping property (3.29) of $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$, we know that $(d\Gamma_{xz}^*)_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{\gamma}$ vanishes for populated γ , and so does $d\pi_{xzg_{\mathbf{n}}}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ since $d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ is an element of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^*$ by (3.27). Thus, the estimates (3.90) and (3.97) on $(d\Gamma_{xz}^*)_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{\gamma}$ and $d\pi_{xzg_{\mathbf{n}}}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ also hold true trivially.

Finally, the estimates (3.7), (3.8), (3.88), and (3.93) on increments of $\delta\Pi_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}$, $\delta\Pi_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^-$, $d\Gamma_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^*$, and $d\pi_{g_{\mathbf{n}}}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ are trivially satisfied, as we have just argued that all these objects vanish.

3.2.2. Induction proper. We turn to the proper induction, where we treat populated and not purely polynomial multiindices β . From (2.19) and the definition (3.30) of $|\cdot|_{\prec}$, we see that $\beta = g_{\mathbf{n}}$ with $|\mathbf{n}| = 1$ can serve as the base case.

In the induction step, we fix a populated and not purely polynomial β and assume for all $\beta' \prec \beta$ that the estimates (2.31), (3.5), (2.32), and (3.91) on $\Pi_{\beta'}$, $\Pi_{\beta'}^-$, $\Gamma_{\beta'}^*$, and

¹⁵Mind the difference of notation between subscripts $\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_j$ used for enumeration and superscripts \mathbf{n}^i denoting the unit vectors of \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d} .

¹⁶by $\mathbf{m} < \mathbf{n}$ we understand $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{n}$ and componentwise $\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{n}$

$\pi_{\beta'}^{(\mathbf{n})}$, the estimates (3.64), (3.6), (3.87), and (3.92) on $\delta\Pi_{\beta'}$, $\delta\Pi_{\beta'}^-$, $\delta\Gamma_{\beta'}^*$, and $\delta\pi_{\beta'}^{(\mathbf{n})}$, the estimates (3.90) and (3.97) on $d\Gamma_{\beta'}^*$ and $d\pi_{\beta'}^{(\mathbf{n})}$, and the estimates (3.7), (3.8), (3.88), and (3.93) on increments of $\delta\Pi_{\beta'}$, $\delta\Pi_{\beta'}^-$, $d\Gamma_{\beta'}^*$, and $d\pi_{\beta'}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ hold true, with the understanding that all these objects have been constructed. Furthermore, we assume that $c_{\beta'}$ has been constructed for all $\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} \prec \beta$. The aim is to construct and estimate the corresponding β -components, except for c where we construct the $c_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}$ component. In the induction, we distinguish the case $|\beta| < 3$ from $|\beta| > 3$, and start by explaining the simpler case $|\beta| > 3$. Note that by (2.24) the case $|\beta| = 3$ has been dealt with in the previous subsection on purely polynomial multiindices.

- (1) By the triangular property (3.33), we construct and estimate $(\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ for γ not purely polynomial in Lemma 3.18 (Algebraic argument I).
- (2) By the triangular property of Lemma 3.7 (i), we define Π_{β}^- by (2.18), where we set $c_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}} = 0$. Furthermore, we estimate Π_{β}^- in Lemma 3.16 (Reconstruction I).
- (3) Based on a Liouville principle, we construct and estimate Π_{β} in Corollary 3.13 (Integration I).
- (4) We construct and estimate $\pi_{\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})}$, which by (3.23) yields together with Item (1) the construction of and estimates on $(\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ for all populated γ . The only equation dependent ingredient in the construction of $\pi_{\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ is a Liouville principle, which we provide in Lemma 3.11; we therefore refer for the construction to [LOTT21, Section 5.3]. We only note for later that the choice

$$(3.39) \quad \pi_{xy\beta}^{(\mathbf{0})} = \Pi_{x\beta}(y)$$

has to be made, and that the construction respects (3.19) and yields that the β -components of (2.25) and (2.26) hold. Recall that also (2.27) and (2.28) hold, the former by Lemma 3.7 and the latter by (3.24) and the choice we made for purely polynomial multiindices in the previous subsection. The estimate on $\pi_{\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ is provided in Lemma 3.22 (Three-point argument I).

In the case $|\beta| < 3$ we proceed as follows.

- (1) By the triangular properties (3.33) and (3.36), we construct and estimate
 - (a) $(\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{P.P.}}$ in Lemma 3.18 (Algebraic argument I),
 - (b) $(\delta\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{P.P.}}$ in Lemma 3.19 (Algebraic argument II),
 - (c) $(d\Gamma^* - d\Gamma^*\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{P.P.}}$ in Lemma 3.20 (Algebraic argument III),
 - (d) $(d\Gamma^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{P.P.}}$ in Lemma 3.21 (Algebraic argument IV).
- (2) By the triangular property of Lemma 3.7 (i), we define Π_{β}^- by (2.18), where we define $c_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}$ according to the BPHZ-choice (3.49). If $\beta - g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$ is not a multiindex then there is no c -component to choose, but (3.49) is still satisfied by the symmetry properties of Proposition 3.8 (for more details see Section 3.3). We show in Proposition 3.9 that this choice allows to estimate $\mathbb{E}\Pi_{\beta}^-$.
- (3) Based on (3.13), we estimate $(\delta\Pi^- - d\Gamma^*\Pi^-)_{\beta}$ in Lemma 3.17 (Reconstruction II).
- (4) Equipped with the estimates of Item (1d) and Item (3), we estimate $\delta\Pi_{\beta}^-$ in Lemma 3.26 (Averaging).
- (5) As explained in Section 3.1.3, we estimate Π_{β}^- by an application of the spectral gap inequality, based on the estimates of Items (2) and (4).
- (6) Exactly as in Item (3) of the case $|\beta| > 3$, we construct and estimate Π_{β} in Corollary 3.13 (Integration I).

- (7) Exactly as in Item (4) of the case $|\beta| > 3$ we construct $\pi_\beta^{(\mathbf{n})}$ and provide its estimate in Lemma 3.22 (Three-point argument I). As before, this finishes together with Item (1a) the construction and estimate on $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ for all populated γ .




FIGURE 1. Visualization of the main steps of the inductive structure of the proof for multiindices $|\beta| < 3$.

This finishes the construction and estimates on the β -components of all objects stated in Theorem 2.12. However, for later induction steps we have to construct and estimate a few more objects which we have made use of.

- (8) Analogous to Π_β , we estimate its Malliavin derivative $\delta\Pi_\beta$ in Corollary 3.14 (Integration II) based on a Liouville principle.
- (9) Analogous to $\pi_\beta^{(\mathbf{n})}$, we estimate its Malliavin derivative $\delta\pi_\beta^{(\mathbf{n})}$ in Lemma 3.23 (Three-point argument II). Applying δ to (3.23), we see that this provides together with Item (1b) the estimate on $(\delta\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ for all populated γ .
- (10) We construct $d\pi_\beta^{(\mathbf{n})}$ for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2$ as follows: By $D^{(\mathbf{n})}\mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} = 1$ (see (3.16)) and $\Gamma_{xz}^*1 = 1$ (see (3.15)), we obtain from the ansatz (3.27) that $d\Gamma_{xz}^*\mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} = d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2$. Furthermore, (2.12a) implies $\frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!}\partial^{\mathbf{n}}((1-P)\Pi_z)(z) = \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n}$, hence (3.25) yields for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1, 2$

$$d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!}\partial^{\mathbf{n}}(\delta\Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^*P\Pi_z)(z).$$

By the triangular structure (3.38), this serves as an inductive definition of $d\pi^{(\mathbf{n})}$ provided we are given $\delta\Pi_\beta$, $(d\Gamma^*)_\beta^{\gamma \neq \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{P}}$, and $\Pi_{\prec\beta}$. By $d\Gamma^*\mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} = d\pi^{(\mathbf{n})}$, this serves, together with Item (1d), as a construction of $(d\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ for all populated γ .

- (11) Once more based on a Liouville principle, we estimate $(\delta\Pi - \delta\Pi - d\Gamma^*\Pi)_\beta$ in Lemma 3.15 (Integration III).
- (12) We estimate $(d\pi^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\pi^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\Gamma^*\pi^{(\mathbf{n})})_\beta$ in Lemma 3.24 (Three-point argument III), which by (3.23) and $d\Gamma_{xz}^*\mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} = d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ provides together with Item (1c) the estimate on $(d\Gamma^* - d\Gamma^*\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ for all populated γ .

- (13) Finally we estimate $d\pi_\beta^{(\mathbf{n})}$ in Lemma 3.25 (Three-point argument IV), which by $d\Gamma_{xz}^* \mathbf{p}_\mathbf{n} = d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ provides, together with Item (1d), the estimate on $(d\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ for all populated γ .

Proof of Lemma 3.7. We start with the proof of (i). For the first two sums in (2.18) it is enough to establish

$$\begin{aligned} e_k + \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{k+1} = \beta &\implies \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k+1} \prec \beta, \\ f_\ell + \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_\ell = \beta &\implies \beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell \prec \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\cdot|_\prec$ is additive and non negative, this is an immediate consequence of $|e_k|_\prec = |f_\ell|_\prec = 1$. The last sum in (2.18) is a linear combination of terms of the form

$$\Pi_{x\beta_1} \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_m} \nabla \Pi_{x\beta_{m+1}} \sum_\gamma ((D^{(0)})^m)_{\beta_{m+2}}^\gamma c_\gamma$$

for $m \geq 0$ and $\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{m+2} = \beta$, which completes the proof of the first part of (i). We now move on to the proof of the second part of (i). Note that (2.17) implies that for all β', γ'

$$(3.40) \quad (D^{(0)})_{\beta'}^{\gamma'} \neq 0 \implies |\beta'|_\prec = |\gamma'|_\prec.$$

By iteration, the same property carries over to $((D^{(0)})^m)_{\beta'}^{\gamma'}$.

We know now that the expression for $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ given in (2.18) consists only of $\Pi_{x\beta'}$ such that $\beta' \prec \beta$. We assume by induction that the result of (i) holds true for all such $\Pi_{x\beta'}$. Thus, we necessarily have that the first two terms on the right hand side of (2.18) depend only on $c_{\beta'}$ such that $\beta' + g_{n_i} \prec \beta$. Thus, for the proof of this proposition, we only have to consider the last sum on the right hand side of (2.18) which consists of terms of the form

$$(3.41) \quad \Pi_{x\beta_1} \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_m} \nabla \Pi_{x\beta_{m+1}} \sum_\gamma ((D^{(0)})^m)_{\beta_{m+2}}^\gamma c_\gamma,$$

such that $\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{m+2} = \beta$ and $m \geq 0$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.7, we observe that

$$((D^{(0)})^m)_{\beta'}^{\gamma'} \neq 0 \implies |\beta'|_\prec = |\gamma'|_\prec.$$

It follows that if $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ contains $c_{\beta'}$, then there must be a term of the form (3.41) such that $|\beta_{m+2}|_\prec = |\beta'|_\prec$ and $\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{m+1} + \beta_{m+2} = \beta$. Consider first the case in which β has no polynomial component. Then, by the additivity of the ordering (3.30), we have

$$|\beta_1|_\prec + \cdots + |\beta_{m+1}|_\prec + |\beta'|_\prec = |\beta|_\prec.$$

Since none of $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{m+1}$ can contain a polynomial component and $m \geq 0$, we must have that $|\beta|_\prec \geq |\beta'|_\prec + 1$. Furthermore, since $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$, it follows that $\beta' + g_{n^i} \prec \beta$, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

Consider now the case in which $|\beta|_p \geq 2$. Again, we have

$$|\beta_1|_\prec + \cdots + |\beta_{m+1}|_\prec + |\beta'|_\prec = |\beta|_\prec.$$

We already know that β' has no polynomial component. It follows that

$$|\beta_1|_\prec + \cdots + |\beta_{m+1}|_\prec \geq \lambda |\beta|_p \geq 2\lambda.$$

It thus follows that

$$|\beta|_\prec \geq |\beta'|_\prec + 2\lambda \geq |\beta' + g_{n^i}|_\prec + \lambda,$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

We are now left to treat the final case, $|\beta|_p = 1$. We first treat the case in which $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{m+1}$ are not all purely polynomial. In this case, we must have

$$|\beta_1|_\prec + \cdots + |\beta_{m+1}|_\prec \geq 1 + \lambda.$$

It follows that $\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} \prec \beta$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. If $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{m+1}$ are purely polynomial, since $|\beta|_p = 1$, we must have $m = 0$ and $\beta_1 = g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq d$. Thus, $\beta_{m+2} = \beta_2 = \beta - g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$. Furthermore, since $m = 0$, we must have $\beta_2 = \beta'$ and so $\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} = \beta$. This completes the proof of (i).

We turn to (ii). Recall from (3.20) that $(\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ is a linear combination of terms of the form

$$(3.42) \quad \pi_{\beta_1}^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots \pi_{\beta_j}^{(\mathbf{n}_j)} (D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)})_{\beta_{j+1}}^\gamma,$$

where $j \geq 0$, $\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_j \in \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d}$, $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{j+1} = \beta$ and $|\beta_i| > |\mathbf{n}_i|$ for $i = 1, \dots, j$. Clearly, $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_j \preceq \beta$, which establishes (3.32). For (3.33) it is enough to argue that $\beta_{j+1} \neq 0$. By assumption we have $\sum_\ell \gamma(\ell) > 0$, and by (2.17) and (3.18) we learn that if (3.42) is not vanishing then $\sum_\ell \gamma(\ell) = \sum_\ell \beta_{j+1}(\ell)$, hence $\beta_{j+1} \neq 0$. We turn to (3.34) and note that also $(\Gamma^* - \text{id})_\beta^\gamma$ is a linear combination of terms of the form (3.42), with the difference to above that here j is restricted to $j \geq 1$. We observe that (3.18) implies for $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and for all β', γ'

$$(3.43) \quad (D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta'}^{\gamma'} \neq 0 \implies |\beta'|_{\prec} = |\gamma'|_{\prec} - \lambda|\mathbf{n}|.$$

Together with (3.40) we obtain

$$(D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)})_{\beta_{j+1}}^\gamma \neq 0 \implies |\beta_{j+1}|_{\prec} = |\gamma|_{\prec} - \lambda(|\mathbf{n}_1| + \dots + |\mathbf{n}_j|).$$

Hence if (3.42) is non-vanishing, then

$$|\beta|_{\prec} = |\beta_1|_{\prec} + \dots + |\beta_j|_{\prec} + |\gamma|_{\prec} - \lambda(|\mathbf{n}_1| + \dots + |\mathbf{n}_j|).$$

From (2.22) and $1 \geq \alpha\lambda$ we obtain $|\beta_i|_{\prec} \geq \lambda|\beta_i|$, which together with $|\beta_i| > |\mathbf{n}_i|$ yields $|\beta_i|_{\prec} > \lambda|\mathbf{n}_i|$, and hence $|\beta|_{\prec} > |\gamma|_{\prec}$. For the second item of (3.34) we first note that by (2.17) and (3.18) we have for all \mathbf{n}

$$(3.44) \quad (D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta'}^{\gamma'} \neq 0 \implies |\beta'| = |\gamma'| + \alpha - |\mathbf{n}|.$$

Hence, similarly as above we obtain that if (3.42) is non-vanishing, then

$$(3.45) \quad |\beta| = |\beta_1| + \dots + |\beta_j| + |\gamma| - (|\mathbf{n}_1| + \dots + |\mathbf{n}_j|).$$

By $|\beta_i| > |\mathbf{n}_i|$ for $i = 1, \dots, j$ and $j \geq 1$ we obtain $|\beta| > |\gamma|$, which finishes the proof of (3.34). (3.35) is an immediate consequence of (3.34).

We come to (iii) and note that by (3.27), $(d\Gamma^*)_\beta^\gamma$ is a linear combination of terms of the form

$$d\pi_{\beta_1}^{(\mathbf{n})} \sum_{\beta'} (\Gamma^*)_{\beta_2}^{\beta'} (D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta'}^\gamma,$$

where $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2$ and $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$. Since only populated β_1 are relevant we have $\beta_1 \neq 0$, in particular $|\beta_1|_{\prec} > 0$ and thus $\beta_2 \prec \beta$. If β_2 were 0, then $\beta' = 0$ by the already established (3.34). However, $(D^{(\mathbf{n})})_0^\gamma \neq 0$ implies $\gamma = g_{\mathbf{n}}$ by (2.17) and (3.18), which contradicts the assumption $\sum_\ell \gamma(\ell) > 0$. Hence $\beta_2 \neq 0$ and therefore $\beta_1 \prec \beta$, which finishes the proof of (3.36). For (3.38), we appeal to (3.34), (3.40) and (3.43) to obtain

$$|\beta|_{\prec} = |\beta_1|_{\prec} + |\beta_2|_{\prec} \geq |\beta_1|_{\prec} + |\gamma|_{\prec} - \lambda|\mathbf{n}|.$$

By (3.28), β_1 is populated and not purely polynomial, which implies $|\beta_1|_{\prec} \geq 1$. Together with $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2$ we obtain $|\beta|_{\prec} \geq |\gamma|_{\prec} + 1 - 2\lambda > |\gamma|_{\prec}$. Similarly, by (3.34) and (3.44) we obtain

$$(3.46) \quad |\beta| = |\beta_1| + |\beta_2| - \alpha \geq |\beta_1| + |\gamma| - |\mathbf{n}|.$$

Since $|\beta_1| \geq \alpha$ and $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2$, this finishes the proof of (3.38).

We finally provide the argument for (3.37). In view of (3.46) it remains to argue that $|\gamma| - |\mathbf{n}| \geq \alpha$. If $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, this is clear. If $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$, note that $(D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta'}^\gamma \neq 0$ implies $\gamma(\mathbf{n}) \geq 1$ by

(3.17), hence in particular $|\gamma|_p \geq |\mathbf{n}|$. As γ is populated, we have $|\gamma| = \alpha \sum_{\ell} \gamma(\ell) + |\gamma|_p$, which implies the desired $|\gamma| \geq \alpha + |\mathbf{n}|$ since γ is not purely polynomial and hence $\sum_{\ell} \gamma(\ell) \geq 1$. \square

3.3. BPHZ-choice of the renormalisation constant. In this section, we will explain how we will choose the renormalisation constants c_{β} . Note that in Section 2.1 we have already considerably reduced the structure of the counterterm. We thus need to argue that at the level of $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ a number of terms should require no renormalisation due to exactly the same symmetries we have used to derive a reduced form of the counterterm. This leads us to the following proposition.

Proposition 3.8. *Assume that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied. Then, for all $x, y, h \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$, the following properties hold true*

- (1) $\Pi_{x\beta}[\xi(\cdot + h)](y) = \Pi_{x+h\beta}[\xi](y + h)$,
 $\Pi_{x\beta}^-[\xi(\cdot + h)](y) = \Pi_{x+h\beta}^-[\xi](y + h)$,
- (2) $\Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi(R\cdot)](y) = (-1)^{|\beta|_p} \Pi_{Rx\beta}[\xi](Ry)$,
 $\Pi_{x\beta}^-[-\xi(R\cdot)](y) = (-1)^{1+|\beta|_p} \Pi_{Rx\beta}^-[\xi](Ry)$, and
- (3) $\Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi](y) = (-1)^{\sum \beta(\ell)} \Pi_{x\beta}[\xi](y)$,
 $\Pi_{x\beta}^-[-\xi](y) = (-1)^{1+\sum \beta(\ell)} \Pi_{x\beta}^-[\xi](y)$.

Furthermore, let β^i be such that $\beta^i(\mathbf{n}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and denote by $\beta^i = \beta^i + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$ where \mathbf{n}^i is the unit vector of \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d} in the i -th direction. Then for $j = 1, \dots, d$

- (4) $\sum_{i=1}^d \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta^i}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) = \Pi_{Ox\beta^j}[\xi](Oy)$,
 $\sum_{i=1}^d \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta^i}^-[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) = \bar{O}^T \Pi_{Ox\beta^j}^-[\xi](Oy)$.

