

# AN ERGODIC THEOREM WITH WEIGHTS AND APPLICATIONS TO RANDOM MEASURES, HOMOGENIZATION AND HYDRODYNAMICS

ALESSANDRA FAGGIONATO

**ABSTRACT.** We prove a multidimensional ergodic theorem with weighted averages for the action of the group  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  on a probability space. At level  $n$  weights are of the form  $n^{-d}\psi(j/n)$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , for real functions  $\psi$  decaying suitably fast. We discuss applications to random measures and to quenched stochastic homogenization of random walks on simple point processes with long-range random jump rates, allowing to remove the technical Assumption (A9) from [8, Theorem 4.4]. This last result concerns also some semigroup and resolvent convergence particularly relevant for the derivation of the quenched hydrodynamic limit of interacting particle systems via homogenization and duality. As a consequence we show that also the quenched hydrodynamic limit of the symmetric simple exclusion process on point processes stated in [7, Theorem 4.1] remains valid when removing the above mentioned Assumption (A9).

*AMS 2010 Subject Classification:* 37A30, 60G55, 60K37, 35B27.

In memory of Francis Comets.

*I desire to thank Francis Comets for his kindness and cheerfulness towards his colleagues and also young people taking their first steps in research (this was my case when we met the first time). I benefited from both his scientific and human qualities. Thanks!*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The multidimensional ergodic theorem with  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -action and arithmetic averages states that, given  $d$  commuting measure-preserving and bijective maps  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and setting  $T^j := T_1^{j_1} \circ T_2^{j_2} \circ \dots \circ T_d^{j_d}$  for  $j = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , the sequence

$$\frac{1}{|I_n|} S_{I_n} f := \frac{1}{|I_n|} \sum_{j \in I_n} f \circ T^j$$

converges as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  a.s. and in  $L^p$  to  $\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{I}]$  for any  $f \in L^p := L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ ,  $p \in [1, +\infty)$ . Above  $\mathcal{I}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of invariant measurable sets and  $I_1 \subset I_2 \subset I_3 \subset \dots$  is any increasing sequence of boxes with union all  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . The above result is due to Tempelman [20] (see e.g. [15, Theorem. 2.8, Chapter 6] and [18, Theorem 2.6]). The multidimensional ergodic theorem can be derived from the maximal inequality (also called dominated ergodic theorem), which reads  $\mathbb{P}(|I_n|^{-1} S_{I_n} f \geq \alpha) \leq C \|f\|_1 / \alpha$  for any non-negative function  $f \in L^1$  and

$\alpha > 0$ . The above ergodic theorem has been further generalized by considering more general bounded sets  $I_n$ , by replacing arithmetic averages by weighted averages (see below) and also by considering other groups including of course  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (see [15, 18, 20, 21] and the Introduction of [22]).

We are interested here to a generalization of the above multidimensional ergodic theorem for more general averages, where the arithmetic average  $|I_n|^{-1} S_{I_n} f$  is replaced by  $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_{n,j} f \circ T^j$  for real weights  $c_{n,j}$  non necessarily with bounded support in  $j$ . We use here the term average in a more relaxed way, not imposing that  $c_n := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_{n,j}$  equals 1 but just that  $c_n$  converges as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  to some finite constant. For the applications motivating our search of such a generalization (see below), the weights  $c_{n,j}$  have not bounded support, but decay fast enough as  $|j| \rightarrow +\infty$ . We point out that the main technical difficulty comes from the the unbounded support, the fact that we deal with real weights does not make any effective difference.

Some ergodic results with weights also with unbounded support are discussed for  $d = 1$  in [15, Chapter 8] (and references therein). The ergodic theorems in [15, Chapter 8.1] refer to  $L^p$  convergence. These results are based on manipulations of sequences and e.g. on spectral theory when working with the Hilbert space  $L^2$  as in [14]. The a.s. convergence has been derived for suitable choices of weights in [15, Chapter 8.2], by using also Abel's transformation for series. For weights with bounded support and  $d$  generic we mention the results in [20, Section 7] and [21][Section 4, Chapter 6]. Finally, an ergodic theorem with weights with unbounded support in the multidimensional case is provided by [22, Proposition 5.3]. This result implies that for a large class of non-negative measurable functions  $\psi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  not necessarily with compact support (e.g. for  $\psi$  measurable and such that  $0 \leq \psi(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  with  $\beta > d$ ) given  $p \in (1, +\infty)$  and  $f \in L^p$  the integral  $n^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x/n) f \circ T^x dx$  converges a.s. to  $c(\psi) \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{I}]$ , where  $(T^x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$  is an action of the group  $\mathbb{R}^d$  on the probability space,  $\mathcal{I}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of invariant sets and  $c(\psi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) dx$ .