Proof. We will provide a formal proof of these identities by using the power series expansion for the solution. This proof can easily be made fully rigorous by using an induction argument on the hierarchy of equations given by (2.14a). However, for the sake of brevity and clarity of the exposition, we will avoid doing this here.

For the symmetry in Item 1, we note, as before, that if the tuple $[u, a, b, p, \xi]$ is a solution of (2.3), then so is $[u(\cdot + h), a, b, p(\cdot + h), \xi(\cdot + h)]$. It follows from the power series expansion (2.13) and comparing coefficients of $u(\cdot + h)$ and u that we must have $\Pi_{x\beta}[\xi(\cdot + h)](y) = \Pi_{x+h\beta}[\xi](y + h)$ for all $x, y, h \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$. The equality at the level of $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ follows by simply using (2.18).

Similarly, for Item 2, we note that if the tuple $[u, a, b, p, \xi]$ is a solution of (2.3) then so is $[u(R\cdot), a, b, p(R\cdot), -\xi(R\cdot)]$. Using the expansion (2.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & u(Ry) - u(Rx) \\ &= \sum_{\beta} \Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi(R\cdot)](y) \mathbf{z}^{\beta} [a(\cdot + u(Rx)), b(\cdot + u(Rx)), p(R\cdot + Rx) - p(Rx)] \\ &= \sum_{\beta} (-1)^{\sum |\mathbf{n}| \geq 1 \beta(\mathbf{n})} \Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi(R\cdot)](y) \mathbf{z}^{\beta} [a(\cdot + u(Rx)), b(\cdot + u(Rx)), p(\cdot + Rx) - p(Rx)] \\ &= \sum_{\beta} (-1)^{|\beta|_p} \Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi(R\cdot)](y) \mathbf{z}^{\beta} [a(\cdot + u(Rx)), b(\cdot + u(Rx)), p(\cdot + Rx) - p(Rx)] \end{aligned}$$

where $|\mathbf{n}|_{\geq 1} := \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{n}_i$. The symmetry then follows by comparing coefficients. We now apply (2.18) to compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{x\beta}^-[-\xi(R\cdot)](y) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k \\ e_k + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{k+1} = \beta}} (-1)^{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} |\beta_i|_p} \Pi_{Rx\beta_1}[\xi](Ry) \cdots \Pi_{Rx\beta_k}[\xi](Ry) (\nabla \Delta \Pi_{Rx\beta_{k+1}}[\xi])(Ry) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{f_\ell + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_\ell = \beta} (-1)^{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |\beta_i|_p} \Pi_{Rx\beta_1}[\xi] \cdots \Pi_{Rx\beta_\ell}[\xi] \xi_\tau \\
& - \sum_{\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{m+2} = \beta} \frac{1}{m!} (-1)^{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} |\beta_i|_p} \Pi_{Rx\beta_1}[\xi](Ry) \cdots \Pi_{Rx\beta_m}[\xi](Ry) (\nabla \Pi_{Rx\beta_{m+1}}[\xi])(Ry) \\
& \hspace{15em} \times ((D^{(0)})^m c)_{\beta_{m+2}} \\
& = (-1)^{1 + |\beta|_p} \Pi_{Rx\beta}^-[\xi](Ry),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Assumption 2.2 and the fact that c depends only on the law of ξ . This completes the proof of Item 2.

We now move on to Item 3 by noting that if $[u, a, b, p, \xi]$ is a solution of (2.3), then so is $[u, a, -b, p, -\xi]$. Once again, appealing to the expansion (2.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u(y) - u(x) &= \sum_{\beta} \Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi](y) z^\beta [a(\cdot + u(x)), -b(\cdot + u(x)), p(\cdot + x) - p(x)] \\
&= \sum_{\beta} (-1)^{\sum \beta(\ell)} \Pi_{x\beta}[-\xi](y) z^\beta [a(\cdot + u(x)), b(\cdot + u(x)), p(\cdot + x) - p(x)].
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing coefficients with the original power series, Item 3 follows at the the level of $\Pi_{x\beta}$. The proof for $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ follows in an identical manner to that of Item 2 by using (2.18). Finally, for Item 4 we note that if $[u, a, b, p, \xi]$ is a solution of (2.3), then so is $[u(O\cdot), a, b, p(O\cdot), \bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)]$. Note that of β^i is of the form described in the statement of the proposition, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& z^{\beta^i} [a(\cdot + u(O\cdot)), b(\cdot + u(O\cdot)), p(O\cdot + Ox) - p(Ox)] \\
& = \sum_j \bar{O}_{ij} z^{\beta^j} [a(\cdot + u(O\cdot)), b(\cdot + u(O\cdot)), p(\cdot + Ox) - p(Ox)].
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing coefficients as before, we obtain

$$(3.47) \quad \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta^i}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) = \Pi_{Ox\beta^j}[\xi](Oy).$$

Before we move on to $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$, we note that an essentially similar argument to the one above can be used to show that, if β has no polynomial component, then

$$(3.48) \quad \Pi_{x\beta}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) = \Pi_{Ox\beta}[\xi](Oy).$$

For $\Pi_{x\beta^i}^-$, we consider the three terms on the right hand side of (2.18) separately. if we attempt to compute $\sum_i \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta^i}^-[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y)$, the first term on the right hand side of (2.18) is of the following form

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta_1}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_k}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) (\nabla \Delta \Pi_{x\beta_{k+1}}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y))$$

where one of $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k+1}$ is of the form $\bar{\beta} + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$, for some $\bar{\beta}$ with no polynomial component, with all the other multiindices having no polynomial component. In the case that one of β_1, \dots, β_k (say β_1) is of the form $\bar{\beta} + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$, we can apply (3.47) and (3.48) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta_1}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_k}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y) (\nabla \Delta \Pi_{x\beta_{k+1}}[\bar{O}^T \xi(O\cdot)](y)) \\
& = \Pi_{Ox\bar{\beta} + g_{\mathbf{n}^j}}[\xi](Oy) \cdots \Pi_{Ox\beta_k}[\xi](Oy) (\bar{O}^T \nabla \Delta \Pi_{Ox\beta_{k+1}}[\xi](Oy)).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $\beta_{k+1} = \bar{\beta} + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$, we can apply similar arguments to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta_1} [\bar{O}^T \xi(O \cdot)](y) \cdots \Pi_{x\beta_k} [\bar{O}^T \xi(O \cdot)](y) (\nabla \Delta \Pi_{x\beta_{k+1}} [\bar{O}^T \xi(O \cdot)](y)) \\ &= \Pi_{Ox\beta_1} [\xi](Oy) \cdots \Pi_{Ox\beta_k} [\xi](Oy) (\bar{O}^T \nabla \Delta \Pi_{Ox\bar{\beta} + g_{\mathbf{n}^j}} [\xi](Oy)). \end{aligned}$$

Applying similar arguments to the other two terms on the right hand side of (2.18) and using the fact that c only depends on the law of ξ (and Assumption 2.2), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \bar{O}_{ij} \Pi_{x\beta^i}^- [\bar{O}^T \xi(O \cdot)](y) = \bar{O}^T \Pi_{Ox\beta^j}^- [\xi](Oy),$$

thus completing the proof. \square

We are now finally in a position to choose the constants c_β . We want to choose the constants such that for all $|\beta| < 3$, the following large scale average vanishes,

$$(3.49) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Pi_{x\beta t}^-] = 0.$$

Using the result of Proposition 3.8 tells us that $\mathbb{E}[\Pi_{x\beta t}^-]$ is independent of x and is non-zero only if

$$1 + |\beta|_p \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + \sum_{\ell} \beta(\ell) \quad \text{are even.}$$

This tells us that we only need to concern ourselves with $\beta = \beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$ where β' has no polynomial component and $\sum_{\ell} \beta'(\ell)$ is odd, thus (2.29) is satisfied.

Using the triangularity established in Lemma 3.7, we can choose the constants c_β in a manner that is self-consistent with respect to the ordering $|\cdot|_{\prec}$ defined in (3.30). As described in Section 3.2, we will perform induction on the ordering \prec assuming that, for a given $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ we have constructed and estimated $\Pi_{x\beta'}$ for $\beta' \prec \beta$ and $c_{\beta'}$ for $\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} \prec \beta$ (for all $i = 1, \dots, d$). Then, for such a $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ which depends on some $c_{\beta'}$, by Lemma 3.7 (i), either $\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} \prec \beta$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ in which case $c_{\beta'}$ has already been chosen or $\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} = \beta$. In the latter case, we note that we can rewrite $\Pi_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}^-$ from (2.18) componentwise as follows

$$(3.50) \quad \Pi_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}^- = \tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}^- - c_{\beta'} \mathbf{n}^i,$$

where $\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}^-$ just represents the remaining terms on the right hand side of (2.18). It follows from Lemma 3.7 (i) that $\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}^-$ only depends on $c_{\bar{\beta}}$ for $\bar{\beta} + g_{\mathbf{n}^j} \prec \beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$, for all $1 \leq j \leq d$, which have all been chosen already. We then make the following choice

$$(3.51) \quad c_{\beta'} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} t}^-]_i.$$

Note that due to Item 4 from Proposition 3.8, we have that

$$(3.52) \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} t}^-]_j = 0,$$

for $i \neq j$ and

$$(3.53) \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^j} t}^-]_j = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} t}^-]_i,$$

for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. For fixed $1 \leq i < j \leq d$, (3.52) follows by choosing

$$(\bar{O})_{mn} = \begin{cases} \delta_{mn} & \text{for } m \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{i, j\}, \\ \delta_{jn} & \text{for } m = i, \\ -\delta_{in} & \text{for } m = j, \end{cases}$$

while (3.53) follows by choosing

$$(\bar{O})_{mn} = \begin{cases} \delta_{mn} & \text{for } m \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{i, j\}, \\ \delta_{jn} & \text{for } m = i, \\ \delta_{in} & \text{for } m = j. \end{cases}$$

Thus, the choice (3.51) is consistent and ensures that the BPHZ renormalisation condition (3.49) is satisfied for all multiindices.

The choice of renormalisation we have made in (3.49) by controlling this large scale average of $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ in fact lets us control $\mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y)$ as we shall establish in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.9. *Assume $|\beta| < 3$ and that (3.5) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.32) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ hold true for all γ not purely polynomial. Then,*

$$(3.54) \quad \int_T^\infty dt \left| \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y) \right| \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{T})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[s]{T} + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha}.$$

Furthermore, by (3.49),

$$(3.55) \quad |\mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y)| \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha}.$$

Proof. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y) &= \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz \psi_{t-s}(y-z) \Pi_{x\beta s}^- (z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz (LL^* \psi_{t-s})(y-z) \mathbb{E}(\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_{zs}^-)_\beta (z), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definition of ψ_t along with the fact that the remainder that shows up in (3.74) is a random polynomial of degree lesser than or equal to $|\beta| - 3$. We now simply apply Proposition 3.8 along with the translation invariance in law of the ensemble ξ from Assumption 2.2 to rewrite the above expression as

$$(3.56) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz (LL^* \psi_{t-s})(y-z) \mathbb{E}((\Gamma_{xz}^* - \text{id}) \Pi_{zs}^-)_\beta (z).$$

From the triangularity of Γ^* established in Lemma 3.7 (see (3.34)), we know that $((\Gamma_{xz}^* - \text{id}) \Pi_{zs}^-)_\beta$ depends on $\Pi_{z\beta'}$ only for $\beta' \prec \beta$. Additionally, from (2.21), we know that $\Pi_{z\beta'}^- \in \tilde{\mathbf{T}}^*$ from which it follows that $((\Gamma_{xz}^* - \text{id}) \Pi_{zs}^-)_\beta$ contains only terms of the form $(\Gamma_{xz}^* - \text{id})_{\beta'}^{\beta'}$ for β' not purely polynomial.

We now choose $s = \frac{t}{2}$ in (3.56). Note that, applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have the following estimate

$$|\mathbb{E}[(\Gamma_{xz}^* - \text{id})_{\beta'}^{\beta'} \Pi_{z\beta' s}^- (z)]| \lesssim |x - z|_s^{|\beta| - |\beta'|} (\sqrt[s]{t})^{|\beta'| - 3} \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha},$$

where we have used the fact that $|\beta'| \geq \alpha$ and $|\beta| - |\beta'| \geq 0$ by the triangularity (3.34) of Γ^* . Integrating in z and applying the moment bound (3.3), we have

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y) \right| \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\alpha-11} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha}.$$

Integrating in t from T to ∞ , we obtain by $|\beta| < 3$ the bound

$$\int_T^\infty dt \left| \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y) \right| \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{T})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[s]{T} + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha},$$

which completes the proof of (3.54). We now have using (3.49)

$$|\mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta T}^- (x)| \leq \int_T^\infty dt \left| \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (x) \right| \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{T})^{|\beta| - 3}.$$

Using the above bound and Γ^* , we have

$$|\mathbb{E}\Pi_{x\beta t}^- (y)| \leq |\mathbb{E}\Pi_{y\beta t}^- (y)| + |\mathbb{E}((\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id})\Pi_{yt}^-)_\beta (y)| \lesssim (\sqrt[5]{t})^{|\beta|-3} + |\mathbb{E}((\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id})\Pi_{yt}^-)_\beta (y)|.$$

For the last right hand side term, we use the triangularity of $\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id}$ as before to estimate the resulting terms with $\beta' \prec \beta$ as follows

$$|\mathbb{E}[(\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id})_\beta^\beta \Pi_{y\beta' t}^- (y)]| \lesssim |x - y|_5^{|\beta|-|\beta'|} (\sqrt[5]{t})^{|\beta'|-3} \lesssim (\sqrt[5]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[5]{t} + |x - y|_5)^{|\beta|-\alpha},$$

where we have used the fact that $|\beta'| < |\beta|$ (from (3.34)) and $|\beta'| \geq \alpha$. Putting it together with the previous estimate, we obtain (3.55). \square

Remark 3.10 (Alternative choice of Π^-). The careful reader may have noticed that the renormalisation constant c_β that we choose for the multiindices $\beta + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$ vanishes after the application of the divergence operator. Since we are ultimately interested in estimates on $\Pi_{x\beta}$, which follow by integration from a corresponding estimate on $\nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta}^-$, this may lead one to the conclusion that the constant is not necessary. However, this is not the case: counterterms chosen within the induction at some point will play an important role for some “bigger” multiindices that come up later in the induction. As an example, consider the multiindex $2f_1 + g_{(0,2)}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x2f_1+g_{(0,2)}}^- &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_1+g_{(0,2)}} \xi_\tau - \nabla(\cdot - x)_1^2 c_{2f_1} - \nabla \Pi_{xf_1+g_{(0,2)}} c_{f_1}) \\ &= \nabla \cdot (\Pi_{xf_1+g_{(0,2)}} \xi_\tau) - c_{2f_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $c_{f_1} = 0$ by Proposition 3.8. From this expression, the diverging lower bound on c_{2f_1} (in $d = 1$) from Theorem 2.16, and the estimate (3.5) (which in turn implies an estimate on its divergence), it is clear that c_{2f_1} cannot be chosen to be 0.

Alternatively, we could have made a different, but equally valid, choice for Π_x^- , say $\check{\Pi}_x^-$, by including the divergence operator $\nabla \cdot$ in its definition. This would amount to solving the hierarchy of linear PDEs given by

$$L\check{\Pi}_{x\beta}^- = \check{\Pi}_{x\beta}^-.$$

We note that in this setting we would have to perform the BPHZ renormalisation in a different way. Repeating the arguments of, it is easy to check that for all β such that \check{c}_β is populated, we would make the choice

$$\check{c}_\beta = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\check{\Pi}_{x\beta+g_{2\mathbf{n}^i} t}^- (x)]$$

for some (and indeed all) $1 \leq i \leq d$. Here, $\check{\Pi}_x^-$ is defined in the natural manner as before.¹⁷ Note that, a priori, this gives us a different choice of the constants $\{\check{c}_\beta\}_\beta$ corresponding to a different functional form of the counterterm $\check{h}(u(\cdot))$. However, if our construction of the models is consistent, h, \check{h} should coincide with each other. We already know from Corollary 2.13 that the two models (Π, Γ) and $(\check{\Pi}, \check{\Gamma})$ (defined in the sense of [Tem23, Definition 1.1]) agree with each other. By induction, we can then show that the families of constants $\{\check{c}_\beta\}_\beta$ and $\{c_\beta\}_\beta$ are the same. Indeed, let us assume that, for any given β , we know that $c_{\beta'} = \check{c}_{\beta'}$ for all $\beta' \prec \beta$. Then, if we look at the model equation for the multiindex $\beta + g_{2\mathbf{n}^i}$, for any $1 \leq i \leq d$, for both Π_x and $\check{\Pi}_x$ and subtract them, we have

$$0 = \nabla \cdot \check{\Pi}_{x\beta+g_{2\mathbf{n}^i}}^- - \check{\Pi}_{x\beta+g_{2\mathbf{n}^i}}^- + 2c_\beta \mathbf{n}^i - 2\check{c}_\beta \mathbf{n}^i.$$

We already know from Lemma 3.7 (i) that $\nabla \cdot \check{\Pi}_{x\beta+g_{2\mathbf{n}^i}}^-$ depends on $c_{\beta'}$ for $\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^j} \prec \beta + g_{2\mathbf{n}^i}$ ($\beta' + g_{\mathbf{n}^i} = \beta + g_{2\mathbf{n}^i}$ is clearly not possible) for all $1 \leq j \leq d$ from which it follows that $\beta' \prec \beta$. The same holds true for $\check{\Pi}_{x\beta+g_{2\mathbf{n}^i}}^-$ since it has the same dependence

¹⁷Note that $\beta + 2g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$ is not populated

on $\{c_\beta\}_\beta$ as $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta+g_{2n^i}}$. It follows then that $c_\beta = \check{c}_\beta$. The base case can be checked in a similarly straightforward manner.

3.4. Annealed Schauder theory.

3.4.1. *Integration of the model.* In this subsection, we discuss the basic integration argument needed for our estimates, i.e. we discuss how to solve (1.4).

Lemma 3.11 (Annealed Schauder estimate). *Let $d \geq 1$, $\gamma > 0$, $\eta \in [\gamma, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, $p < \infty$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$ be given. Assume that $f \in (\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))^{\otimes d}$ is a random vector-valued tempered distribution which satisfies*

$$(3.57) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |f_t(y)|^p \leq (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\gamma-3} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-y|_s)^{\eta-\gamma},$$

for all $t > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$. Then, there exists a unique random function u satisfying

$$(3.58) \quad \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}} \frac{1}{|x-y|_s^\eta} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |u(y)|^p < \infty$$

and, in the sense of distributions,

$$(3.59) \quad Lu = \nabla \cdot f.$$

Furthermore, the constant in the bound (3.58) depends only on γ , η , and d .

Proof. We first notice that we can formally represent the fundamental solution associated to L as

$$\int_0^\infty dt (L^* \psi_t),$$

where L^* is the adjoint of L . We thus propose the following solution formula for u

$$(3.60) \quad u = \int_0^\infty dt (\text{id} - T_x^\eta)(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t),$$

where the operator T_x^η projects an arbitrary smooth function onto its Taylor polynomial centered at x of order $\leq \eta$. We will argue that u , defined in this manner, makes sense, satisfies (3.58), and is a distributional solution of (3.59). We will see that subtracting the Taylor polynomial is necessary in order for the expression (3.60) to make sense.