We stress that [22, Proposition 5.3] does not cover the case  $p = 1$  and this is a limitation in the applications motivating our investigation. In Theorem 2.3 below we present a multidimensional ergodic theorem covering also the case  $p = 1$  and implying the following. Given the action  $(T^j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and given a map  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $|\psi(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  and  $\beta > 2d + 2$  (and satisfying some minor conditions), the weighted average  $n^{-d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) f \circ T^j$  converges a.s. and in  $L^p$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  to  $c(\psi) \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{I}]$  for any  $f \in L^p$  with  $p \in [1, +\infty)$ . Although the critical exponent  $2d+2$  could not be optimal, this result is enough for our applications and covers the case  $p = 1$ . Our proof is different from the one of [22, Proposition 5.3]. The derivation of Theorem 2.3 relies on a maximal inequality (cf. Theorem 2.2) with its own interest. The proof of the maximal inequality is based on a suitable covering procedure extending the one (similar to Vitali's covering lemma) used in the derivation of Tempelman's multidimensional ergodic theorem (cf. [15, Theorem. 2.8, Chapter 6]).

Our applications concern random measures, stochastic homogenization of random walks on simple point processes and hydrodynamic limits of interacting particle systems on simple point processes. Let us consider the group  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$  or  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  acting on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by Euclidean translations and on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . We assume that  $\mathbb{P}$  is stationary and ergodic w.r.t. the  $\mathbb{G}$ -action. Let  $\mu_\omega$  be a random locally finite measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for which a natural covariant relation is satisfied under the two above actions (see Section 3). By calling  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon$  the rescaled measure  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(A) := \varepsilon^d \mu_\omega(\varepsilon^{-1}A)$ , we show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) \mu_\omega^\varepsilon(dx) = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) dx \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

where  $m$  is the intensity of the measure, assumed to be finite, in the following cases where  $\psi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ : (i)  $|\psi(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)^{-\beta}$  with  $\beta > 2d+2$ , (ii)  $|\psi(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)^{-\beta}$  with  $\beta > d$  if in addition for some  $\alpha > 1$   $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(A)^\alpha] < +\infty$  for any bounded Borel set  $A$ . The above result has been derived using a tail control related to Theorem 2.3 for case (i) and [22, Proposition 5.3] for case (ii). Note that a priori the measure  $\mu_\omega$  is not uniformly bounded on balls of fixed radius and density fluctuations can be present with balls with arbitrarily large mass. Hence the above result provides a control at infinity of these fluctuations. In Section 3 we present also further progresses on random measures (see Theorems 3.3 and 3.5, Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6 and Corollary 3.7). For other ergodic results concerning random measures we mention [3, 16, 17] and references therein.

And finally we arrive at our starting motivation. In [8] we have derived quenched stochastic homogenization results for random walks with long-range random jump rates on simple point processes on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (assuming a stationary and ergodic action of the group  $\mathbb{G}$ ). In [7] we have derived the quenched hydrodynamic limit in path space for random walks as above but interacting via site exclusion when the rates are symmetric (the so called symmetric simple exclusion process). Both [7] and [8] aim to universal results applicable to a large class of models. The homogenization in [8] concerns also the convergence of the  $L^2$ -Markov semigroup and resolvent of the random walk towards the corresponding objects of the Brownian motion with diffusion matrix given by twice the effective homogenized matrix. A suitable form of convergence (cf. (19),..., (22) below), also crucial to derive the above mentioned hydrodynamic limit, is derived in [8] under an additional assumption called (A9) in [8] (and recalled in Section 4), which allows to control at infinity regions where the simple point process has many points. Roughly, Assumption (A9) requires that the number of points in unit boxes is uniformly bounded or satisfies a suitable covariance decay. As a consequence the same assumption appears in [7] which relies on [8].

Starting from our results for random measures we show that this assumption (A9) is not necessary anymore, and the control at infinity is assured by ergodicity itself (which was already between the basic assumptions in [7] and [8]). This was not possible at the time of [7] and [8] exactly because a result

like our Theorem 2.3 was missing. For more details we refer to Section 4 and in particular to Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 4.4. As a consequence, both in [7] and [8] Assumption (A9) can now be removed.