Given the bound (3.57) on the right hand side f , we can obtain the following estimate

$$(3.61) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} f_t(y)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\gamma-3-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-y|_s)^{\eta-\gamma}.$$

To see this, we use the semigroup property (3.4), along with the bound (3.57)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} f_t(y)|^p &\lesssim \int dz |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(y-z)| \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |f_{\frac{t}{2}}(z)|^p \\ &\lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\gamma-3} \int dz |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(y-z)| (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-z|_s)^{\eta-\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the moment bound (3.3) gives us (3.61). Given (3.61), we can now estimate (3.60) by splitting it into a *far-field* and *near-field* component. Before we do this, we note that the Taylor remainder $(\text{id} - T_x^\eta)(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t)(y)$ can be expressed as a linear combination of terms of the form $(y-x)^{\mathbf{n}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} L^* \nabla \cdot f_t(z)$ for $|\mathbf{n}| > \eta$ where z is some point between y and x . Using an essentially identical argument to (3.61), we can estimate such a term by

$$|x-y|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\gamma-8-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t} + |x-y|_s)^{\eta-\gamma}.$$

Thus, for $\sqrt[s]{t} \geq |x-y|_s$, i.e. the far-field component, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left| \int_{|x-y|_s^{\frac{s}{2}}}^\infty dt (\text{id} - T_x^\eta)(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t)(y) \right|^p \lesssim \int_{|x-y|_s^{\frac{s}{2}}}^\infty dt |x-y|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\eta-8-|\mathbf{n}|} \lesssim |x-y|_s^\eta,$$

where we have used $\eta \geq \gamma$ and $|\mathbf{n}| > \eta$. For $\sqrt[s]{t} \leq |x - y|_s$, i.e. the near-field component, we argue as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |(\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_x^\eta)(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t)(y)|^p &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t)(y)|^p + \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq \eta} |x - y|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}}(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t)(x)|^p \\ &\lesssim (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\gamma-8} |x - y|_s^{\eta-\gamma} + \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq \eta} |x - y|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\eta-8-|\mathbf{n}|}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used (3.61). Since η is not an integer, the sum in the above expression can be limited to $|\mathbf{n}| < \eta$ and so all powers of t in the above expression are greater than -1 giving us the desired integrability near $t = 0$. We thus have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left| \int_0^{|x-y|_s^s} dt (\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_x^\eta)(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t)(y) \right|^p \lesssim |x - y|_s^\eta,$$

completing the proof of (3.58). The fact that u is a solution follows from applying the operator L to (3.60) with cut-off at s and T and then passing to the limit. The limit converges in the topology defined by the norm in (3.58). Note that

$$L \int_s^T dt (\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_x^\eta)(L^* \nabla \cdot f_t) = (1 - \mathbb{T}_x^{\eta-4}) \nabla \cdot f_s - (1 - \mathbb{T}_x^{\eta-4}) \nabla \cdot f_T.$$

Now (3.61) implies that, as $s \rightarrow 0$, $\mathbb{T}_x^{\eta-4} \nabla \cdot f_s$ converges to 0 almost surely. Using (3.61) again, we find that $(1 - \mathbb{T}_x^{\eta-4}) \nabla \cdot f_T$ converges to 0 almost surely as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, u is necessarily a solution.

Finally, we present a Liouville-type argument for uniqueness. Let v be the difference of two distributional solutions of (3.59) satisfying (3.58). Then,

$$(3.62) \quad Lv = 0.$$

We now use the kernel bound (3.3) along with (3.58) to see that

$$(3.63) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} v_t|^p = 0,$$

as long as $|\mathbf{n}| > \eta$. Using (3.62), we also have

$$\partial_t \partial^{\mathbf{n}} v_t = -\partial^{\mathbf{n}} L L^* v_t = 0.$$

It follows by integrating in time and using (3.63)

$$\partial^{\mathbf{n}} v = 0,$$

for all $|\mathbf{n}| > \eta$. It follows that v is a polynomial of degree $|\mathbf{m}| \leq \eta$ and, in fact, $|\mathbf{m}| < \eta$ since $\eta \notin \mathbb{Z}$. But the estimate (3.58) tells us that v must in fact be identically zero, thus completing the proof. \square

Remark 3.12 (Failure of integration for integer η). The careful reader may have noticed that we excluded $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}$ from the statement of Lemma 3.11. This is due to the fact that Schauder theory, and by extension an annealed estimate of the form (3.58), fails to hold true for integer exponents. To understand this one can look at the Poisson equation

$$\Delta u = f$$

for $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 2$ and ask if $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This is in general not true. As a counterexample for $d = 2$, consider $u(x) = \varphi(x)(x_1^2 - x_2^2) \log(-\log(|x|^2))$ where φ is a smooth bump function which is 1 for $|x| \leq 1$ and 0 for $|x| \geq 2$. One can check (see [FRRO22, Section 2.2]) that u has a bounded and continuous Laplacian but an unbounded Hessian. The same counterexample can be used to show that the Calderón–Zygmund estimate fails for $p = \infty$.

We will now apply Lemma 3.11 to two specific cases, estimating $\Pi_{x\beta}$ given an estimate on $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ and estimating $\delta \Pi_{x\beta}$ given an estimate on $\delta \Pi_{x\beta}^-$.

Corollary 3.13 (Integration I: Π^- to Π). *Assume that (3.5) $_{\beta}$ holds. Then, (2.31) $_{\beta}$ holds, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\Pi_{x\beta}(y)|^{q'} \lesssim |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta|}.$$

Corollary 3.14 (Integration II: $\delta\Pi^-$ to $\delta\Pi$). *Assume that (3.6) $_{\beta}$ holds. Then, (3.64) $_{\beta}$ holds, i.e.*

$$(3.64) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\delta\Pi_{x\beta}(y)|^{q'} \lesssim |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta|} \bar{w}.$$

The proofs of the above two corollaries follow immediately from applying Lemma 3.11 with f chosen to be $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ and $\bar{w}^{-1}\delta\Pi_{x\beta}^-$, respectively.

3.4.2. Integration of the rough path increment. We now present a weighted version of the integration argument in Lemma 3.11 that will help us pass from the increment $(\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)$ to $(\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)$. The crucial ingredient for this integration argument is the following representation formula which establishes the relationship between the two increments:

$$(3.65) \quad (\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_{\beta} = \int_0^{\infty} dt (\text{id} - T_z^2)(L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}).$$

We will provide the proof of this identity in Lemma 3.15, which is the main result of this section.

Lemma 3.15 (Integration III: $(\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)$ to $(\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)$). *Let $|\beta| < 3$ and assume that (3.5) $_{\prec\beta}$, (3.6) $_{\beta}$, and (3.8) $_{\beta}$ hold true. Furthermore, assume that, for all γ not purely polynomial, we have the bound (3.90) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$. Then, (3.65) $_{\beta}$ and (3.7) $_{\beta}$ hold true.*

Proof. We will assume for the time being that (3.65) $_{\beta}$ holds true. The strategy of proof is to show that the right hand side of (3.65) is estimated by the right hand side of (3.7). We split our argument into three ranges: a near-field range $\sqrt[8]{t} \leq |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, a far-field range $\sqrt[8]{t} \geq \max(|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}, |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})$, and an intermediate range $|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \sqrt[8]{t} \leq |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}$. We start with the near-field range. Applying essentially the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.11 along with the negative moment bound (3.3) we have the bound

$$(3.66) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} (\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - 3 - |\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\kappa} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)). \end{aligned}$$

We use (3.66) to derive two intermediate estimates, one by restricting to $y = z$ and the other by restricting to the near-field range:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} (\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(z)|^{q'} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - 3 - |\mathbf{n}| + \kappa} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} w_x(z), \\ & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} (\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - 3 - |\mathbf{n}|} |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)) \quad , \text{ if } \sqrt[8]{t} \leq |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

We use this to estimate the Taylor polynomial and the original term as follows:

$$(3.67) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |T_z^2 L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim t^{-1} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - |\mathbf{n}| + \kappa} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} w_x(z), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta\Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim t^{-1} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha} |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)) \quad , \text{ if } \sqrt[8]{t} \leq |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating $\int_0^{|y-z|_s^8} dt$ and using the fact that $\alpha - 2 + \kappa > 0$, which itself follows from (3.14) and $\alpha < 1$, on the first integral, and $\alpha > 0$ on the second, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_0^{|y-z|_s^8} dt T_z^2 L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim |y-z|_s^{\alpha+\kappa} (|y-z|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} w_x(z), \\ & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_0^{|y-z|_s^8} dt L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim |y-z|_s^{\alpha+\kappa} (|y-z|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)), \end{aligned}$$

which takes care of the near-field contribution.

We now deal with the far-field contribution $\sqrt[8]{t} \geq \max\{|y-z|_s, |x-z|_s\}$, by splitting it into the one coming from $d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-$ and the one from $\delta \Pi_x^-$. For the first one, we use the fact that $\Pi_z^- \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^*$ (see (2.21)) and the strict triangularity of $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$ with respect to \prec (see (3.38)) along with (3.90) and (3.5) for $\Pi_{z\beta}^-$ to establish

$$(3.68) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |x-z|_s^{\kappa+|\beta|-|\gamma|} w_x(z) (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y-z|_s)^{|\gamma|-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which, using a similar argument as before, we can transform into

$$(3.69) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \partial^{\mathbf{n}} (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\gamma|-3-|\mathbf{n}|} |x-z|_s^{\kappa+|\beta|-|\gamma|} w_x(z) \quad , \text{ if } |y-z|_s \leq \sqrt[8]{t}. \end{aligned}$$

We now represent Taylor's remainder in a manner compatible with the natural scaling \mathfrak{s} associated to the operator L

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{id} - T_z^2) f(y) &= \int_0^1 ds \frac{(1-s)^2}{2} \frac{d^3}{ds^3} h(s), \\ h(s) &= f(s^{s_0} y_0 + (1-s^{s_0}) z_0, \dots, s^{s_d} y_d + (1-s^{s_d}) z_d). \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to $f = L^* \nabla \cdot (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}$ and using (3.69), we obtain

$$(3.70) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| (\text{id} - T_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim t^{-1} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \\ n_0 + \dots + n_d \leq 3}} \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |y-z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\gamma|-|\mathbf{n}|} |x-z|_s^{\kappa+|\beta|-|\gamma|} w_x(z), \\ & \text{if } |y-z|_s \leq \sqrt[8]{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating over $\int_{\max\{|y-z|_s^8, |x-z|_s^8\}}^\infty dt$ and noting that $|\gamma| - |\mathbf{n}| < 3 - 3 = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_{\max\{|y-z|_s^8, |x-z|_s^8\}}^\infty dt (\text{id} - T_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \\ n_0 + \dots + n_d \leq 3}} \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |y-z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (|y-z|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\gamma|-|\mathbf{n}|} |x-z|_s^{\kappa+|\beta|-|\gamma|} w_x(z) \\ & \lesssim |y-z|_s^{\kappa+\alpha} (|y-z|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} w_x(z) \quad \text{by } |\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \geq \kappa + \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

For the second part of the far-field contribution, we can use (3.6) to obtain

$$(3.71) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \delta \Pi_{x\beta t}^{-}(y) \right|^{q'} \lesssim (\sqrt[q]{t})^{\alpha-3-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[q]{t} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} \bar{w},$$

which, by Taylor's theorem and $|x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} \lesssim |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, implies

$$(3.72) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| (\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot \delta \Pi_{x\beta t}^{-}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim t^{-1} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \\ n_0 + \dots + n_d \leq 3}} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[q]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[q]{t} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} \bar{w}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating over $\int_{\max\{|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}, |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}\}}^{\infty} dt$ and using $|\beta| - |\mathbf{n}| < 3 - 3 = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_{\max\{|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}, |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}\}}^{\infty} dt (\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot \delta \Pi_{x\beta t}^{-}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \\ n_0 + \dots + n_d \leq 3}} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\mathbf{n}|} (|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|} (|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} \bar{w} \\ & \lesssim |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa+\alpha} (|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} w_x(z), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have simply used the definition of $w_x(z)$ (see (3.9)) and the fact that $|\mathbf{n}| > \kappa + \alpha$. We now treat the intermediate range. To this end, we start by applying the semigroup property to (3.66) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \partial^{\mathbf{n}} (\delta \Pi_x^{-} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^{-})_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \leq \int dy' |\psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(y-y')| \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \partial^{\mathbf{n}} (\delta \Pi_x^{-} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^{-})_{\beta \frac{t}{2}}(y') \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int dy' |\psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(y-y')| (\sqrt[q]{t})^{\alpha-3-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[q]{t} + |y'-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\kappa} (\sqrt[q]{t} + |y'-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} \\ & \quad \times (w_x(y') + w_x(z)) \\ & \lesssim (\sqrt[q]{t})^{\alpha-3-|\mathbf{n}|+\kappa} (\sqrt[q]{t} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} w_x(z) \quad , \text{ if } |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \sqrt[q]{t}. \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have applied the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (3.11). Applying Taylor's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| (\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^{-} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^{-})_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim t^{-1} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \\ n_0 + \dots + n_d \leq 3}} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[q]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|+\kappa} |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta|-\alpha} w_x(z), \quad \text{if } |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \sqrt[q]{t} \leq |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, integrating over $\int_{|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}}^{|x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}} dt$ as expected, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_{|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}}^{|x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathfrak{s}}} dt (\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^{-} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^{-})_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \lesssim |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa+\alpha} |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta|-\alpha} w_x(z).$$

We are now left to argue that the representation in (3.65) is justified. Note that by using (2.30) and taking the Malliavin derivative, (3.12) holds true, i.e

$$(3.73) \quad L(\delta \Pi_x - \delta \Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_{\beta} = \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^{-} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^{-})_{\beta}.$$

Furthermore, we know from (3.25) that $(\delta \Pi_x - \delta \Pi_x(z) - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_{\beta}(y)$ vanishes super-quadratically in $|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, and by (3.64), (2.31) and the fact that $d\Gamma^*$ has the projection Q built-in it grows sub-cubically in y at infinity. Provided the right hand side of (3.65) also satisfies equation (3.73), vanishes super-quadratically at z and grows sub-cubically,

it then follows that (3.65) holds true by using exactly the same Liouville-type argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.11.

To see that the time integral on the right hand side of (3.65) is a solution of (3.73), we cut off the time integral as follows and apply the operator L to note that

$$\begin{aligned} & L \int_s^T dt (\text{id} - \mathbb{T}_z^2)(L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}) \\ &= \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta s} - \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta T}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.68) and (3.71), the second term goes to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$, while the first term converges to the required object as $s \rightarrow 0$.

For the vanishing behaviour at z , we note that above we have estimated the right hand side of (3.65) by the right hand side of (3.7). Along with the observation that $\kappa + \alpha > 2$ (from (3.14) and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$), this implies that the right hand side of (3.65) vanishes super-quadratically in $|y - z|_s$.

For the growth at infinity, we split the t -integral of (3.65) into three regimes: $t \in [0, 1]$, $[1, |y - z|_s^8]$, $[|y - z|_s^8, \infty)$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$, we estimate the parts involving id and \mathbb{T}_z^2 separately. For the part involving id , we can directly apply (3.71) and (3.68), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{q'}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_0^1 dt L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int_0^1 dt t^{-1} \left((\sqrt[8]{t})^\alpha (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} \bar{w} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z) (\sqrt[8]{t})^\alpha (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_s)^{|\gamma| - \alpha} \right) \\ & \lesssim (1 + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} \bar{w} + \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z) (1 + |y - z|_s)^{|\gamma| - \alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which grows sub-cubic in $|y|_s$ as desired since both $|\beta|, |\gamma| < 3$. For the Taylor polynomial, we use the bound (3.67) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{q'}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_0^1 dt \mathbb{T}_z^2 L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int_0^1 dt t^{-1} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - |\mathbf{n}| + \kappa} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} w_x(z) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (1 + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} w_x(z), \end{aligned}$$

which again is sub-cubic in $|y|_s$. For the second regime, $1 \leq t \leq |y - z|_s^8$, we estimate the id part with exactly the same estimates as before to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{q'}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_1^{|y - z|_s^8} dt L^* \nabla \cdot (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int_1^{|y - z|_s^8} dt t^{-1} \left((\sqrt[8]{t})^\alpha (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} \bar{w} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z) (\sqrt[8]{t})^\alpha (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_s)^{|\gamma| - \alpha} \right) \\ & \lesssim (1 + |y - z|_s^\alpha) (|y - z|_s + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} \bar{w} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z) (1 + |y - z|_s^\alpha) |y - z|_s^{|\gamma| - \alpha},$$

which grows again sub-cubically in $|y|_s$ since $|\beta|, |\gamma| < 3$. We estimate the Taylor polynomial T_z^2 , separately as follows: for the term involving $\delta \Pi_{x,\beta}^-$, we use (3.71) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_1^{|y-z|_s^8} dt T_z^2 L^* \nabla \cdot \delta \Pi_{x,\beta t}^-(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int_1^{|y-z|_s^8} dt t^{-1} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - |\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} \bar{w} \\ & \lesssim \int_1^{|y-z|_s^8} dt t^{-1} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - |\mathbf{n}|} ((\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\beta| - \alpha} + |x - z|_s^{|\beta| - \alpha}) \bar{w} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (1 + |y - z|_s^{|\beta| - |\mathbf{n}|} + |x - z|_s^{|\beta| - \alpha} + |y - z|_s^{\alpha - |\mathbf{n}|} |x - z|_s^{|\beta| - \alpha}), \end{aligned}$$

which grows sub-cubically in $|y|_s$ by $|\beta| < 3$, while for the term involving $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$, we proceed with (3.90) and (3.5) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_1^{|y-z|_s^8} dt T_z^2 L^* \nabla \cdot (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int_1^{|y-z|_s^8} dt t^{-1} \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z) \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\gamma| - |\mathbf{n}|} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z) (1 + |y - z|_s^{|\gamma| - |\mathbf{n}|}). \end{aligned}$$

Again by $|\gamma| < 3$ this grows sub-cubically in $|y|_s$. We now treat the final regime $|y - z|_s^8 \leq t < \infty$. For the term involving $\delta \Pi_x^-$, we simply apply (3.72) to estimate it as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_{|y-z|_s^8}^{\infty} dt (\text{id} - T_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot \delta \Pi_{x,\beta t}^-(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int_{|y-z|_s^8}^{\infty} dt t^{-1} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \\ n_0 + \dots + n_d \leq 3}} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha - |\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} \bar{w} \\ & \lesssim |y - z|_s^{|\beta|} + |x - z|_s^{|\beta| - \alpha} |y - z|_s^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

For the the term involving $d\Gamma^*$, we use (3.70) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \int_{|y-z|_s^8}^{\infty} (\text{id} - T_z^2) L^* \nabla \cdot (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim \int_{|y-z|_s^8}^{\infty} dt t^{-1} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{n}| \geq 3 \\ n_0 + \dots + n_d \leq 3}} \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |y - z|_s^{|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\gamma| - |\mathbf{n}|} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \in A \cap (-\infty, 3) \cap [\alpha, \kappa + |\beta|]} |y - z|_s^{|\gamma|} |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

3.5. Reconstruction. It will be crucial for reconstruction to control the dependence of Π_x^- on its base point, we therefore start with the following observation. As a consequence of (2.25), Γ_{xy}^* recenters also the negative part Π_y^- of the model,

$$(3.74) \quad \Pi_x^- = \Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^- + P \sum_k \mathbf{a}_k (\Gamma_{xy}^* (\text{id} - P) \Pi_y + \pi_{xy}^{(0)})^k \nabla \Delta (\Gamma_{xy}^* (\text{id} - P) \Pi_y + \pi_{xy}^{(0)}).$$

In particular, by (2.12a) one can read off that $(\Pi_x^- - \Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^-)_\beta$ is a space-time polynomial of degree $\leq |\beta| - 3$. The proof of (3.74) is analogous to the one of [LOTT21, Proposition 5.2] (in particular, $(3.74)_\beta$ is a consequence of $(2.25)_{\prec\beta}$).