**Outline of the paper:** In Section 2 we present our multidimensional ergodic theorem with weighted averages (Theorem 2.3) and the associated maximal inequality (Theorem 2.2). In Section 3 we discuss some applications to random measures (Theorems 3.3 and 3.5, Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6 and Corollary 3.7). In Section 4 we discuss applications to stochastic homogenization of random walks with random jump rates on simple point processes (Theorem 4.3) and to the hydrodynamic limit of the symmetric simple exclusion process on simple point processes with random jump rates (Corollary 4.4). The remaining sections and the appendix are devoted to proofs (for Theorem 2.2 see Section 5, for Theorem 2.3 see Section 6, for Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 see Section 7, for Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 see Section 8, for Theorem 4.3 see Section 9). The proofs for Section 3 (Section 4) rely on the results of Section 2 (Section 3, respectively), but the proofs for each section can be read independently.

## 2. AN ERGODIC THEOREM WITH WEIGHTED AVERAGES

We fix some basic notation. We set  $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, +\infty)$  and  $\mathbb{N}_+ := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ . We denote by  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_d$  the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . We fix  $\kappa \in [1, +\infty]$  and, given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we denote by  $|x|$  the  $\ell^\kappa$ -norm of  $x$  (in particular,  $|x|$  is the Euclidean norm of  $x$  when  $\kappa = 2$ ).

Let  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d$  be  $d$  commuting measure-preserving and bijective maps on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . We call  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{F}$  the  $\sigma$ -subalgebra given by the invariant sets, i.e.  $\mathcal{I} := \{A \in \mathcal{F} : T_k^{-1}A = A \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq d\}$ . Moreover we set  $T^j := T_1^{j_1} \circ T_2^{j_2} \circ \dots \circ T_d^{j_d}$  for  $j = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . In what follows we write  $L^p$  for  $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and we denote by  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  the expectation w.r.t.  $\mathbb{P}$ .

**Definition 2.1.** *A function  $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is called  $d$ -good if it is non-increasing and  $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m^{2d} \vartheta(m) \rho(m)^{-1} < +\infty$  for some positive summable function  $\rho : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ .*

Trivially, given  $c > 0$  and  $\beta > 2d + 2$ , the function  $\vartheta(r) := c(1+r)^{-\beta}$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  is  $d$ -good (take  $\rho(m) := (1+m)^{-1-\delta}$  with  $\delta > 0$  small). The reader, interested just in the applications presented in the next sections, can neglect the concept of  $d$ -good function and simply take  $\vartheta(r) := c(1+r)^{-\beta}$  with  $\beta > 2d + 2$  in Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 below.

Recall that  $|x|$  denotes the  $\ell^\kappa$ -norm of  $x$ , where  $\kappa \in [1, +\infty]$ . Our first result is the following maximal inequality, (see Section 5 for the proof):

**Theorem 2.2** (Maximal Inequality). *For any function  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\psi(x) \leq \vartheta(|x|)$  for some  $d$ -good function  $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , for any non-negative  $f \in L^1$  and for any  $\alpha > 0$ , it holds*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) f(T^j \omega) > \alpha\right) \leq \frac{C \|f\|_1}{\alpha}, \quad (1)$$

where  $C = C(d, \vartheta, \rho, \kappa)$  is a suitable positive constant and  $\rho$  is as in Definition 2.1.

The above maximal inequality is a form of dominated ergodic theorem [15] and is the main tool to derive the following result (see Section 6 for the proof):

**Theorem 2.3** (Ergodic theorem for weighted averages). *Fix a function  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

- (i)  $|\psi(x)| \leq \vartheta(|x|)$  for some  $d$ -good function  $\vartheta$ ;
- (ii)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n) - \psi((j + e_i)/n)| = 0$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ;
- (iii) the limit  $c(\psi) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n)$  exists and is finite.

Then, for any measurable function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in  $L^p$  for some  $p \in [1, +\infty)$ , it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) f(T^j \omega) = c(\psi) \mathbb{E}[f | \mathcal{I}]$$

both  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and in  $L^p$ .

**Remark 2.4.** *If  $\psi$  is Riemann integrable, then Item (iii) above holds with  $c(\psi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) dx$ . Moreover, the function  $\psi(x) := (1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  with  $\beta > 2d + 2$  fulfills all the assumptions of the above ergodic theorem.*

We introduce the shorthand notation

$$W_n^\psi(f)(\omega) := \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) f(T^j \omega). \quad (2)$$

We point out that, whenever  $|\psi(x)| \leq \vartheta(|x|)$  for a  $d$ -good function  $\vartheta$ , then the series  $\frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n)$  in Item (iii) of Theorem 2.3 is absolutely convergent and therefore well defined. If in addition  $f \in L^p \subset L^1$ , then the series defining  $W_n^\psi(f)(\omega)$  is absolutely convergent a.s. Indeed, the measure-preserving property of  $T^j$  implies that  $\mathbb{E}[W_n^{|\psi|}(|f|)] = \mathbb{E}[|f|] \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n)| < +\infty$ .

### 3. APPLICATIONS TO RANDOM MEASURES ON $\mathbb{R}^d$

Differently from Section 2, in this section  $|x|$  will denote the Euclidean norm of  $x$ . Moreover, given a topological space  $W$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(W)$  will denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $W$ .

Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be the abelian group  $\mathbb{R}^d$  or  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , endowed with the standard Euclidean topology and the discrete topology, respectively. We suppose that  $\mathbb{G}$  acts on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . We call  $(\theta_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  this action. This means that the maps  $\theta_g : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  satisfy the following properties:  $\theta_0 = \text{id}$ ;  $\theta_g \circ \theta_{g'} = \theta_{g+g'}$  for all  $g, g' \in \mathbb{G}$ ; the map  $\mathbb{G} \times \Omega \ni (g, \omega) \mapsto \theta_g \omega \in \Omega$  is measurable.

A set  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  is called  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant if  $A = \theta_g A$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ .

**Assumption 1:** *We assume that  $\mathbb{P}$  is  $\mathbb{G}$ -stationary, i.e.  $\mathbb{P} \circ \theta_g^{-1} = \mathbb{P}$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ . We also assume that  $\mathbb{P}$  is ergodic, i.e.  $\mathbb{P}(A) \in \{0, 1\}$  for any  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ .*

We fix a proper action  $(\tau_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  of  $\mathbb{G}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  given by translations. More precisely, for a given invertible  $d \times d$  matrix  $V$ , we have

$$\tau_g x = x + Vg, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall g \in \mathbb{G}. \quad (3)$$

In several applications  $V = \mathbb{I}$ , thus implying that  $\tau_g x = x + g$ . The case  $V \neq \mathbb{I}$  is particularly relevant when treating e.g. crystal lattices [7, 8]. An example with  $V \neq \mathbb{I}$  is given in Section 3.2.2.

We denote by  $\mathcal{M}$  the metric space of locally finite non-negative measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\sigma$ -algebra of measurable sets given by the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  [3, Appendix A2.6]. The definition of the metric  $d_{\mathcal{M}}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is rather involved and is given in [3, Eq. (A2.6.1)]. We will not use the explicit expression of  $d_{\mathcal{M}}$ . We just recall that  $\nu_n \rightarrow \nu$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  if and only if  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\nu_n(x) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\nu(x)$  for each real continuous function  $f$  with compact support (shortly  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ). The action of  $\mathbb{G}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  naturally induces an action of  $\mathbb{G}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , which (with some abuse of notation) we still denote by  $(\tau_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$ . In particular,  $\tau_g : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is given by  $\tau_g \mathbf{m}(A) := \mathbf{m}(\tau_g A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d(\tau_g \mathbf{m})(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\tau_{-g} x) d\mathbf{m}(x). \quad (4)$$

**3.1.  $\mathbb{G}$ -stationary random measure  $\mu_\omega$  and rescaled random measure  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon$ .** We suppose now to have a random locally finite non-negative measure  $\mu_\omega$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , i.e. a measurable map  $\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \mu_\omega \in \mathcal{M}$ . The fundamental relation between the above two actions of  $\mathbb{G}$  and the random measure  $\mu_\omega$  is given by the following assumption:

**Assumption 2:** *The random measure  $\mu_\omega$  is  $\mathbb{G}$ -stationary: for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$  it holds  $\mu_{\theta_g \omega} = \tau_g \mu_\omega$ .*

Calling  $v^1, v^2, \dots, v^d$  the columns of  $V$ , we introduce the parallelepiped

$$\Delta := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d t_i v^i : 0 \leq t_i < 1 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

When  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  one can also take for  $\Delta$  any bounded Borel subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with finite and positive Lebesgue measure (e.g.  $\Delta = [0, 1]^d$ ).