Lemma 3.16 (Reconstruction I). *Assume $|\beta| > 3$, that $(2.31)_{\prec\beta}$, $(3.91)_{\prec\beta}$ and $(3.5)_{\prec\beta}$ hold, and that $(2.32)_\beta^\gamma$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then $(3.5)_\beta$ holds.*

Proof. The estimate (3.5) follows by general reconstruction [LO22, Lemma 4.8] from “vanishing at the base point”,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\Pi_{x\beta t}^-(x)|^p = 0 \quad \text{provided } |\beta| > 3,$$

and “continuity in the base point”,

$$(3.75) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |(\Pi_y^- - \Pi_x^-)_{\beta t}(x)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[p]{t} + |x - y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha}.$$

For the former, we note that by (annealed) continuity (2.36) of $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$, it is enough to show that $\Pi_{x\beta}^-(x) = 0$. By Lemma 3.7 (i), we observe that on the right hand side of (2.18) only $\Pi_{x\beta'}$ with $\beta' \prec \beta$ come up. We can therefore appeal to $(2.31)_{\prec\beta}$, which implies $\Pi_{x\beta'}(x) = 0$, to see

$$\Pi_{x\beta}^-(x) = \nabla \Delta \Pi_{x\beta-e_0}(x) + \delta_\beta^{f_0} \xi_\tau(x) - \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \nabla \Pi_{x\beta_1}(x) c_{\beta_2}.$$

Note that $(2.31)_{\prec\beta}$ implies by the semigroup property and the moment bound (3.3)

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta' t}(x)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{t})^{|\beta'| - |\mathbf{n}|}.$$

By $|\beta - e_0| = |\beta| > 3$ and the (annealed) continuity (2.35), we have $\nabla \Delta \Pi_{x\beta-e_0}(x) = 0$. Similarly, we have $\sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \nabla \Pi_{x\beta_1}(x) c_{\beta_2} = 0$: by (2.29) we have $|\beta_1| = |\beta| - |\beta_2| + \alpha > 3 - 2 - \alpha + \alpha = 1$ and therefore $\nabla \Pi_{x\beta_1}(x) = 0$. By $|f_0| = \alpha < 3 < |\beta|$ we also have $\delta_\beta^{f_0} = 0$, which concludes the argument for $\Pi_{x\beta}^-(x) = 0$.

We turn to the continuity in the base point (3.75), which relies crucially on (3.74). Since (3.74) is identical to [LOTT21, (2.63)], except that the second derivative ∂_1^2 of [LOTT21, (2.63)] is replaced by the third derivative $\nabla \Delta$ here, the proof of (3.75) is identical to the one of [LOTT21, (4.9)], except that the exponent -2 has to be replaced by -3 . \square

Lemma 3.17 (Reconstruction II). *Assume that $(2.31)_{\prec\beta}$, $(2.32)_{\prec\beta}$, $(3.5)_{\prec\beta}$ and $(3.7)_{\prec\beta}$ hold, and that $(3.88)_{\prec\beta}^\gamma$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then $(3.8)_\beta$ holds.*

Proof. We define

$$F_{xz} := (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-) - \left(\sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z) \nabla \Delta (\delta \Pi_x^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-) + \sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell(z) \delta \xi_\tau \right),$$

and we shall establish

$$(3.76) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |F_{xz\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \lesssim (\sqrt[q']{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[q']{t} + |y - z|_s)^\kappa (\sqrt[q']{t} + |y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)),$$

which together with

$$(3.77) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \left(\sum_k \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z) \nabla \Delta (\delta \Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z) + \sum_\ell \mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell(z) \delta \xi_\tau \right)_{\beta t}(y) \right|^{q'} \\ \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^\kappa (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z))$$

yields the desired (3.8). We start with the proof of (3.76). As in the proof of Lemma 3.16, as a consequence of general reconstruction [LO22, Lemma 4.8] we obtain from “vanishing at the base point”

$$(3.78) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |F_{xz\beta t}(z)|^{q'} = 0$$

and “continuity in the base point”

$$(3.79) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(F_{xy} - F_{xz})_{\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \\ \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\kappa+\alpha} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-2\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z))$$

the following stronger version of (3.76),

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |F_{xz\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \\ \lesssim (\sqrt[t]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{\kappa+\alpha} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-2\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)).$$

Here, we have used that $\kappa + 2\alpha - 3 > 0$, which follows from (3.14), and we have used that $|\beta| \geq 2\alpha$ unless the left hand side of (3.79) vanishes, for which we give the argument term by term in (3.80) – (3.83) below. For (3.78) we note that (3.13) amounts to

$$F_{xz\beta}(z) = 0,$$

which implies (3.78), provided we have (annealed) continuity of $F_{xz\beta}(y)$ in the active variable y . This continuity is a consequence of Remark 2.14 and Remark 3.1.

We turn to (3.79), and bound its left hand side by the triangle inequality by

$$(3.80) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(d\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^-)_{\beta t}(y)|^{q'}$$

$$(3.81) \quad + \sum_k \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(y) \nabla \Delta (d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z - d\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y)_t(y))_{\beta}|^{q'}$$

$$(3.82) \quad + \sum_k \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\mathbf{a}_k (\Pi_x^k(y) - \Pi_x^k(z)) \nabla \Delta (\delta \Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_t(y))_{\beta}|^{q'}$$

$$(3.83) \quad + \sum_\ell \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\mathbf{b}_\ell (\Pi_x^\ell(y) - \Pi_x^\ell(z)))_{\beta} (\delta \xi_\tau)_t(y)|^{q'}.$$

For (3.80), we note that the presence of Q in $d\Gamma_{xz}^*$ allows by (3.74) to rewrite

$$d\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^- - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z^- = (d\Gamma_{xy}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*) \Pi_y^-.$$

Hence the left hand side of (3.80) is by Hölder’s inequality, (3.88) $_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \mathbb{P} \cdot \mathbb{P} \cdot}$ and (3.5) $_{\prec \beta}$ estimated by

$$1_{|\beta| \geq 2\alpha} \sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathbf{A} \cap [\alpha, \kappa + 2\alpha]} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa+2\alpha-|\gamma|} (|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-2\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)) (\sqrt[t]{t})^{|\gamma|-3},$$

which is bounded by the right hand side of (3.79). Since $\nabla \Delta (d\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z) = \nabla \Delta (d\Gamma_{xy}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*) \Pi_y$ by (2.25), (3.81) is by Hölder’s inequality, (3.88) $_{\prec \beta}^{\gamma \neq \mathbb{P} \cdot \mathbb{P} \cdot}$, (2.31) $_{\prec \beta}$ and the moment bound (3.3) estimated by

$$\sum_k \sum_{e_k + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{k+1} = \beta} |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta_1| + \dots + |\beta_k|} 1_{|\beta_{k+1}| \geq 2\alpha} \\ \times \sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathbf{A} \cap [\alpha, \kappa + 2\alpha]} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa+2\alpha-|\gamma|} (|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_{k+1}|-2\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)) (\sqrt[t]{t})^{|\gamma|-3},$$

which is again bounded by the right hand side of (3.79). To estimate (3.82), we note that the same argumentation as for [LOTT21, (4.81)] shows that (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.32) $_{\prec\beta}$ imply

$$(3.84) \quad \sum_k \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |(\mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(y) - \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z))_\beta|^p \lesssim |y - z|_s^\alpha (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - 2\alpha}.$$

Also here, the left hand side vanishes unless $|\beta| \geq 2\alpha$: the $k = 0$ term vanishes, and for $k \geq 1$ the left hand side vanishes unless β contains e_k which implies $|\beta| \geq 2\alpha$. Furthermore, the same argumentation as for [LOTT21, (4.82)] shows that (3.7) $_\beta$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\nabla \Delta (\delta \Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_{\beta t}(y)|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_s)^\kappa (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence (3.82) is by Hölder's inequality, (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$, (2.32) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (3.7) $_{\prec\beta}$ estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} |y - z|_s^\alpha (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta_1| - 2\alpha} \\ & \times (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_s)^\kappa (\sqrt[8]{t} + |y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta_2| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)), \end{aligned}$$

which is once more bounded by the right hand side of (3.79). We turn to (3.83), and note that the same argumentation as for (3.84) shows that (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.32) $_{\prec\beta}$ imply

$$(3.85) \quad \sum_\ell \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |(\mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell(y) - \mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell(z))_\beta|^p \lesssim |y - z|_s^\alpha (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - 2\alpha},$$

as above with the understanding that the left hand side vanishes unless $|\beta| \geq 2\alpha$. Furthermore, by the semigroup property

$$\delta \xi_t(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz |y - z|^\kappa (LL^*)^{-\frac{s}{2|L|}} \psi_t(y - z) |y - z|^{-\kappa} (LL^*)^{\frac{s}{2|L|}} \delta \xi(z),$$

which by the triangle inequality and Cauchy–Schwarz yields

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\delta \xi_t(y)|^q \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dz |y - z|^{2\kappa} |(LL^*)^{-\frac{s}{2|L|}} \psi_t(y - z)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w(y).$$

Since $q' < q$, this implies by the scaling (3.2) of ψ_t

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\delta \xi_\tau)_t(y)|^{q'} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha-3+\kappa} w(y).$$

Thus (3.83) is by Hölder's inequality, (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.32) $_{\prec\beta}$ estimated by

$$|y - z|_s^\alpha (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta| - 2\alpha} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha-3+\kappa} w(y),$$

which is bounded by the right hand side of (3.79).

It remains to establish (3.77). We bound its left hand side by the triangle inequality by

$$\sum_k \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z) \nabla \Delta (\delta \Pi_x - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z)_t(y))_\beta|^{q'} + \sum_\ell \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\mathbf{b}_\ell \Pi_x^\ell(z))_\beta (\delta \xi_\tau)_t(y)|^{q'}.$$

As above, we argue that this is by (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (3.7) $_{\prec\beta}$ estimated by the right hand side of (3.77). \square

3.6. Algebraic arguments.

Lemma 3.18 (Algebraic argument I). *Assume that (3.91) $_{<\beta}$ holds. Then (2.32) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Furthermore,*

$$(3.86) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |(\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta}^{\gamma}|^p \lesssim |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta| - |\gamma| - \alpha + |\mathbf{n}|}$$

holds for all γ populated and for all \mathbf{n} .

Proof. Recall from (3.20) that $(\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ is a linear combination of terms of the form

$$\pi_{xy\beta_1}^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots \pi_{xy\beta_j}^{(\mathbf{n}_j)} (D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)})_{\beta_{j+1}}^{\gamma},$$

where $j \geq 0$, $\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_j \in \mathbb{N}_0^{1+d}$ and $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{j+1} = \beta$. Since by assumption $\sum_{\ell} \gamma(\ell) > 0$, (3.33) yields $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_j \prec \beta$, hence Hölder's inequality and (3.91) $_{<\beta}$ imply that the stochastic norm $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\cdot|^p$ of the above expression is estimated by

$$|x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta_1| - |\mathbf{n}_1|} \dots |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta_j| - |\mathbf{n}_j|}.$$

By (3.45), the sum of the exponents equals $|\beta| - |\gamma|$. We turn to the proof of (3.86). If γ is purely polynomial, then either the left hand side of (3.86) vanishes, or $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\gamma = g_{\mathbf{n}}$. In the latter case, $(\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta}^{\gamma} = (\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{\beta}^0 = \delta_{\beta}^0$, which trivially satisfies (3.86) since $|\beta = 0| = \alpha$ and $|\gamma = g_{\mathbf{n}}| = |\mathbf{n}|$. If γ is not purely polynomial, then $\sum_{\ell} \gamma(\ell) > 0$. It follows from (2.17) and (3.18) that $(\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta}^{\gamma} = \sum_{\beta'} (\Gamma_{xy}^*)_{\beta}^{\beta'} (D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta'}^{\gamma}$ is a sum over multiindices β' restricted to $\sum_{\ell} \beta'(\ell) > 0$. We can therefore appeal to the already established (2.32) $_{\beta}^{\beta'}$ (notice that above we only used $\sum_{\ell} \gamma(\ell) > 0$, not that γ is populated) to estimate the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\cdot|^p$ -norm of every summand by $|x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta| - |\beta'|}$. From (3.44) we obtain $|\beta'| = |\gamma| + \alpha - |\mathbf{n}|$, which establishes (3.86). \square

Lemma 3.19 (Algebraic argument II). *Assume that (3.91) $_{<\beta}$ and (3.92) $_{<\beta}$ hold. Then for all γ populated and not purely polynomial*

$$(3.87) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q}} |(\delta \Gamma_{xy}^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma}|^{q'} \lesssim |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta| - |\gamma|_{\bar{w}}}.$$

Proof. Applying δ to (3.15) yields by the chain rule

$$\delta \Gamma_{xy}^* = \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{1}{(j-1)!} \sum_{\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_j} \delta \pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n}_2)} \dots \pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n}_j)} D^{(\mathbf{n}_1)} \dots D^{(\mathbf{n}_j)}.$$

Clearly, (3.33) transfers from Γ^* to $\delta \Gamma^*$, hence the same argumentation as in Lemma 3.18 applies. \square

Lemma 3.20 (Algebraic argument III). *Assume that (3.91) $_{<\beta}$, (3.93) $_{<\beta}$ and (3.97) $_{<\beta}$ hold, and that (2.32) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then for all γ populated and not purely polynomial*

$$(3.88) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(d\Gamma_{xy}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*)_{\beta}^{\gamma}|^{q'} \\ \lesssim |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + 2\alpha - |\gamma|} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - 2\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)),$$

with the understanding that $\kappa + 2\alpha - |\gamma| > 0$ and $|\beta| \geq 2\alpha$ unless the left hand side vanishes.

Proof. Due to the presence of the projection Q in the definition (3.27) of $d\Gamma^*$ together with the triangularity (3.33) of Γ^* with respect to $|\cdot|$, the left hand side of (3.88) vanishes unless $|\gamma| < 3$, which by (3.14) implies $|\gamma| < \kappa + 2\alpha$. Furthermore, by (3.24) and (3.37) we observe that $|\beta| \geq 2\alpha$ unless the left hand side of (3.88) vanishes.

We turn to the proper estimate (3.88), for which we momentarily denote by $d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xy}^*$ the object defined in (3.27) without the projection Q , i.e.

$$d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xy}^* = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} d\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} \Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})}.$$

Then

$$(d\Gamma_{xy}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*) = (d\Gamma_{xy}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*)Q = (d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xy}^* - d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*)Q + (d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^*)\Gamma_{zy}^*Q,$$

where in the first equality we used $Q\Gamma_{zy}^*Q = Q\Gamma_{zy}^*$, which follows from (3.34), and in the second equality we used $d\Gamma_{xy}^*Q = d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xy}^*Q$. We start by estimating

$$\begin{aligned} ((d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^*)\Gamma_{zy}^*Q)_\beta^\gamma &= \left(\sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} \Gamma_{xz}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})} (\text{id} - Q)\Gamma_{zy}^*Q \right)_\beta^\gamma \\ &= \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} \sum_{|\beta'| \geq 3} \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} d\pi_{xz\beta_1}^{(\mathbf{n})} (\Gamma_{xz}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta_2}^{\beta'} (\Gamma_{zy}^*)_{\beta'}^\gamma 1_{|\gamma| < 3}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption γ is populated and not purely polynomial, which carries over to β' by (3.24). By (3.36) and (3.38), which also hold for $d\tilde{\Gamma}^*$ since we did not at all make use of the projection Q in the proof, we have $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta' \prec \beta$. Therefore we appeal to (3.97) $_{\prec\beta}$, (2.32) $_{\prec\beta}^\gamma$ and (3.86) $_{\prec\beta}^{\beta'}$ to estimate the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}}|\cdot|^{q'}$ norm of every summand by

$$|x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta_1| - |\mathbf{n}|} w_x(z) |x - z|_s^{|\beta_2| - |\beta'| - \alpha + |\mathbf{n}|} |y - z|_s^{|\beta'| - |\gamma|}.$$

Since β' is populated and not purely polynomial, the condition $|\beta'| \geq 3$ strengthens to $|\beta'| > 3$, and from (3.14b) we obtain $|\beta'| \geq \kappa + 2\alpha$. Hence the above expression is further estimated by

$$|y - z|_s^{\kappa + 2\alpha - |\gamma|} (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| - 3\alpha} w_x(z),$$

which is estimated by the right hand side of (3.88) since $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$ implies $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| - \alpha = |\beta|$ by (2.22).

We turn to the estimate on $(d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xy}^* - d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*)Q$. The same argumentation as in [LOTT21, (4.43)] reveals

$$(d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xy}^* - d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*)Q = \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} (d\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}) \Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})} Q,$$

where we rewrite the right hand side as

$$\sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} (d\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}) \Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})} Q + \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} ((d\Gamma_{xz}^* - d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^*) \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}) \Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})} Q.$$

The $(\cdot)_\beta^\gamma$ -component of this first term equals

$$(3.89) \quad \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} (d\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} - d\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta_1} (\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta_2}^\gamma 1_{|\gamma| < 3}.$$

As in the proof of (3.36) we argue that $\beta_2 \neq 0$ and thus $\beta_1 \prec \beta$. Clearly, we also have $\beta_2 \prec \beta$ by $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$. Since γ is by assumption populated, we can therefore appeal to Hölder's inequality, (3.93) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (3.86) $_{\prec\beta}^\gamma$ to estimate the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}}|\cdot|^{q'}$ -norm of every summand of (3.89) by

$$|y - z|_s^{\kappa + \alpha - |\mathbf{n}|} (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta_1| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)) |x - y|_s^{|\beta_2| - |\gamma| - \alpha + |\mathbf{n}|}.$$

Let us mention that only γ with $(\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta_2}^\gamma \neq 0$ come up, which by (2.16) and (3.17) satisfy $|\gamma| \geq |\mathbf{n}| + \alpha$. This expression is therefore further bounded by

$$|y - z|_s^{\kappa + 2\alpha - |\gamma|} (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| - 3\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)),$$

which coincides with the right hand side of (3.88).

It remains to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} ((d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^*)\pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})})\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})} Q \right)_\beta^\gamma \\
&= \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} ((d\tilde{\Gamma}_{xz}^* - d\Gamma_{xz}^*)\pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta_1} (\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta_2}^\gamma 1_{|\gamma| < 3} \\
&= \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 = \beta} \sum_{|\beta'| \geq 3} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}| \leq 2} d\pi_{xz\beta_1}^{(\mathbf{m})} (\Gamma_{xz}^* D^{(\mathbf{m})})_{\beta_2}^{\beta'} \pi_{zy\beta'}^{(\mathbf{n})} (\Gamma_{xy}^* D^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta_3}^\gamma 1_{|\gamma| < 3}.
\end{aligned}$$

We shall argue now that $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta' \prec \beta$. Since β_1 is populated, we have $\beta_1 \neq 0$ and therefore $\beta_2, \beta_3 \prec \beta$. Since γ is by assumption not purely polynomial, we also have $\beta_3 \neq 0$ and therefore $\beta_1 \prec \beta$. From (3.38) we know $\beta' \prec \beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta - \beta_3 \prec \beta$. We can therefore appeal to (3.97) $_{\prec \beta}$, (3.86) $_{\prec \beta}^{\beta', \gamma}$ and (3.91) $_{\prec \beta}$ to estimate every summand by

$$|x - z|_s^{|\beta_1| - |\mathbf{m}| + \kappa} w_x(z) |x - z|_s^{|\beta_2| - |\beta'| - \alpha + |\mathbf{m}|} |y - z|_s^{|\beta'| - |\mathbf{n}|} |x - y|_s^{|\beta_3| - |\gamma| - \alpha + |\mathbf{n}|}.$$

By $|\beta'| \geq 3$ we obtain $|\beta'| + \alpha > 3$ and therefore (3.14b) yields $|\beta'| \geq \kappa + \alpha$, and the same argument as for (3.89) yields $|\gamma| \geq |\mathbf{n}| + \alpha$. The above expression is therefore further estimated by

$$|y - z|_s^{\kappa + 2\alpha - |\gamma|} (|y - z|_s + |x - z|_s)^{|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| + |\beta_3| - 4\alpha} w_x(z),$$

which is bounded by the right hand side of (3.88) since $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 = \beta$ and $|\cdot| - \alpha$ is additive. \square

Lemma 3.21 (Algebraic argument IV). *Assume that (3.64) $_{\prec \beta}$ and (3.97) $_{\prec \beta}$ hold, and that (2.32) $_\beta^\gamma$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then for all γ populated and not purely polynomial*

$$(3.90) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(d\Gamma_{xz}^*)_\beta^{q'}| \lesssim |x - z|_s^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(z).$$

The proof of Lemma 3.21 follows the same lines as the one in [LOTT21, Proposition 4.16], which we therefore skip.