**Definition 3.1.** *The intensity  $m$  of the random measure  $\mu_\omega$  is defined as  $m := \ell(\Delta)^{-1} \int_{\Omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \mu_\omega(\Delta)$ , where  $\ell(\Delta)$  is the Lebesgue measure of  $\Delta$ .*

By the  $\mathbb{G}$ -stationarity of  $\mathbb{P}$ , if  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  then  $\int_{\Omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \mu_\omega(U) = m\ell(U)$  for any bounded Borel set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , while if  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$  then  $\int_{\Omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \mu_\omega(U) = m\ell(U)$  for any bounded set  $U$  which is a union of sets of the form  $\tau_g \Delta$  with  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

We introduce the rescaled measure  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon$  defined as

$$\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(A) = \varepsilon^d \mu_\omega(\varepsilon^{-1} A) \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (6)$$

Note that it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\varepsilon x) d\mu_\omega(x) \quad (7)$$

for any Borel function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ .

**Definition 3.2.** We denote by  $C_*(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the set of functions  $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for which, given any  $\beta > 0$ , there exists  $C > 0$  such that  $|f(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

We can now state our limit theorem for  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon$ , where convergence is stronger than the one in  $\mathcal{M}$  itself (see Section 7 for the proof):

**Theorem 3.3.** Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 to be valid and that the intensity  $m$  is finite. Then there exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$  and with the following property. Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function such that, for some  $C > 0$  and  $\beta > 2d + 2$ ,  $|\varphi(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{A}$  the integral  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(x)| d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x)$  is finite and it holds

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) dx. \quad (8)$$

In particular, (8) holds for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{A}$  and all  $\varphi \in C_*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

The proof of Theorem 3.3 will use the following technical lemma, which will be important also for our applications to stochastic homogenization and hydrodynamics (see Section 7 for the proof):

**Lemma 3.4.** Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 to be valid and that the intensity  $m$  is finite. Then there exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$  and with the following property. Fixed  $\beta > 2d + 2$  set  $\vartheta(r) := (1 + r)^{-\beta}$  for  $r \geq 0$ . Then for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$  we have  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vartheta(|x|) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) < +\infty$  and

$$\lim_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell\}} \vartheta(|x|) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = 0. \quad (9)$$

When the random measure has higher finite density moments, one can deal with a larger class of functions. Indeed, by means [22, Prop. 5.3] we can derive the following result where  $\Delta$  is the fundamental cell defined in (5) (see Section 8 for the proof):

**Theorem 3.5.** Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 to be valid. In addition, assume that  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$  for some  $\alpha > 1$ . Fix a measurable function  $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing, is convex on  $[a, +\infty)$  for some  $a > 0$  and satisfies  $\int_0^\infty r^{d-1} \vartheta(r) dr < +\infty$ . Then there exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\mathcal{A}_\vartheta \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_\vartheta) = 1$  such that, for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{A}_\vartheta$ , the integral  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(x)| d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x)$  is finite and (8) holds for all continuous functions  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $|\varphi(x)| \leq \vartheta(|x|)$ .

Trivially, if  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$  for some  $\alpha > 1$ , then the intensity  $m$  is finite. The assumptions in Theorem 3.5 on  $\vartheta$  are the same assumptions required in [22, Prop. 5.3] and we have kept them in their original form. An important example for applications is given by  $\vartheta(r) = (1 + r)^{-\beta}$  with  $\beta > d$ . The proof of the above theorem relies on the following lemma (proved in Section 8), relevant also for our applications to stochastic homogenization and hydrodynamics:

**Lemma 3.6.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 to be valid. In addition, assume that  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$  for some  $\alpha > 1$ . Fix a function  $\vartheta$  as in Theorem 3.5. Then there exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\mathcal{C}_\vartheta \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_\vartheta) = 1$  and such that, for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_\vartheta$ , it holds  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vartheta(|x|) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) < +\infty$  and (9) is verified.*

By applying Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 to the countable family of functions  $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  of the form  $\vartheta(r) := C(1+r)^{-\beta}$  with rational  $C, \beta$  and  $\beta > d$ , one gets the following immediate consequence:

**Corollary 3.7.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 to be valid. In addition, assume that  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$  for some  $\alpha > 1$ . Then both Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 remain true if one substitutes the condition  $\beta > 2d+2$  by the condition  $\beta > d$ .*

For later use we point out that, as the reader can easily check from the proofs, Theorems 3.3 and 3.5, Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6 and Corollary 3.7 remain true if Assumption 2 is replaced by the following one:

**Assumption 2\*:** *It holds  $\mu_{\theta_g\omega} = \tau_g\mu_\omega$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$  and all  $\omega$  varying in a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\Omega_* \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_*) = 1$ .*

**3.2. Examples.** In this section we provide some examples of random measures to which one can apply the above results. The class is very large and we just give some illustrative examples.

**3.2.1. Random measures associated to the Bernoulli bond percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ .** Consider the Bernoulli bond percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Denoting by  $\mathbb{E}_d$  the set of undirected edges of the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , the probability space is given by  $\Omega := \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$  endowed with the product topology ( $\{0, 1\}$  has the discrete topology),  $\mathcal{F}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel sets and  $\mathbb{P}$  is the Bernoulli product measure on  $\Omega$  of parameter  $p \in [0, 1]$ . Below we write  $\omega_{x,y}$  instead of  $\omega_{\{x,y\}}$  for  $\{x, y\} \in \mathbb{E}_d$ . The group  $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{Z}^d$  acts on  $\Omega$  by the maps  $\theta_g : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  with  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ , where  $(\theta_g\omega)_{x,y} := \omega_{x+g,y+g}$  for all  $\{x, y\} \in \mathbb{E}_d$ . Note that Assumption 1 is satisfied by  $\mathbb{P}$ .

We consider the translations  $(\tau_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  given by (3) with  $V = \mathbb{I}$ , i.e.  $\tau_g x = x + g$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ . Then the parallelepiped in (5) is given by  $\Delta = [0, 1]^d$ .

An example of random measure satisfying Assumption 2 is  $\mu_\omega := \sum_{x \in V(\omega)} \delta_x$ , where  $V(\omega)$  is the vertex set of the graph obtained by keeping only the open edges, i.e.  $V(\omega) := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \omega_{x,y} = 1 \text{ for some } y \text{ with } |x - y| = 1\}$ .

If  $p$  is supercritical, then it is known that there exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$  such that the graph obtained by keeping only the open edges has a unique infinite connected component, and we call  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$  the vertex set of this component for  $\omega \in \Omega_1$ . Then another example of random measure satisfying Assumption 2 is given by

$$\mu_\omega := \begin{cases} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} \delta_x & \text{if } \omega \in \Omega_1, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \omega \notin \Omega_1. \end{cases}$$






FIGURE 1. Hexagonal lattice, vectors  $v^1$  and  $v^2$ , hexagon center  $c$ . The fundamental cell  $\Delta$  is the parallelepiped with vertexes  $0, v^1, v^2, v^1 + v^2$  (apart boundary terms).

For both the above random measures  $\mu_\omega(\Delta) \in \{0, 1\}$ , hence all moments of  $\mu_\omega(\Delta)$  are finite. The first moment, i.e. the intensity  $m$ , is then given by  $\mathbb{P}(0 \in \mathcal{V}(\omega))$  and  $\mathbb{P}(0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega))$  in the first and the second case, respectively.

3.2.2. *Contrast structures.* Let  $\Omega := \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$  endowed with the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  of Borel subsets. Let  $\mathbb{P}$  be a probability measure on  $\Omega$  satisfying Assumption 1 where  $(\theta_g \omega)_z := \omega_{z+g}$  for any  $g, z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  (for example,  $\mathbb{P}$  can be a product probability measure with equal marginals).

Consider the hexagonal lattice in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Let  $v^1, v^2$  be the basis vectors and  $c$  be the center of the hexagon containing the origin as in Figure 1. Take  $\Delta$  as in (5), set  $V := [v^1 | v^2]$  and let  $\tau_g x := x + Vg = x + g_1 v^1 + g_2 v^2$  for all  $g = (g_1, g_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Note that the hexagonal lattice is left invariant by the translations  $(\tau_g)_{g \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ . Moreover, note that the map  $g \mapsto \tau_g c$  is a bijection between  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  and the set of hexagon centers. In what follows, given  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ , we define  $H_g$  as the hexagon centered at  $\tau_g c$ .