3.7. Three-point arguments.

Lemma 3.22 (Three-point argument I). *Assume that (2.31) $_{\prec \beta}$ holds, and that (2.32) $_\beta^\gamma$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then*

$$(3.91) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\pi_{xy\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})}|^p \lesssim |x - y|_s^{|\beta| - |\mathbf{n}|}.$$

The proof of Lemma 3.22 follows the same lines as in [LOTT21, Proposition 4.4], and relies on the three-point identity

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}} \pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} (z - y)^{\mathbf{n}} = \Pi_x(z) - \Pi_y(z) - (\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id})P\Pi_y(z),$$

which is a consequence of (2.25), (2.12a), (3.23) and (3.39).

Lemma 3.23 (Three-point argument II). *Assume that (2.31) $_{\prec \beta}$ and (3.64) $_{\preccurlyeq \beta}$ hold, and that (2.32) $_\beta^\gamma$ and (3.87) $_\beta^\gamma$ hold for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then*

$$(3.92) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\delta\pi_{xy\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})}|^{q'} \lesssim |x - y|_s^{|\beta| - |\mathbf{n}|} \bar{w}.$$

The proof of Lemma 3.23 is identical to the one of [LOTT21, Proposition 4.10], and relies on

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}} \delta\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} (z - y)^{\mathbf{n}} = \delta\Pi_x(z) - \Gamma_{xy}^* P \delta\Pi_y(z) - \delta\Gamma_{xy}^* P \Pi_y(z),$$

which is seen to be true by applying δ to the three-point identity above.

Lemma 3.24 (Three-point argument III). *Assume that (2.31) $_{<\beta}$ and (3.7) $_{\beta}$ hold, and that (3.88) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then for $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2$*

$$(3.93) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\mathrm{d}\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} - \mathrm{d}\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})})_{\beta}|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + \alpha - |\mathbf{n}|} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, the statement is a consequence of (3.28), (3.39) and (3.7). For $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we first prove the formula

$$(3.94) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} (\mathrm{d}\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} - \mathrm{d}\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}) (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}} &= (\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z) \\ &\quad - (\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(y) - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y) \\ &\quad - (\mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xy}^* - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*) P \Pi_y. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, (3.28) and (2.25) yield

$$\begin{aligned} & (\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(z) - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z) - (\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(y) - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y) - (\mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xy}^* - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*) P \Pi_y \\ &= \mathrm{d}\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{0})} - \mathrm{d}\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{0})} - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Pi_z(y) + (\mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xy}^* - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*) (1 - P) \Pi_y, \end{aligned}$$

which by (3.39) and (2.12a) equals

$$\mathrm{d}\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{0})} - \mathrm{d}\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{0})} - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{0})} + (\mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xy}^* - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^*) \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbf{n}} (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}}.$$

From (3.27), (2.15) and (3.16) we read off

$$(3.95) \quad \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xy}^* \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbf{n}} (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}, |\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} \mathrm{d}\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}},$$

and using in addition (3.23) we see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \Gamma_{zy}^* \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbf{n}} (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}} &= \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}} (\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbf{n}} + \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}) (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}, |\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} (\mathrm{d}\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} + \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}) (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes (3.94). The $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\cdot|^{q'}$ -norm of the β -component of the right hand side of (3.94) is by (3.7) $_{\beta}$, (3.88) $_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{p.p.}}$ and (2.31) $_{<\beta}$ estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} & |\cdot - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + \alpha} (|\cdot - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(\cdot) + w_x(z)) \\ &+ |\cdot - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + \alpha} (|\cdot - y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(\cdot) + w_x(y)) \\ &+ |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + 2\alpha - |\gamma|} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - 2\alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)) |\cdot - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\gamma|}. \end{aligned}$$

Restricting the active variable to $|\cdot - y|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, this is further estimated by

$$|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + \alpha} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(\cdot) + w_x(y) + w_x(z)),$$

and we obtain

$$(3.96) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \sum_{|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} (\mathrm{d}\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})} - \mathrm{d}\pi_{xz}^{(\mathbf{n})} - \mathrm{d}\Gamma_{xz}^* \pi_{zy}^{(\mathbf{n})}) (\cdot - y)^{\mathbf{n}} \right|^{q'} \\ & \lesssim |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + \alpha} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(\cdot) + w_x(y) + w_x(z)). \end{aligned}$$

We now evaluate at $y + \lambda \mathbf{m}$ for $0 \neq |\mathbf{m}| \leq 2$ and average over $\lambda \leq |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} / |\mathbf{m}|$ in order to recover (3.93) $_{\beta}$ for $0 \neq |\mathbf{n}| \leq 2$. Indeed, for the left hand side of (3.96) we appeal to the obvious $\int_{\lambda \leq |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}} \lambda \sim |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}$. For the right hand side of (3.96), by definition (3.9) of w_x , it suffices to appeal to $\int_{\lambda \leq |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}} |y + \lambda \mathbf{m} - x|^{-\kappa} \lesssim |y - x|^{-\kappa}$. \square

Lemma 3.25 (Three-point argument IV). *Assume that (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$, (3.64) $_{\beta}$ and (3.7) $_{\beta}$ hold, and that (3.90) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ holds for all γ populated and not purely polynomial. Then for $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 2$*

$$(3.97) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |d\pi_{xy\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})}|^{q'} \lesssim |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\kappa + |\beta| - |\mathbf{n}|} w_x(y).$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, the statement is a consequence of (3.28) and (3.64). For $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ we observe that by (3.95)

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}, |\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} d\pi_{xy}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z - y)^{\mathbf{n}} = \delta\Pi_x(z) - \delta\Pi_x(y) - (\delta\Pi_x - \delta\Pi_x(y) - d\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y)(z) - d\Gamma_{xy}^* P\Pi_y(z).$$

By assumption we can therefore estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}, |\mathbf{n}| \leq 2} d\pi_{xy\beta}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z - y)^{\mathbf{n}} \right|^{q'} &\lesssim |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta|} \bar{w} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta|} \bar{w} \\ &\quad + |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + \alpha} (|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathbf{A} \cap [\alpha, |\beta| + 2 - \alpha]} |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(y) |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\gamma|}. \end{aligned}$$

Restricting z to $|y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, the right hand side is further estimated by

$$|x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + |\beta|} (w_x(y) + w_x(z)),$$

and as in the proof of Lemma 3.24 we obtain (3.97). \square

3.8. Averaging.

Lemma 3.26 (Averaging). *Assume that (3.8) $_{\beta}$, (3.6) $_{\prec\beta}$, (3.5) $_{\prec\beta}$, (2.32) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$, (3.87) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ and (3.90) $_{\beta}^{\gamma}$ hold, all for γ not purely polynomial. Then (3.6) $_{\beta}$ holds.*

Proof. We first establish (3.6) $_{\beta}$ for $x = y$. For that, we use the semigroup property (3.4) and the triangle inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\delta\Pi_{x\beta t}^{-}(x)|^{q'} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dy |\psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(x - y)| \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(\delta\Pi_x^{-} - d\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^{-})_{\beta \frac{t}{2}}(y)|^{q'} \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dy |\psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(x - y)| \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |(d\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^{-})_{\beta \frac{t}{2}}(y)|^{q'}. \end{aligned}$$

The first right hand side term is by (3.8) $_{\beta}$ estimated by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dy |\psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(x - y)| (\sqrt[t]{t})^{\alpha - 3} (\sqrt[t]{t})^{\kappa} (\sqrt[t]{t} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta| - \alpha} w_x(y),$$

which by (3.11) and the moment bound (3.3) is bounded by the desired $(\sqrt[t]{t})^{|\beta| - 3} \bar{w}$. For the second right hand side term we appeal to (3.90) $_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{P.P.}}$, the triangularity (3.38) of $d\Gamma^*$ with respect to \prec , and (3.5) $_{\prec\beta}$, which by Hölder's inequality imply an estimate by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} dy |\psi_{\frac{t}{2}}(x - y)| \sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathbf{A} \cap [\alpha, |\beta| + 2 - \alpha]} |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\kappa + |\beta| - |\gamma|} w_x(y) (\sqrt[t]{t})^{|\gamma| - 3}.$$

Again by (3.11) and the moment bound (3.3) this is estimated as desired by $(\sqrt[t]{t})^{|\beta| - 3} \bar{w}$. To get rid of the restriction $x = y$ we apply the Malliavin derivative to (3.74), where we note that due to $|\beta| < 3$ the correction is not present, which yields

$$\delta\Pi_{x\beta t}^{-}(y) = (\delta\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^{-} + \Gamma_{xy}^* \delta\Pi_y^{-})_{\beta t}(y).$$

Applying $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\cdot|^{q'}$ and Hölder's inequality, we use on the first right hand side term (3.87) $_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{P.P.}}$ and (3.5) $_{\prec\beta}$ which is sufficient by the triangularity (3.35), and we use on

the second right hand side term $(2.32)_\beta^{\gamma \neq p \cdot}$ and the just established $(3.6)_{\prec \beta}$ for $x = y$ which is sufficient by the triangularity (3.34) , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{q'}} |\delta \Pi_{x\beta t}^-(y)|^{q'} &\lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathcal{A} \cap [\alpha, |\beta|]} (|x-y|_s^{|\beta|-|\gamma|} \bar{w} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\gamma|-3} + |x-y|_s^{|\beta|-|\gamma|} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\gamma|-3} \bar{w}) \\ &\lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x-y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} \bar{w}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4. Proof of Theorem 2.16

Proof of Theorem 2.16. We remind the reader that we are working with the model $\hat{\Pi}$ from Remark 2.15, but we have dropped the hat for notational convenience. Furthermore, we work with $L = (\partial_0 - (1-a_0)\Delta^2)$ which depends on a_0 and we define $m_0 = 1-a_0$. Given Proposition 3.8 and the BPHZ choice of renormalisation made in (3.49), we have the following result that gives us a natural restriction on when the constants c_β can be chosen to be zero.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Assumption 2.2 be satisfied with $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, and let $d = 1$. Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$ and $|\beta| < 3$ such that $\beta \notin \{e_1 + f_0 + f_1 + g_{(0,1)}, 2f_1 + g_{(0,1)}, 2e_1 + 2f_0 + g_{(0,1)}\}$, we have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta t}^-(x)] = 0,$$

where $\tilde{\Pi}^-$ is as defined in (3.50).

Proof. Since the value of $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta t}^-(x)]$ depends only on the law of ξ , the symmetries of Proposition 3.8 tell us that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta t}^-(x)] \neq 0$ only if $[\beta] + |\beta|_p$ and $1 + [\beta]$ are even. This restriction, together with the fact that $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $|\beta| < 3$ tell us that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Pi}_{x\beta t}^-(x)] \neq 0$ only if

$$(4.1) \quad \beta \in \{e_1 + f_0 + f_1, f_0 + f_2, 2f_1, 2e_1 + 2f_0, e_2 + 2f_0\} + g_{(0,1)}.$$

Note now that by Remark 2.8, and since $c_{f_1} = 0$ as a consequence of f_1 not being present in the above set, we have

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{x(f_0+f_2+g_{(0,1)})}^-(y) = 2(y_1 - x_1) \Pi_{x f_0}(y) \xi_\tau(y).$$

By Proposition 3.8 (1) and Assumption 2.2 we can choose $x = 0$ without loss of generality and compute using the integral representation (3.60)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Pi}_{0(f_0+f_2+g_{(0,1)})t}^-(0) \right] &= 2\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) y_1 \Pi_{0 f_0}(y) \xi_\tau(y) \\ &= 2\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy ds \psi_t(y) y_1 [(\text{id} - T_0^0) L^* \partial_1 (\xi_\tau)_s(y)] \xi_\tau(y) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(y-z) y_1 \xi_\tau(z) \xi_\tau(y) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(-z) y_1 \xi_\tau(z) \xi_\tau(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(y-z) y_1 F(y-z) \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(-z) y_1 F(y-z) \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(-z) y_1 F(y-z), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) y_1 = 0$. For the remaining term, we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(-z) y_1 F(y-z) \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dz ds ((\cdot)_1 \psi_t * F)(z) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(z) \right| \\
&\lesssim \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ds dk t |k_1|^7 (k_0^2 + k_1^8) |k_1| |\mathcal{F}F(k)| |\mathcal{F}\psi_s(k)| |\mathcal{F}\psi_t(k)| \\
&\lesssim t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ds dk |k|_s^{16} |\mathcal{F}F(k)| e^{-|k|_s^8(t+s)} \\
(4.2) \quad &= t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk |k|_s^8 |\mathcal{F}F(k)| e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-5} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have used the fact that $|k|_s^8 \lesssim (k_0^2 + k_1^8) \lesssim |k|_s^8$, that $\mathcal{F}F$ is a Schwartz function, and the explicit form of the Fourier transform of ψ_s .

Finally, we treat the term $\tilde{\Pi}_{x(e_2+2f_0+g_{(0,1)})}^-$ using again Remark 2.8 and $c_{e_1+f_0} = 0$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Pi}_{0(e_2+2f_0+g_{(0,1)})t}^-(0) \right| \\
&= 2 \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) y_1 \Pi_{0f_0}(y) (\partial_1^3 \Pi_{0f_0})(y) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) y_1 \partial_1^3 (\Pi_{0f_0}^2)(y) \right| + 3 \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) y_1 \partial_1 ((\partial_1 \Pi_{0f_0})^2)(y) \right| \\
&\lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{2\alpha-2} \\
&+ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 \psi_t(y) y_1 \partial_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz_1 dz_2 \psi_{s_1}(y-z_1) \psi_{s_2}(y-z_2) F(z_1-z_2) \right| \\
&= (\sqrt[8]{t})^{2\alpha-2} \\
&+ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 \psi_t(y) y_1 \partial_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz_1 dz_2 \psi_{s_1}(z_1) \psi_{s_2}(z_2) F(z_1-z_2) \right| \\
&= (\sqrt[8]{t})^{2\alpha-2} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\alpha < 1$. \square

The results of Lemma 4.1 tell us that in $d = 1$ and for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ there are three multi-indices in need of renormalisation, and we start with considering $\beta = e_1 + f_0 + f_1 + g_{(0,1)}$. Choosing $x = 0$ without loss of generality due to Proposition 3.8, $\tilde{\Pi}_{0(e_1+f_0+f_1+g_{(0,1)})}^-$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Pi}_{0(e_1+f_0+f_1+g_{(0,1)})}^-(y) &= \underbrace{y_1 \partial_1^3 \Pi_{0(f_0+f_1)}(y)}_{(i)} + \underbrace{\partial_1^3 (\Pi_{0f_0} \Pi_{0(f_1+g_{(0,1)})})(y)}_{(ii)} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{3 \partial_1 (\partial_1 \Pi_{0(f_1+g_{(0,1)})} \partial_1 \Pi_{0f_0})(y)}_{(iii)} + \underbrace{\Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})}(y) \xi_\tau(y)}_{(iv)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now convolve with ψ_t and evaluate at 0, take the expectation, and treat the four terms on the right hand side of the above expression separately. For (i) and (ii), we can simply apply the bounds from Theorem 2.12 (note that $|f_0 + f_1| = 2\alpha$, $|f_0| = \alpha$ and $|f_1 + g_{(0,1)}| = \alpha + 1$) to obtain

$$|\mathbb{E}(i)_t(0)| + |\mathbb{E}(ii)_t(0)| \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{2\alpha-2} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

where we used $\alpha < 1$. We now treat the term (iv). We know from (4.1) that $c_{e_1+f_0} = 0$. Thus, using Remark 2.8 and the solution formula along with the fact that $|e_1 + f_0 + g_{(0,1)}| = \alpha + 1 < 2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(\text{iv})_t(0) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \xi_\tau(y) \int_0^\infty ds_1 (\text{id} - T_0^1) L^* \partial_1 ((\cdot)_1 \partial_1^3 \Pi_{0f_0})_{s_1}(y) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \xi_\tau(y) \int_0^\infty ds_1 (\text{id} - T_0^1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz (L^* \partial_1 \psi_{s_1})(y-z) z_1 \\
&\quad \times \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ds_2 dv \partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}(z-v) \xi_\tau(v) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy dz dv ds_1 ds_2 \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_{s_1})(y-z) z_1 \partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}(z-v) F(y-v) \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy dz dv ds_1 ds_2 \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_{s_1})(z) z_1 \partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}(z-v) F(y-v) \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy dz dv ds_1 ds_2 \psi_t(y) y_1 (\partial_1^2 L^* \psi_{s_1})(z) z_1 \partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}(z-v) F(y-v) \\
&= \underbrace{- \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dz ds_1 ds_2 (L^* \partial_1 \psi_{s_1})(z) z_1 (\partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}) * F(z)}_{(\text{iv})_a} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 \psi_t(y) ((L^* \partial_1 \psi_{s_1}(\cdot)_1) * (\partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}) * F)(y)}_{(\text{iv})_b} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 y_1 \psi_t(y) ((L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1}(\cdot)_1) * (\partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}) * F)(y)}_{(\text{iv})_c},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used that F and ψ are even. We now deal with (iv)_b and (iv)_c. Assuming $m_0 = 1$ without loss of generality, for (iv)_b, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\text{iv})_b| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 \psi_t(y) ((L^* \partial_1 \psi_{s_1}(\cdot)_1) * (\partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}) * F)(y) \right| \\
&= \left| \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ds_1 ds_2 dk \mathcal{F} \psi_t(k) i(2\pi k_1)^5 (-2\pi i k_0 + (2\pi k_1)^4)^2 \mathcal{F} \psi_{s_2}(k) \right. \\
&\quad \times \mathcal{F} F(k) \mathcal{F}(\psi_{s_1}(\cdot)_1)(k) \left. \right| \\
&= \left| \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ds_1 ds_2 dk \mathcal{F} \psi_t(k) i(2\pi k_1)^5 (-2\pi i k_0 + (2\pi k_1)^4)^2 \mathcal{F} \psi_{s_2}(k) \right. \\
&\quad \times \mathcal{F} F(k) \frac{i}{2\pi} \partial_{k_1} \mathcal{F} \psi_{s_1}(k) \left. \right| \\
&\lesssim \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ds_1 ds_2 dk |\mathcal{F} \psi_t(k) k_1^5 (k_0^2 + k_1^8) \mathcal{F} \psi_{s_2}(k) \partial_{k_1} \mathcal{F} \psi_{s_1}(k) \mathcal{F} F(k)| \\
&\lesssim \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ds_1 ds_2 dk |s_1 k_1^{12} (k_0^2 + k_1^8) e^{-((2\pi k_0)^2 + (2\pi k_1)^8)(t+s_1+s_2)} \mathcal{F} F(k)|
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the explicit form of $\mathcal{F}\psi$. Integrating in s_1 and s_2 and using that for fixed $\tau > 0$, F is a Schwartz function and thus bounded, we obtain

$$|(\text{iv})_b| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{1}{|k|_s^4} e^{-|k|_s^8 t} |\mathcal{F} F(k)| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{1}{|k|_s^4} e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-1} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

The term $(iv)_c$ can be treated in a similar manner as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |(iv)_c| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 y_1 \psi_t(y) ((L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1}(\cdot)_1) * (\partial_1^4 L^* \psi_{s_2}) * F)(y) \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk t |k|_s^5 e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-1} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

We leave $(iv)_a$ aside for the time being and move on to the term (iii) which we deal with as follows: By the integral representation (3.60) (note that $|f_1 + g_{(0,1)}| = 1 + \alpha$ and $|f_0| = \alpha$) and using that ψ is even we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(iii)_t(0) &= 3\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_0^\infty ds_1 L^* \partial_1^2 (\xi_\tau)_{s_1}(y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \int_0^\infty ds_2 (L^* \partial_1^2 ((\cdot)_1 \xi_\tau)_{s_2}(y) - L^* \partial_1^2 ((\cdot)_1 \xi_\tau)_{s_2}(0)) \right] \\ &= 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy dz dx ds_1 ds_2 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1})(y-z) \\ &\quad \times \left((L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2})(y-x) - (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2})(-x) \right) x_1 F(z-x). \end{aligned}$$

Using that ψ and F are even, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(iii)_t(0) &= 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy dz dx ds_1 ds_2 y_1 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1})(z) (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2})(x) F(z-x) \\ &\quad - 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) ((L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1}) * (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2}(\cdot)_1) * F)(y) \\ &= \underbrace{-3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dz ds_1 ds_2 (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1})(z) (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2} * F)(z)}_{(iii)_a} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) ((L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1}) * (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2}(\cdot)_1) * F)(y)}_{(iii)_b}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy y_1 \partial_1 \psi(y) = -1$. We treat the term $(iii)_b$ in a similar manner to $(iv)_b$ (again assuming $m_0 = 1$) as follows

$$|(iii)_b| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{1}{|k|_s^4} e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-1} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

We are now left to deal with the terms $(iii)_a$ and $(iv)_a$. We integrate by parts and after some tedious computations obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (iii)_a + (iv)_a &= -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dz ds_1 ds_2 (L^* \psi_{s_1})(z) (L^* \partial_1^4 \psi_{s_2} * F)(z) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dz ds_1 ds_2 z_1 (L^* \psi_{s_1})(z) (L^* \partial_1^5 \psi_{s_2} * F)(z) \\ &= -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{(2\pi k_1)^4}{(2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2 (2\pi k_1)^8} \mathcal{F}F(k) \\ &\quad + 4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk m_0^2 \frac{(2\pi k_1)^{12}}{((2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2 (2\pi k_1)^8)^2} \mathcal{F}F(k), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (2.42). We now choose C and φ_τ to be as in the statement of the theorem. After rescaling, this leaves us with

$$c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Pi}_{0(e_1+f_0+f_1+g_{(0,1)})t}^-(0)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{m_0^{\frac{5}{4}}(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{4k_1^8}{k_0^2 + k_1^8} - 2 \right) e^{-(k_0^2 + k_1^8)\tau} \\
&= \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{5}{4}}} \underbrace{\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{4k_1^8}{k_0^2 + k_1^8} - 2 \right) e^{-(k_0^2 + k_1^8)}}_{=: C_{\alpha,1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The equality (2.45) follows from exactly computing the integral.

We now treat the other choice of mollifier. After rescaling appropriately we are left with

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{e_1+f_0+f_1} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Pi}_{0(e_1+f_0+f_1+g_{(0,1)})t}^-(0) \\
&= \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}}(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{4k_1^8}{k_0^2 + k_1^8} - 2 \right) e^{-m_0^2 k_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1} - k_1^8} \\
&= \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}}} \underbrace{\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{4k_1^8}{k_0^2 + k_1^8} - 2 \right) e^{-k_1^8}}_{=: C_{\alpha,1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}}(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{4k_1^8}{k_0^2 + k_1^8} - 2 \right) e^{-k_1^8} (e^{-k_0^2 m_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1).
\end{aligned}$$

The first term is as desired, with (2.49) following by exactly computing the integral for $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$. The remainder we control as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}}(2\pi)^2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{12k_1^8}{k_0^2 + k_1^8} - 2 \right) e^{-k_1^8} (e^{-k_0^2 m_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1) \right| \\
&\lesssim \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{k_0^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} e^{-k_1^8} |e^{-k_0^2 m_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1| \\
&\lesssim \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha+3}{4}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dk_0 \frac{|e^{-k_0^2 m_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1|}{k_0^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(3+2\alpha)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now move on to $\tilde{\Pi}_{x(2f_1+g_{(0,1)})}^-$ and note that again we have, by Remark 2.8 and by $c_{f_1} = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Pi}_{0(2f_1+g_{(0,1)})t}^-(0) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \Pi_{0(f_1+g_{(0,1)})}(y) \xi_\tau(y) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy ds \psi_t(y) [(\text{id} - T_0^1) L^* \partial_1((\cdot)_1 \xi_\tau)_s(y)] \xi_\tau(y) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(y-z) z_1 \xi_\tau(z) \xi_\tau(y) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(-z) z_1 \xi_\tau(z) \xi_\tau(y) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) y_1 (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_s)(-z) z_1 \xi_\tau(z) \xi_\tau(y) \\
&= \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(y-z) z_1 F(y-z)}_{(v)} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(-z) z_1 F(y-z)}_{(vi)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$- \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy dz ds \psi_t(y) y_1 (L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_s)(-z) z_1 F(y-z)}_{(vii)}.$$

We leave (v) as it is and now treat the terms (vi) and (vii) individually, explicitly bounding them as we did in (4.2). For (vi), we have, after applying Plancherel's identity,

$$\begin{aligned} |(vi)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy ds \psi_t(y) ((\cdot)_1 L^* \partial_1 \psi_s) * F(y) \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dk ds e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \left| \partial_{k_1} (k_1 (-k_0 + k_1^4) e^{-|k|_s^8}) \mathcal{F}F(k) \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dk ds e^{-|k|_s^8 t} |\mathcal{F}F(k)| \left((|k_1|^4 + |k_0|) e^{-|k|_s^8 s} + s |k_1|^7 (|k_0| |k_1| + |k_1|^5) e^{-|k|_s^8 s} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have arrived at the above expression by using the explicit form of the Fourier transform of z_1 and brutally estimating the terms that show up. Integrating in s and using that F is a Schwartz function, we see that the above term can be bounded as follows

$$|(vi)| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{1}{|k|_s^4} e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-1} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

For (vii), we proceed similarly to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(vii)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dy ds \psi_t(y) y_1 ((\cdot)_1 L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_s) * F(y) \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dk ds \left| \partial_{k_1} e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \partial_{k_1} (k_1^2 (-k_0 + k_1^4) e^{-|k|_s^8}) \mathcal{F}F(k) \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dk ds |\mathcal{F}F(k)| |k_1|^7 t e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \left((|k_0| |k_1| + |k_1|^5) + |k_1|^7 s (|k_0| |k_1|^2 + |k_1|^6) \right) e^{-|k|_s^8 s}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating in s and using that $\mathcal{F}F$ is a Schwartz function, we bound the above quantity as follows

$$|(vii)| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk |k|_s^4 t e^{-|k|_s^8 t} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-1} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

We are thus left only with (v) which we treat in the following manner

$$(v) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dz ds (L^* \partial_1 \psi_s)(z) z_1 F(z),$$

where we have used the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy y_1 \psi_t(y) = 0$. Applying Plancherel's identity and using the explicit form of the Fourier transform of z_1 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (v) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty dk ds (-i2\pi k_0 + m_0 (2\pi k_1)^4) (i2\pi k_1) e^{-((2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2 (2\pi k_1)^8) s} \frac{i}{2\pi} \partial_{k_1} \mathcal{F}F(k) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1}{(2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2 (2\pi k_1)^8} (-i2\pi k_0 + m_0 (2\pi k_1)^4) \partial_{k_1} \mathcal{F}F(k), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (2.43). Again, we now choose C and φ_τ to be as in the statement of the theorem and rescale as we did before to obtain the following

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2f_1} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Pi}_x^-(2f_1 + g_{(0,1)}) \\ &= \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{1}{4}}} \underbrace{\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{8k_1^8}{k_0^2 + k_1^8} - 5 \right)}_{=: C_{\alpha,2}} e^{-k_0^2 - k_1^8}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, the equality (2.46) then follows from explicitly computing the integral. We now repeat the calculation but with the alternative choice of the mollifier

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2f_1} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Pi}_{x(2f_1+g_{(0,1)})}^- \\ &= \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \underbrace{\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2+k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{8k_1^8}{k_0^2+k_1^8} - 5 \right) e^{-k_1^8}}_{=: C_{\alpha,2}} e^{-k_1^8} \\ &\quad + \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2+k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{8k_1^8}{k_0^2+k_1^8} - 5 \right) e^{-k_1^8} (e^{-m_0^2 k_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

The first term is as desired, with (2.50) following by exactly computing the integral. We control the second term as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}} (2\pi)^2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^4}{(k_0^2+k_1^8)^{1+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \left(\frac{8k_1^8}{k_0^2+k_1^8} - 5 \right) e^{-k_1^8} (e^{-m_0^2 k_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1) \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dk_0 \frac{|e^{-m_0^2 k_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1|}{k_0^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \lesssim m_0 (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(2\alpha+3)}. \end{aligned}$$

We move on to treat $\Pi_{x(2e_1+2f_0+g_{(0,1)})}^-$, where we note that by Remark 2.8 and $c_{e_1+f_0} = 0$ as a consequence of $e_1 + f_0$ not being an element of the set in (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Pi}_{0(2e_1+2f_0+g_{(0,1)})t}^- (0) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) y_1 (\partial_1^3 \Pi_{0(e_1+2f_0)})(y) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \left(\Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})}(y) (\partial_1^3 \Pi_{0f_0})(y) + \Pi_{0f_0}(y) (\partial_1^3 \Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})})(y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the right hand side, we simply apply the bounds from Theorem 2.12 and the scaling of ψ_t (see (3.2)), where we note that $|e_1 + 2f_0| = 2\alpha$ and $\alpha < 1$, to obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) y_1 (\partial_1^3 \Pi_{0(e_1+2f_0)})(y) \right| \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{2\alpha-2} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

We deal with the second term by using the solution formula (3.60) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \left(\Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})}(y) (\partial_1^3 \Pi_{0f_0})(y) + \Pi_{0f_0}(y) (\partial_1^3 \Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})})(y) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \partial_1^3 \left(\Pi_{0f_0} \Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})} \right) (y) \\ &\quad - 3 \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \partial_1 \left(\partial_1 \Pi_{0f_0} \partial_1 \Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})} \right) (y) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \partial_1^3 \left(\Pi_{0f_0} \Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})} \right) (y) \\ &\quad + 3 \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_0^\infty ds_1 L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_1} * \xi_\tau(y) \\ &\quad \times \left(\int_0^\infty ds_2 L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2} * ((\cdot)_1 \partial_1^3 \Pi_{0f_0})(y) - L^* \partial_1^2 \psi_{s_2} * ((\cdot)_1 \partial_1^3 \Pi_{0f_0})(0) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \psi_t(y) \partial_1^3 \left(\Pi_{0f_0} \Pi_{0(e_1+f_0+g_{(0,1)})} \right) (y) \\ &\quad + 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz dx dv x_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\times \bar{\psi}_{s_1}(y-z)(\bar{\psi}_{s_2}(y-x) - \bar{\psi}_{s_2}(-x))\tilde{\psi}_{s_3}(x-v)F(z-v),$$

where $\bar{\psi}_s = \partial_1^2 L^* \psi_s$ and $\tilde{\psi} = \partial_1^4 L^* \psi_s$. The first term on the right hand side goes to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$ by $\alpha < 1$ by applying the bounds from Theorem 2.12 (note that $|f_0| = \alpha$ and $|e_1 + f_0 + g_{(0,1)}| = \alpha + 1$). We now deal with the second term which we can rewrite as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz dx dv x_1 \\ & \times \bar{\psi}_{s_1}(y-z)(\bar{\psi}_{s_2}(y-x) - \bar{\psi}_{s_2}(-x))\tilde{\psi}_{s_3}(x-v)F(z-v) \\ & = 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz dx dv x_1 \\ & \times \bar{\psi}_{s_1}(y-z)\bar{\psi}_{s_2}(y-x)\tilde{\psi}_{s_3}(x-v)F(z-v) \\ & - 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz dx dv x_1 \\ & \times \bar{\psi}_{s_1}(y-z)\bar{\psi}_{s_2}(-x)\tilde{\psi}_{s_3}(x-v)F(z-v) \\ & = 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz dx dv (x_1 - y_1 + y_1) \\ & \times \bar{\psi}_{s_1}(y-z)\bar{\psi}_{s_2}(y-x)\tilde{\psi}_{s_3}(x-v)F(z-v) \\ & - 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz dx dv x_1 \\ & \times \bar{\psi}_{s_1}(y-z)\bar{\psi}_{s_2}(-x)\tilde{\psi}_{s_3}(x-v)F(z-v) \\ & = 3 \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 y_1 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dv (\bar{\psi}_{s_1} * F)(v) (\bar{\psi}_{s_2} * \tilde{\psi}_{s_3})(v)}_{\text{(viii)}} \\ & + 3 \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 dz \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \bar{\psi}_{s_1}(y-z) \left(((\cdot)_1 \bar{\psi}_{s_2}) * \tilde{\psi}_{s_3} * F \right) (-z)}_{\text{(ix)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the term (viii) we have used the fact that the term involving $(x_1 - y_1)$ is independent of y and that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \partial_1 \psi_t(y) = 0$. We bound the term (ix) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{ix})| &= \left| 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 dz (\partial_1 \psi_t * \bar{\psi}_{s_1})(z) \left(((\cdot)_1 \bar{\psi}_{s_2}) * \tilde{\psi}_{s_3} * F \right) (z) \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dk ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 e^{-|k|_s^8 t} |k_1|^7 (|k_0| + |k_1|^4)^3 \\ &\quad \times (s_2 |k_1|^9 + |k_1|) e^{-|k|_s^8 (s_1 + s_2 + s_3)} |\mathcal{F}F(k)| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{e^{-|k|_s^8 t}}{|k|_s^4} \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-1} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have again used the explicit forms of the Fourier transforms of ψ and x_1 along with the fact that F is a Schwartz function. We are thus left to treat the term (viii), which we do as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{viii}) &= 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dy ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 y_1 \partial_1 \psi_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dv (\bar{\psi}_{s_1} * F)(v) (\bar{\psi}_{s_2} * \tilde{\psi}_{s_3})(v) \\ &= -3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{1}{((2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2 (2\pi k_1)^8)^2} (i2\pi k_0 + m_0 (2\pi k_1)^4) (2\pi k_1)^8 \mathcal{F}F(k) \\ &= -3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{m_0 (2\pi k_1)^{12}}{((2\pi k_0)^2 + m_0^2 (2\pi k_1)^8)^2} \mathcal{F}F(k), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (2.44). As before, choosing C and φ_τ to be as in the statement of the theorem and rescaling we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2e_1+2f_0} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Pi}_{0(2e_1+2f_0+g_{(0,1)})t}^-(0) \right] \\ &= \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{\frac{9}{4}}} \underbrace{\frac{-3}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^{12}}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} e^{-k_1^8 - k_0^2}}_{=: C_{\alpha,3}}, \end{aligned}$$

with (2.47) following by exactly computing the integral. For the alternative choice of mollifier, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2e_1+2f_0} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Pi}_{0(2e_1+2f_0+g_{(0,1)})t}^-(0) \right] \\ &= \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \underbrace{\frac{-3}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^{12}}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} e^{-k_1^8}}_{=: C_{\alpha,3}} \\ &\quad - \frac{3(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{(2\pi)^2 m_0^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^{12}}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} e^{-k_1^8} (e^{-m_0^2 k_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where the value of $C_{\alpha,3}$ given in (2.51) follows from computing the integral explicitly. The error term can be controlled as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{3(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{(2\pi)^2 m_0^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dk \frac{k_1^{12}}{(k_0^2 + k_1^8)^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} e^{-k_1^8} (e^{-m_0^2 k_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1) \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2}}{m_0^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{4}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dk_0 \frac{|e^{-m_0^2 k_0^2 \tau^{\eta-1}} - 1|}{(k_0^2)^{2+\frac{2\alpha-1}{8}}} \lesssim m_0 (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{2\alpha-2+(\eta-1)(11+2\alpha)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX A. Proof of qualitative smoothness

Proof of Remark 2.14. The estimates (2.33) – (2.36) are clear for purely polynomial multiindices. The remaining multiindices we treat by induction with respect to \prec . The base case amounts to (2.36) $_{\beta=f_0}$, which is contained in Step 1 below. The induction step we split over the following four steps. We show in Step 1 that (2.33) $_{\prec\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}i}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$ & (2.34) $_{\prec\beta}$ & (2.35) $_{\prec\beta}$ imply (2.36) $_{\beta}$. In Step 2 we prove that (2.36) $_{\beta}$ implies (2.35) $_{\beta}$. Step 3 establishes that (2.35) $_{\beta}$ implies (2.34) $_{\beta}$, and finally in Step 4 we obtain that (2.33) $_{\prec\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}i}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$ & (2.34) $_{\prec\beta}$ imply (2.33) $_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}i}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Step 1. We show (2.33) $_{\prec\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}i}}$ & (2.34) $_{\prec\beta}$ & (2.35) $_{\prec\beta}$ together with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ imply (2.36) $_{\beta}$. We only give the proof for $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, the proof for $|\mathbf{n}| = 1$ is analogous by using Leibniz rule. To obtain (2.36), we estimate the individual components of Π_x^- separately, and start with $\sum \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k \nabla \Delta \Pi_x$. We rewrite the β -component of its increment as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} (\mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(y) - \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z))_{\beta_1} \nabla \Delta \Pi_{x\beta_2}(y) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} (\mathbf{a}_k \Pi_x^k(z))_{\beta_1} (\nabla \Delta \Pi_x(y) - \nabla \Delta \Pi_x(z))_{\beta_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we note that $\beta_1, \beta_2 \prec \beta$. Thus we can estimate the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\cdot|^p$ -norm of the first line as in (3.84) with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.35) $_{\prec\beta}$, and with (2.34) $_{\prec\beta}$ by

$$\sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} |y - z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^\alpha (|x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x - z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_1| - 2\alpha} (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{\alpha-3} (\sqrt[8]{\tau} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_2| - \alpha},$$

which since $|\cdot| - \alpha$ is additive is estimated by the right hand side of (2.36). Similarly, the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}|\cdot|^p$ -norm of the second line is with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.35) $_{\prec\beta}$ estimated by

$$\sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta_1|-\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-3} (\sqrt[p]{\tau} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_2|-\alpha} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\alpha},$$

which is as before estimated by the right hand side of (2.36).

We turn to $\sum_{\ell} \mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell} \xi_{\tau}$, and rewrite the β -component of its increment as

$$\sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell}(y) - \mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell}(z))_{\beta} \xi_{\tau}(y) + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\mathbf{b}_{\ell} \Pi_x^{\ell}(z))_{\beta} (\xi_{\tau}(y) - \xi_{\tau}(z)).$$

The $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}|\cdot|^p$ -norm of the first sum is as in (3.85) with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.35) $_{\prec\beta}$, and with (2.10) estimated by

$$|y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\alpha} (|x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta|-2\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{\alpha-3},$$

which is estimated by the right hand side of (2.36). For the second sum we first note that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\xi_{\tau}(y) - \xi_{\tau}(z)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-3} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\alpha},$$

which follows from the mean-value theorem and (2.10). Together with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ we therefore obtain a bound of the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}|\cdot|^p$ -norm of the second sum by

$$|x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta|-\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-3} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\alpha},$$

which is once more estimated by the right hand side of (2.36).

We turn to $\sum_m \frac{1}{m!} \Pi_x^m \nabla \Pi_x (D^{(0)})^m c$, and rewrite the β -component of its increment as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2+\beta_3=\beta} (\Pi_x^m(y) - \Pi_x^m(z))_{\beta_1} \nabla \Pi_{x\beta_2}(y) ((D^{(0)})^m c)_{\beta_3} \\ & + \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2+\beta_3=\beta} (\Pi_x^m(z))_{\beta_1} (\nabla \Pi_x(y) - \nabla \Pi_x(z))_{\beta_2} ((D^{(0)})^m c)_{\beta_3}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that only c_{γ} -components with $\gamma \prec \beta - g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$ can appear due to Lemma 3.7 (i), and by (2.17) in this case $|\gamma| = |\beta_3| - m\alpha$. We thus estimate the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}|\cdot|^p$ -norm of the first line as in (3.84) (with β replaced by $\beta_1 + e_m$) with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.35) $_{\prec\beta}$, and with (2.34) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.33) $_{\prec\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}$ by a linear combination of terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2+\beta_3=\beta} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\alpha} (|x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_1+e_m|-2\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{\alpha-1} (\sqrt[p]{\tau} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_2|-\alpha} \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \times (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{|\beta_3|-m\alpha-\alpha-2}. \end{aligned}$$

By $|\beta_1 + e_m| = |\beta_1| + m\alpha$, and since $|\beta_3| - m\alpha = |\gamma| \geq 0$, this is further bounded by

$$(A.1) \quad \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2+\beta_3=\beta} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-3} (\sqrt[p]{\tau} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_1|+|\beta_2|+|\beta_3|-3\alpha},$$

which by additivity of $|\cdot| - \alpha$ is estimated by the right hand side of (2.36). For the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}}|\cdot|^p$ -norm of the second line we proceed similarly, and use (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$, (2.35) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.33) $_{\prec\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}$ to obtain an estimate by a linear combination of terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2+\beta_3=\beta} |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{|\beta_1|+(m-1)\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-1} (\sqrt[p]{\tau} + |x-y|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |x-z|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{|\beta_2|-\alpha} |y-z|_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\alpha} \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \times (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{|\beta_3|-m\alpha-\alpha-2}, \end{aligned}$$

which as before is estimated by (A.1) and therefore by the right hand side of (2.36).

Step 2. We show $(2.36)_\beta$ together with $(2.31)_\beta$ & $(2.32)_\beta$ & $(3.5)_\beta$ imply $(2.35)_\beta$. For the rest of Step 2 we fix \mathbf{n} with $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 4$. First, we claim that (2.35) follows from

$$(A.2) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(y)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[p]{t} + \sqrt[p]{\tau} + |x-y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{m}|} \text{ for all } \mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

Indeed, rewriting $\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(z)$ as

$$(\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(y)) + (\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(z)) + (\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(z) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(z)),$$

we can estimate the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\cdot|^p$ -norm of the first and the third terms by using (3.1) and $(A.2)$ by

$$\int_0^t ds \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |LL^* \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta s}(y)|^p \lesssim \int_0^t ds (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[p]{s} + \sqrt[p]{\tau} + |x-y|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{s})^{\alpha-8}.$$

By $\alpha > 0$ this expression is integrable at 0 and with the choice $\sqrt[p]{t} = |y-z|_s$ thus estimated by the right hand side of (2.35) . For the $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\cdot|^p$ -norm of the second term we obtain by the mean-value theorem (mind the anisotropy) and $(A.2)$ an estimate by

$$(\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[p]{t} + \sqrt[p]{\tau} + |x-y|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} ((\sqrt[p]{t})^{\alpha-4} |y-z|_s^4 + (\sqrt[p]{t})^{\alpha-1} |y-z|_s),$$

which again by the choice $\sqrt[p]{t} = |y-z|_s$ is estimated by the right hand side of (2.35) .

We further claim that it is enough to establish $(A.2)$ along the diagonal $y = x$ in form of

$$(A.3) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(x)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[p]{t} + \sqrt[p]{\tau})^{|\beta|-\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{m}|} \text{ for all } \mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

Indeed, using the recentering (2.25) , the estimate $(2.32)_\beta$ of Γ_{xy}^* and $(A.3)$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(y)|^p \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathbf{A} \cap [\alpha, |\beta|]} |x-y|_s^{|\beta|-|\gamma|} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[p]{t} + \sqrt[p]{\tau})^{|\gamma|-\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{m}|},$$

which is estimated by the right hand side of $(A.2)$.

Before we prove $(A.3)$, we note that it is enough to establish $(A.3)$ in the regime $t < \tau$. Indeed, we obtain from $(2.31)_\beta$, the semigroup property (3.4) and the moment bound (3.3) the estimate

$$(A.4) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(x)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{t})^{|\beta|-|\mathbf{n}|-|\mathbf{m}|},$$

which for $t \geq \tau$ is stronger than $(A.3)$.

We now turn to the proof of $(A.3)$ for $t < \tau$, where we distinguish the two cases $|\beta| < 1 + |\mathbf{n}|$ and $|\beta| \geq 1 + |\mathbf{n}|$. For the latter, we appeal again to $(A.4)$ and use that $|\beta| - \alpha - |\mathbf{n}| \geq |\beta| - 1 - |\mathbf{n}| \geq 0$ to see

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(x)|^p \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{m}|} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{|\beta|-\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|},$$

which is estimated by the right hand side of $(A.3)$. For the former case, we appeal to the integral representation (3.60) where we note that due to the presence of $\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}}$ the Taylor polynomial drops out, hence

$$\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta t}(x)|^p \lesssim \int_t^\infty ds \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} L^* \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x)|^p.$$

We split the integral from t to τ and from τ to ∞ . For the latter, we appeal to the semigroup property (3.4) , the estimate $(3.5)_\beta$ of $\Pi_{x\beta}^-$ and the moment bound (3.3) to obtain

$$\int_\tau^\infty ds \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} L^* \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x)|^p \lesssim \int_\tau^\infty ds (\sqrt[p]{s})^{|\beta|-8-|\mathbf{n}|-|\mathbf{m}|}.$$

Since $|\beta| - |\mathbf{n}| - |\mathbf{m}| \leq |\beta| - |\mathbf{n}| - 1 < 0$, the integral is convergent at $s = \infty$ and bounded by

$$(\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{|\beta|-|\mathbf{n}|-|\mathbf{m}|} \lesssim (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[p]{t} + \sqrt[p]{\tau})^{|\beta|-\alpha} (\sqrt[p]{\tau})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{m}|}.$$

Since $\alpha - |\mathbf{m}| < 0$ and $t < \tau$, this is estimated by the right hand side of (A.3). For the integral from t to τ we make the convolution with ψ_s explicit

$$\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} L^* \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x) = \int dy \partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} L^* \psi_s(x-y) (\nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta}^-(y) - \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta}^-(x)),$$

where we could smuggle in the term $\nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta}^-(x)$ since the integral over derivatives of ψ_s vanishes. We thus obtain from (2.36) $_{\beta}$ and the moment bound (3.3)

$$\int_t^{\tau} ds \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} L^* \nabla \cdot \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x)|^p \lesssim \int_t^{\tau} ds (\sqrt[s]{s})^{-|\mathbf{n}|-|\mathbf{m}|-4} (\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{-4} (\sqrt[s]{s} + \sqrt[s]{\tau})^{|\beta|-\alpha} (\sqrt[s]{s})^{\alpha},$$

which can be estimated by

$$(\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{-4} (\sqrt[s]{t} + \sqrt[s]{\tau})^{|\beta|-\alpha} ((\sqrt[s]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|-|\mathbf{m}|-4} + (\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|-|\mathbf{m}|-4}).$$

Since $|\mathbf{n}| \leq 4$ and $t < \tau$ we have $(\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{-4} \leq (\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t})^{|\mathbf{n}|-4}$, hence the above expression is estimated by

$$(\sqrt[s]{t} + \sqrt[s]{\tau})^{|\beta|-\alpha} ((\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{t})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{m}|} + (\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{\alpha-|\mathbf{n}|-|\mathbf{m}|}),$$

which since $\alpha - |\mathbf{m}| < 0$ and $t < \tau$ is estimated by the right hand side of (A.3).

Step 3. We show (2.35) $_{\beta}$ together with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ & (2.32) $_{\beta}$ imply (2.34) $_{\beta}$. We fix \mathbf{n} with $1 \leq |\mathbf{n}| \leq 4$ and rewrite

$$\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) = \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta\tau}(y) + \int dz \psi_{\tau}(y-z) (\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(y) - \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\beta}(z)).$$

Since $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and the integral over derivatives of ψ vanish, the first right hand side term equals

$$\int dz \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \psi_{\tau}(y-z) (\Pi_{x\beta}(z) - \Pi_{x\beta}(y));$$

its $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\cdot|^p$ -norm is by the recentering (2.25), the estimate (2.32) $_{\beta}$ on Γ_{xy}^* and the estimate (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ on Π_x estimated by

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathbf{A} \cap [\alpha, |\beta|]} \int dz |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \psi_{\tau}(y-z)| |x-y|_s^{|\beta|-|\gamma|} |y-z|_s^{|\gamma|},$$

which by the moment bound (3.3) is estimated by the right hand side of (2.34). For the second right hand side term we appeal to (2.35) $_{\beta}$ to bound its $\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\cdot|^p$ -norm by

$$\int dz |\psi_{\tau}(y-z)| (\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{-|\mathbf{n}|} (\sqrt[s]{\tau} + |x-y|_s + |x-z|_s)^{|\beta|-\alpha} |y-z|_s^{\alpha},$$

which by the moment bound (3.3) is again bounded by the right hand side of (2.34).

Step 4. We show (2.33) $_{\prec\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}$ & (2.34) $_{\prec\beta}$ together with (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ & (2.32) $_{\beta}^{\neq \text{P.P.}}$ & (3.5) $_{\prec\beta}$ imply (2.33) $_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}$. By (2.29) we can restrict to multiindices β with $|\beta| < 3$. Since for such multiindices $\mathbb{E} \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$ by the BPHZ-choice (3.49), we have

$$c_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}} \mathbf{n}^i = \int dy \psi_t(x-y) \mathbb{E} (\Pi_{x\beta}^-(y) + c_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}} \mathbf{n}^i) + \int_t^{\infty} ds \partial_s \mathbb{E} \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x),$$

where the choice $t = \tau$ will turn out to be convenient. The first term on the right hand side can be estimated by the same arguments as we estimated $\Pi_{x\beta}^-(y) - \Pi_{x\beta}^-(z)$ in Step 1, where now we are in the simpler setting of not dealing with increments, and were (2.33) $_{\prec\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}$, (2.34) $_{\prec\beta}$ and (2.31) $_{\prec\beta}$ are sufficient due to Lemma 3.7 (i). More precisely, the first right hand side term can be estimated by

$$\int dy \psi_t(x-y) (\sqrt[s]{\tau})^{-3} (\sqrt[s]{\tau} + |x-y|_s)^{|\beta|},$$

which by the moment bound (3.3) and the choice $t = \tau$ is bounded by $(\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{|\beta|-3}$. To estimate the second right hand side term we appeal to (3.1) and the semigroup property (3.4) and rewrite

$$\int_t^\infty ds \partial_s \mathbb{E} \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x) = - \int_t^\infty ds \int dy LL^* \psi_{s/2}(x-y) \mathbb{E} \Pi_{x\beta s/2}^-(y).$$

By $(\Gamma_{xy}^* \Pi_y^-)_\beta = \Pi_{x\beta}^-$, which is a consequence of (3.74) and $|\beta| < 3$, and since $\mathbb{E} \Pi_{y\beta s/2}(y)$ does not depend on y and integrals over derivatives of ψ vanish, we have furthermore

$$\int_t^\infty ds \partial_s \mathbb{E} \Pi_{x\beta s}^-(x) = - \int_t^\infty ds \int dy LL^* \psi_{s/2}(x-y) \mathbb{E} ((\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id}) \Pi_{y\beta s/2}^-)_\beta.$$

Using Hölder's inequality together with (2.32) $_{\beta}^{\gamma \neq \text{P.P.}}$ and (3.5) $_{\prec \beta}$, which is sufficient by the triangularity (3.34) of $\Gamma_{xy}^* - \text{id}$, this expression is estimated by

$$\int_t^\infty ds \int dy |LL^* \psi_{s/2}(x-y)| \sum_{|\gamma| \in \mathcal{A} \cap [\alpha, |\beta|]} |x-y|_s^{|\beta|-|\gamma|} (\sqrt[8]{s})^{|\gamma|-3} \lesssim \int_t^\infty ds (\sqrt[8]{s})^{|\beta|-3-8}$$

where we have used the moment bound (3.3) in the last inequality. Since $|\beta| - 3 < 0$, this integral is convergent at $s = \infty$, and is bounded by $(\sqrt[8]{t})^{|\beta|-3}$. Again by the choice $t = \tau$ we obtain altogether

$$|c_{\beta-g_{\mathbf{n}^i}}| \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{|\beta|-3}.$$

Relabelling $\tilde{\beta} = \beta - g_{\mathbf{n}^i}$ yields $|c_{\tilde{\beta}}| \lesssim (\sqrt[8]{\tau})^{|\tilde{\beta}+g_{\mathbf{n}^i}|}$, which by $|\tilde{\beta} + g_{\mathbf{n}^i}| = |\tilde{\beta}| + 1 - \alpha$ yields the desired (2.33). \square

APPENDIX B. Proof of analyticity

Proof of (2.40). First note that Theorem 2.12 still holds true in the $\hat{\cdot}$ -setting as well as in the $\bar{\cdot}$ -setting, and the estimates (2.31) and (2.32) on $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}, \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta}$ and $(\hat{\Gamma}_{xy}^*)_{\hat{\beta}}, (\bar{\Gamma}_{xy}^*)_{\beta}$ as well as the estimates (2.33) and (2.34) on $\hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}}, \bar{c}_{\beta}$ and $\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}, \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta}$ hold locally uniformly in a_0 . This is an immediate consequence of the fact that the “heat” kernel $\hat{\psi}$ associated to $(\partial_0 + (1-a_0)\Delta^2)(\partial_0 + (1-a_0)\Delta^2)^* = -\partial_0^2 + |1-a_0|^2 \Delta^4$ satisfies

$$\hat{\psi}_t(a_0, x) = \psi_t \left(x_0, \frac{x_1}{\sqrt[4]{|1-a_0|}}, \dots, \frac{x_d}{\sqrt[4]{|1-a_0|}} \right),$$

where ψ is the “heat” kernel associated to $(\partial_0 + \Delta^2)(\partial_0 + \Delta^2)^*$ from (3.1). Hence the moment bound (3.3) holds also for $\hat{\psi}$, locally uniformly for $\text{Re}(a_0) < 1$.

The analyticity expressed by (2.40) is clear for purely polynomial $\hat{\beta}$, and we proceed by induction with respect to \prec in the remaining multiindices. We show in Step 1 that (2.40a) $_{\prec \hat{\beta}-g_{\mathbf{n}}}$ & (2.40b) $_{\prec \hat{\beta}}$ imply (2.40a) $_{\hat{\beta}-g_{\mathbf{n}}}$, and in Step 2 that (2.40a) $_{\prec \hat{\beta}-g_{\mathbf{n}}}$ & (2.40b) $_{\prec \hat{\beta}}$ imply (2.40b) $_{\hat{\beta}}$. The base case amounts to establishing (2.40b) $_{\hat{\beta}=f_0}$, which is covered by Step 2 as we argue now. The proof of (2.40b) $_{\hat{\beta}}$ in Step 2 makes only use of (B.5), which is true for $\hat{\beta} = f_0$ as can be seen from the componentwise form (2.18) of Π^- : for $\hat{k} = 0$ we have $\hat{\Pi}_{f_0}^- = \xi_\tau = \bar{\Pi}_{f_0}^-$; for $\hat{k} \geq 1$ we have $\partial_{a_0}^{\hat{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{f_0}^- = 0$, as well as $\bar{\Pi}_{f_0+\hat{k}e_0}^- - \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+(\hat{k}-1)e_0} = 0$.

Step 1. We show (2.40a) $_{\prec \hat{\beta}-g_{\mathbf{n}}}$ & (2.40b) $_{\prec \hat{\beta}}$ imply (2.40a) $_{\hat{\beta}-g_{\mathbf{n}}}$. By (2.20) we may assume $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}' + g_{\mathbf{n}}$ where $\hat{\beta}'$ has no polynomial components. For such $\hat{\beta}$, we define $\hat{\hat{\Pi}}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-$ by

$$(B.1) \quad \hat{\hat{\Pi}}_{x\hat{\beta}}^- = \hat{\hat{\Pi}}_{x\hat{\beta}'}^- - \hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}-g_{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{n}.$$

By Leibniz rule and using the notation $\hat{\partial}^k := \frac{1}{k!} \partial_{a_0}^k$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^- &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{e_k + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{k+1} = \hat{\beta} \\ k_1 + \dots + k_{k+1} = \hat{k}}} \hat{\partial}^{k_1} \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_1} \dots \hat{\partial}^{k_k} \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_k} \hat{\partial}^{k_{k+1}} \nabla \Delta \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_{k+1}} \\
&+ \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{f_\ell + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_\ell = \hat{\beta} \\ k_1 + \dots + k_\ell = \hat{k}}} \hat{\partial}^{k_1} \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_1} \dots \hat{\partial}^{k_\ell} \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_\ell} \xi_\tau \\
&- \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{m+2} = \hat{\beta} \\ k_1 + \dots + k_{m+2} = \hat{k}}} \hat{\partial}^{k_1} \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_1} \dots \hat{\partial}^{k_m} \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_m} \hat{\partial}^{k_{m+1}} \nabla \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_{m+1}} \hat{\partial}^{k_{m+2}} ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^m \hat{c})_{\beta_{m+2}} \\
&- \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \hat{\beta} \\ \beta_1 \neq g_{\mathbf{n}} \\ k_1 + k_2 = \hat{k}}} \hat{\partial}^{k_1} \nabla \hat{\Pi}_{x\beta_1} \hat{\partial}^{k_2} \hat{c}_{\beta_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that (2.40b) implies $\hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}} = \partial^{\mathbf{n}} \Pi_{x\hat{\beta} + \hat{k}e_0}$ for $1 \leq |\mathbf{n}| \leq 4$ with respect to the norm

$$\sup_{y,t} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-(\alpha - |\mathbf{n}|)} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{-(|\hat{\beta}| - \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\partial^{\mathbf{n}} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}t}(y)|^p,$$

which follows from the locally uniform (in a_0) (2.32). Together with the triangularity properties Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.7 (i), we obtain from (2.40a) $_{\prec \hat{\beta} - g_{\mathbf{n}}}$ & (2.40b) $_{\prec \hat{\beta}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^- \\
&= \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{e_k + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{k+1} = \hat{\beta} \\ k_1 + \dots + k_{k+1} = \hat{k}}} \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_1 + k_1 e_0} \dots \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_k + k_k e_0} \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_{k+1} + k_{k+1} e_0} \\
&+ \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{f_\ell + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_\ell = \hat{\beta} \\ k_1 + \dots + k_\ell = \hat{k}}} \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_1 + k_1 e_0} \dots \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_\ell + k_\ell e_0} \xi_\tau \\
&- \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{m+2} = \hat{\beta} \\ k_1 + \dots + k_{m+2} = \hat{k}}} \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_1 + k_1 e_0} \dots \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_m + k_m e_0} \nabla \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_{m+1} + k_{m+1} e_0} \hat{\partial}^{k_{m+2}} ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^m \hat{c})_{\beta_{m+2}} \\
&- \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \hat{\beta} \\ \beta_1 \neq g_{\mathbf{n}} \\ k_1 + k_2 = \hat{k}}} \nabla \bar{\Pi}_{x\beta_1 + k_1 e_0} \bar{c}_{\beta_2 + k_2 e_0},
\end{aligned}$$

with respect to

$$(B.2) \quad \sup_{y,t} (\sqrt[8]{t})^{-(\alpha - 3)} (\sqrt[8]{t} + |x - y|_{\mathfrak{s}})^{-(|\hat{\beta}| - \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\frac{1}{p}} |\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}t}^-(y)|^p.$$

This establishes

$$(B.3) \quad \hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^- = \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta} + \hat{k}e_0}^- - \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta} + (\hat{k}-1)e_0} + \bar{c}_{\hat{\beta} - g_{\mathbf{n}} + \hat{k}e_0} \mathbf{n}$$

with respect to (B.2) and with the understanding that the second right hand side term vanishes for $\hat{k} = 0$, provided we show that for all $k \geq 0$ and $m \geq 0$

$$(B.4) \quad \hat{\partial}^k ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^m \hat{c})_{\beta_{m+2}} = ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_{\beta_{m+2} + k e_0},$$

which we shall establish now by induction in m and for β_{m+2} replaced by an arbitrary $\beta \prec \hat{\beta} - g_{\mathbf{n}}$ with $\beta(k=0) = 0$. This captures β_{m+2} , since by $m \geq 1$ and $|\cdot|_{\prec} \geq \lambda$ we have $|\beta_{m+2}|_{\prec} = |\hat{\beta}|_{\prec} - |\beta_1|_{\prec} - \dots - |\beta_{m+1}|_{\prec} \leq |\hat{\beta}|_{\prec} - 2\lambda < |\hat{\beta} - g_{\mathbf{n}}|_{\prec}$. The base

case $m = 0$ follows from (2.40a) $_{\prec \hat{\beta} - g_n}$. For the induction step $m \rightsquigarrow m + 1$ we argue as follows. On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\partial}^k ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^{m+1} \hat{c})_\beta \\
&= \hat{\partial}^k \sum_\gamma (\hat{D}^{(0)})_\beta^\gamma ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^m \hat{c})_\gamma \\
&= \hat{\partial}^k \sum_\gamma \left(\partial_{a_0} \delta_\beta^{\gamma+e_1} + \sum_{k \geq 1} (k+1) \gamma(k) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-e_k+e_{k+1}} + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell+1) \gamma(\ell) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-f_\ell+f_{\ell+1}} \right) ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^m \hat{c})_\gamma \\
&= (k+1) \hat{\partial}^{k+1} ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^m \hat{c})_{\beta-e_1} \\
&+ \sum_\gamma \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} (k+1) \gamma(k) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-e_k+e_{k+1}} + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell+1) \gamma(\ell) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-f_\ell+f_{\ell+1}} \right) \hat{\partial}^k ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^m \hat{c})_\gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

which by the induction hypothesis (note that $\beta - e_1 \prec \beta \prec \hat{\beta} - g_n$ and by (3.40) $|\gamma|_\prec = |\beta|_\prec < |\hat{\beta} - g_n|_\prec$) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\partial}^k ((\hat{D}^{(0)})^{m+1} \hat{c})_\beta \\
&= (k+1) ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_{\beta+(k+1)e_0-e_1} \\
&+ \sum_\gamma \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} (k+1) \gamma(k) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-e_k+e_{k+1}} + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell+1) \gamma(\ell) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-f_\ell+f_{\ell+1}} \right) ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_{\gamma+k e_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& ((D^{(0)})^{m+1} \bar{c})_{\beta+k e_0} \\
&= \sum_\gamma (D^{(0)})_{\beta+k e_0}^\gamma ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_\gamma \\
&= \sum_\gamma \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} (k+1) \gamma(k) \delta_{\beta+k e_0}^{\gamma-e_k+e_{k+1}} + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell+1) \gamma(\ell) \delta_{\beta+k e_0}^{\gamma-f_\ell+f_{\ell+1}} \right) ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_\gamma \\
&= (k+1) ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_{\beta+(k+1)e_0-e_1} \\
&+ \sum_\gamma \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} (k+1) \gamma(k) \delta_{\beta+k e_0}^{\gamma-e_k+e_{k+1}} + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell+1) \gamma(\ell) \delta_{\beta+k e_0}^{\gamma-f_\ell+f_{\ell+1}} \right) ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_\gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last equality that β doesn't contain e_0 components, i.e. $\beta(k=0) = 0$. Since the last sum over γ vanishes if γ does not contain at least $k e_0$, and for $k \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 0$ we have $(\gamma + k e_0)(k) = \gamma(k)$ and $(\gamma + k e_0)(\ell) = \gamma(\ell)$, we obtain by resummation

$$\begin{aligned}
& ((D^{(0)})^{m+1} \bar{c})_{\beta+k e_0} \\
&= (k+1) ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_{\beta+(k+1)e_0-e_1} \\
&+ \sum_\gamma \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} (k+1) \gamma(k) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-e_k+e_{k+1}} + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell+1) \gamma(\ell) \delta_\beta^{\gamma-f_\ell+f_{\ell+1}} \right) ((D^{(0)})^m \bar{c})_{\gamma+k e_0},
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the argument for (B.4) and hence (B.3).

In the following, we pass from (B.3) to (2.40a) $_{\hat{\beta} - g_n}$. Recall from (3.49) that $\hat{c}_{\hat{\beta} - g_n}$ is only non-vanishing, if $|\hat{\beta}| < 3$. We therefore restrict to such multiindices $\hat{\beta}$. By the locally uniform (in a_0) estimate (3.5) of $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-$ together with $|\hat{\beta}| < 3$ and the definition (B.1) of $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-$, we know that $\hat{c}_{\hat{\beta} - g_n} \mathbf{n} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}t}^- (x)$, locally uniformly in a_0 . Since the analyticity (B.3) of $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-$ with respect to (B.2) implies analyticity of $\mathbb{E} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}t}^- (x)$, this

yields analyticity of $\hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}-g_n}$. Hence we have by (B.3)

$$\hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}-g_n} \mathbf{n} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E} \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + \hat{k} e_0}^- (x) - \mathbb{E} \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + (\hat{k}-1) e_0} (x) + \bar{c}_{\hat{\beta}-g_n + \hat{k} e_0} \mathbf{n} \right).$$

Since $|\cdot|$ is degenerate in e_0 and $|\hat{\beta}| < 3$, we obtain from the estimates (3.5) of $\bar{\Pi}_x^-$ and (2.31) of $\bar{\Pi}_x$ that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + \hat{k} e_0}^- (x) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + (\hat{k}-1) e_0} (x) = 0$, which implies (2.40a) $_{\hat{\beta}-g_n}$.

Step 2. We show (2.40a) $_{\hat{\beta}-g_n}$ & (2.40b) $_{\hat{\beta}}$ imply (2.40b) $_{\hat{\beta}}$. By definition of $\hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-$ and the just established (B.3), we have

$$\hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^- = \hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} (\hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^- - \hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}-g_n} \mathbf{n}) = \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + \hat{k} e_0}^- - \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + (\hat{k}-1) e_0} + \bar{c}_{\hat{\beta}-g_n + \hat{k} e_0} \mathbf{n} - \hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \hat{c}_{\hat{\beta}-g_n} \mathbf{n},$$

which by (2.40a) $_{\hat{\beta}-g_n}$ yields

$$(B.5) \quad \hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^- = \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + \hat{k} e_0}^- - \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + (\hat{k}-1) e_0},$$

with respect to (B.2) and again with the understanding that the second right hand side term vanishes if $\hat{k} = 0$. We now perform an integration argument to pass from (B.5) to (2.40b) $_{\hat{\beta}}$. We do so by induction in $\hat{k} \geq 0$, and start with the base case $\hat{k} = 0$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} R_{x \hat{\beta}}^- &:= \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) - \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a_0), \\ R_{x \hat{\beta}} &:= \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}(a'_0) - \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}(a_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the equations (2.37) and (2.38) for $\hat{\Pi}$ and $\bar{\Pi}$, we obtain

$$(\partial_0 + (1-a_0)\Delta^2) R_{x \hat{\beta}} = \nabla \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) - (1-a'_0)\Delta^2 \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) + (1-a_0)\Delta^2 \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) - \nabla \cdot \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a_0).$$

Using $\bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^- = \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-$ from (B.5), we obtain

$$(\partial_0 + (1-a_0)\Delta^2) R_{x \hat{\beta}} = \nabla \cdot (R_{x \hat{\beta}}^- + (a'_0 - a_0) \nabla \Delta \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0)).$$

Since $R_{x \hat{\beta}}$ inherits from $\hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}$ and $\bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}$ the vanishing and growth conditions, we obtain an integral representation of $R_{x \hat{\beta}}$ in terms of $R_{x \hat{\beta}}^- + (a'_0 - a_0) \nabla \Delta \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0)$, analogous to the proof of Lemma 3.11. By the exact same argumentation as in the proof of Lemma 3.11, we therefore obtain

$$\|R_{x \hat{\beta}}\|_{(2.41)} \lesssim \|R_{x \hat{\beta}}^-\|_{(B.2)} + |a'_0 - a_0| \|\hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0)\|_{(2.41)}.$$

As the right hand side of this expression vanishes for $a'_0 \rightarrow a_0$, we obtain as desired $\hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}(a_0) = \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}(a_0)$.

In the induction step $0, \dots, \hat{k} \rightsquigarrow \hat{k} + 1$ we proceed similarly. We define

$$\begin{aligned} R_{x \hat{\beta}}^- &:= \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) - \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{k}+1} (a'_0 - a_0)^j \hat{\partial}^j \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a_0), \\ R_{x \hat{\beta}} &:= \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}(a'_0) - \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{k}} (a'_0 - a_0)^j \hat{\partial}^j \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}(a_0) - (a'_0 - a_0)^{\hat{k}+1} \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + (\hat{k}+1) e_0}(a_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the equations (2.37) and (2.38) for $\hat{\Pi}$ and $\bar{\Pi}$, and by the induction hypothesis $\hat{\partial}^j \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}} = \bar{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta} + j e_0}$ for $j = 0, \dots, \hat{k}$, we obtain

$$(\partial_0 + (1-a_0)\Delta^2) R_{x \hat{\beta}} = \nabla \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) - (1-a'_0)\Delta^2 \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) + (1-a_0)\Delta^2 \hat{\Pi}_{x \hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0)$$

$$- \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{k}+1} (a'_0 - a_0)^j \nabla \cdot \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+je_0}^-(a_0).$$

Using (B.5) to rewrite $\bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+je_0}^- = \hat{\partial}^j \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^- + \nabla \Delta \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+(j-1)e_0}$, and using once more the induction hypothesis in form of $\hat{\partial}^{j-1} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^- = \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+(j-1)e_0}$ for $j-1 = 0, \dots, \hat{k}$, we obtain

$$(\partial_0 + (1 - a_0)\Delta^2)R_{x\hat{\beta}} = \nabla \cdot R_{x\hat{\beta}}^- + (a'_0 - a_0)\Delta^2 \left(\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-(a'_0) - \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{k}} (a'_0 - a_0)^j \hat{\partial}^j \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-(a_0) \right).$$

By definition of $R_{x\hat{\beta}}$, this yields

$$(\partial_0 + (1 - a_0)\Delta^2)R_{x\hat{\beta}} = \nabla \cdot \left(R_{x\hat{\beta}}^- + (a'_0 - a_0)\nabla \Delta (R_{x\hat{\beta}} + (a'_0 - a_0)^{\hat{k}+1} \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+(\hat{k}+1)e_0}(a_0)) \right).$$

Again, since $R_{x\hat{\beta}}$ inherits growth and vanishing conditions from $\hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}$ and $\bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}$, the same argumentation as in the proof of Lemma 3.11 yields

$$\|R_{x\hat{\beta}}\|_{(2.41)} \lesssim \|R_{x\hat{\beta}}^-\|_{(B.2)} + |a'_0 - a_0| \|R_{x\hat{\beta}}\|_{(2.41)} + |a'_0 - a_0|^{\hat{k}+2} \|\bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+(\hat{k}+1)e_0}(a_0)\|_{(2.41)}.$$

For $|a'_0 - a_0|$ sufficiently small, the right hand side term $|a'_0 - a_0| \|R_{x\hat{\beta}}\|_{(2.41)}$ can be absorbed in the left hand side, establishing that $\|R_{x\hat{\beta}}\|_{(2.41)} = o(|a'_0 - a_0|^{\hat{k}+1})$. Hence $\hat{\partial}^{\hat{k}+1} \hat{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}}^-(a_0) = \bar{\Pi}_{x\hat{\beta}+(\hat{k}+1)e_0}(a_0)$, which finishes the induction step and therefore the proof of (2.40b) $_{\hat{\beta}}$. \square

REFERENCES

- [BCCH21] Y. Bruned, A. Chandra, I. Chevyrev, and M. Hairer. Renormalising SPDEs in regularity structures. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 23(3):869–947, 2021. doi:10.4171/jems/1025.
- [BDH19] I. Bailleul, A. Debussche, and M. Hofmanová. Quasilinear generalized parabolic Anderson model equation. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 7(1):40–63, 2019. doi:10.1007/s40072-018-0121-1.
- [BHK22] I. Bailleul, M. Hoshino, and S. Kusuoka. Regularity structures for quasilinear singular spdes. Preprint *arXiv:2209.05025*, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.05025>.
- [BHZ19] Y. Bruned, M. Hairer, and L. Zambotti. Algebraic renormalisation of regularity structures. *Invent. Math.*, 215(3):1039–1156, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00222-018-0841-x.
- [BL23] Y. Bruned and P. Linares. A top-down approach to algebraic renormalization in regularity structures based on multi-indices. Preprint *arXiv:2307.03036*, 2023. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.03036>.
- [BOTT23] L. Broux, F. Otto, M. Tempelmayr, and P. Tsatsoulis. Lecture notes on malliavin calculus in regularity structures. To appear, 2023+.
- [CH16] A. Chandra and M. Hairer. An analytic BPHZ theorem for regularity structures. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1612.08138, December 2016. arXiv:1612.08138, doi:10.48550/arXiv.1612.08138.
- [DGGG21] K. Dareiotis, B. Gess, M. V. Gnann, and G. Grün. Non-negative Martingale solutions to the stochastic thin-film equation with nonlinear gradient noise. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 242(1):179–234, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00205-021-01682-z.
- [DGGG23] Konstantinos Dareiotis, Benjamin Gess, Manuel V. Gnann, and Max Sauerbrey. Solutions to the stochastic thin-film equation for initial values with non-full support. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2305.06017, May 2023. arXiv:2305.06017, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.06017.
- [DMS05] B. Davidovitch, E. Moro, and H. A. Stone. Spreading of viscous fluid drops on a solid substrate assisted by thermal fluctuations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95:244505, Dec 2005. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.244505>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.244505.
- [DOGKP19] M. A. Durán-Olivencia, R. S. Gvalani, S. Kalliadasis, and G. A. Pavliotis. Instability, rupture and fluctuations in thin liquid films: theory and computations. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 174(3):579–604, 2019. doi:10.1007/s10955-018-2200-0.
- [FG18] J. Fischer and G. Grün. Existence of positive solutions to stochastic thin-film equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 50(1):411–455, 2018. doi:10.1137/16M1098796.
- [FG19] M. Furlan and M. Gubinelli. Paracontrolled quasilinear SPDEs. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(2):1096–1135, 2019. doi:10.1214/18-AOP1280.

- [FRRO22] X. Fernández-Real and X. Ros-Oton. *Regularity Theory for Elliptic PDE*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. EMS Press, 2022. URL: https://sma.epfl.ch/~xafernan/Documents/Fernandez-Real_Ros-Oton_Book.pdf.
- [Ger20] M. Gerencsér. Nondivergence form quasilinear heat equations driven by space-time white noise. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 37(3):663–682, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.anihpc.2020.01.003.
- [GG20] B. Gess and M. V. Gnann. The stochastic thin-film equation: existence of non-negative martingale solutions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(12):7260–7302, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.spa.2020.07.013.
- [GGKO22] B. Gess, R. S. Gvalani, F. Kunick, and F. Otto. Thermodynamically consistent and positivity-preserving discretization of the thin-film equation with thermal noise. Preprint *arXiv:2109.06083*, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.06083>.
- [GH19] M. Gerencsér and M. Hairer. A solution theory for quasilinear singular SPDEs. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(9):1983–2005, 2019. doi:10.1002/cpa.21816.
- [GIP15] M. Gubinelli, P. Imkeller, and N. Perkowski. Paracontrolled distributions and singular PDEs. *Forum Math. Pi*, 3:e6, 75, 2015. doi:10.1017/fmp.2015.2.
- [GK22] G. Grün and L. Klein. Zero-contact angle solutions to stochastic thin-film equations. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 22(3):Paper No. 64, 37, 2022. doi:10.1007/s00028-022-00818-2.
- [GMR06] G. Grün, K. Mecke, and M. Rauscher. Thin-film flow influenced by thermal noise. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 122(6):1261–1291, 2006. doi:10.1007/s10955-006-9028-8.
- [GO02] L. Giacomelli and F. Otto. Droplet spreading: intermediate scaling law by PDE methods. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 55(2):217–254, 2002. doi:10.1002/cpa.10017.
- [Hai13] M. Hairer. Solving the KPZ equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 178(2):559–664, 2013. doi:10.4007/annals.2013.178.2.4.
- [Hai14] M. Hairer. A theory of regularity structures. *Invent. Math.*, 198(2):269–504, 2014. doi:10.1007/s00222-014-0505-4.
- [HS23] M. Hairer and R. Steele. The BPHZ Theorem for Regularity Structures via the Spectral Gap Inequality. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2301.10081, January 2023. arXiv:2301.10081, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2301.10081.
- [IORT23] R. Ignat, F. Otto, R. Ried, and P. Tsatsoulis. Variational methods for a singular spde yielding the universality of the magnetization ripple. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 76(11):2959–3043, 2023. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.22093.
- [KT22] F. Kunick and P. Tsatsoulis. Gradient-type estimates for the dynamic ϕ_2^4 -model. Preprint *arXiv:2202.11036*, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.11036>.
- [LO22] P. Linares and F. Otto. A tree-free approach to regularity structures: The regular case for quasi-linear equations. Preprint *arXiv:2207.10627*, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.10627>.
- [LOT23] P. Linares, F. Otto, and M. Tempelmayr. The structure group for quasi-linear equations via universal enveloping algebras. *Comm. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3:1–64, 2023. doi:10.1090/cams/16.
- [LOTT21] P. Linares, F. Otto, M. Tempelmayr, and P. Tsatsoulis. A diagram-free approach to the stochastic estimates in regularity structures. Preprint *arXiv:2112.10739*, 2021. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.10739>.
- [MG22] S. Metzger and G. Grün. Existence of nonnegative solutions to stochastic thin-film equations in two space dimensions. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 24(3):307–387, 2022. doi:10.4171/afb/476.
- [OSSW21] F. Otto, J. Sauer, S. A. Smith, and H. Weber. A priori bounds for quasi-linear SPDEs in the full sub-critical regime. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2103.11039, March 2021. arXiv:2103.11039, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2103.11039.
- [OST23] F. Otto, K. Seong, and M. Tempelmayr. Lecture notes on tree-free regularity structures. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2301.00778, January 2023. arXiv:2301.00778, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2301.00778.
- [OW19a] F. Otto and H. Weber. Quasi-linear SPDEs in divergence form. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 7(1):64–85, 2019. doi:10.1007/s40072-018-0122-0.
- [OW19b] F. Otto and H. Weber. Quasilinear SPDEs via rough paths. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 232(2):873–950, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00205-018-01335-8.
- [Sau21] M. Sauerbrey. Martingale solutions to the stochastic thin-film equation in two dimensions. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2108.05754, August 2021. arXiv:2108.05754, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2108.05754.
- [Tem23] M. Tempelmayr. Characterizing models in regularity structures: a quasilinear case. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2303.18192, March 2023. arXiv:2303.18192, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.18192.