We set  $\mu_\omega(dx) := f_\omega(x)dx$  where  $f_\omega(x) := \omega_g$  for  $x \in H_g$ . Let us check that the random measure  $\mu_\omega$  satisfies Assumption 2. Since the density function  $f_\omega(x)$  is constant on the lattice hexagons, it is enough to check that  $\mu_{\theta_g \omega}(H_z) = \tau_g \mu_\omega(H_z)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega, g, z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ . We first observe that, since  $H_z$  has center  $\tau_z c$ , then  $\tau_g H_z$  has center  $\tau_g(\tau_z c) = \tau_{g+z} c$ . This implies that  $\tau_g H_z = H_{g+z}$ . By denoting  $A$  the area of a hexagon we then have

$$\tau_g \mu_\omega(H_z) = \mu_\omega(\tau_g H_z) = \mu_\omega(H_{g+z}) = A \omega_{g+z} = A(\theta_g \omega)_z = \mu_{\theta_g \omega}(H_z).$$

Hence, we have checked Assumption 2.

Since  $\mu_\omega(\Delta) = A(\frac{4}{6}\omega_0 + \frac{1}{6}\omega_{-v_2} + \frac{1}{6}\omega_{-v_1})$ , the intensity  $m$  is finite if and only if  $\int d\mathbb{P}(\omega)\omega_0 < +\infty$  and in general  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$  if and only if  $\int d\mathbb{P}(\omega)\omega_0^\alpha < +\infty$ .

Suppose for example that  $\omega_0$  under  $\mathbb{P}$  is a continuous random variable with probability density  $\gamma \mathbb{1}_{[e, +\infty)}(x)(x \ln x)^{-2}$ , where  $\gamma$  is the normalizing constant. Since  $1/[x(\ln x)^2] = -D(1/\ln x)$ ,  $m$  is finite but  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] = +\infty$  for all  $\alpha > 1$  (in particular, one can apply e.g. Theorem 3.3 but not Theorem 3.5).

3.2.3. *Random measures associated to simple point processes.* Let  $\Omega$  be the space of locally finite subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The injective map  $\Phi : \Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \sum_{x \in \omega} \delta_x \in \mathcal{M}$  allows to identify  $\Omega$  with a subset of  $\mathcal{M}$  (indeed  $\Phi(\Omega)$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathcal{M}$

as stated in [3, Prop. 7.1.III]). As in [3] we endow  $\Omega$  with the metric induced by  $d_{\mathcal{M}}$  and the above injection  $\Phi$ , i.e.  $d(\omega, \omega') := d_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi(\omega), \Phi(\omega'))$ . We define  $\mathcal{F}$  as the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $\Omega$  w.r.t. the above metric. It is known (see [3, Corollary 7.1.VI]) that  $\mathcal{F}$  is generated by the sets  $\{\omega \in \Omega : |\omega \cap A| = n\}$  with  $A$  Borel set of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $n$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  acts on  $\Omega$  by the maps  $\theta_g \omega := \omega - g$  (cf. [3, Chapter 10]).

Let  $\mathbb{P}$  be a probability measure on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  satisfying Assumption 1, i.e.  $\mathbb{P}$  is the law of any simple point process stationary and ergodic w.r.t. Euclidean translations according to the definitions of [3] (e.g.  $\mathbb{P}$  is the law of a homogeneous Poisson point process).

We take  $V = \mathbb{I}$  in (3), i.e. we set  $\tau_g x := x + g$  for all  $x, g \in \mathbb{R}^d = \mathbb{G}$ . Given  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we set  $\mu_\omega := \Phi(\omega) = \sum_{x \in \omega} \delta_x$ . Then it is simple to check that also Assumption 2 is satisfied. Indeed, since  $\tau_g \mu_\omega(A) = \mu_\omega(\tau_g A) = \mu_\omega(A + g)$ , we have  $\tau_g \mu_\omega = \sum_i \delta_{x_i - g}$  if  $\mu_\omega = \sum_i \delta_{x_i}$ . This implies that  $\tau_g \mu_\omega = \mu_{\theta_g \omega}$ .

#### 4. APPLICATION TO STOCHASTIC HOMOGENIZATION OF LONG-RANGE RANDOM WALKS ON POINT PROCESSES AND TO HYDRODYNAMICS

Differently from Section 2, in this section  $|x|$  will denote the Euclidean norm of  $x$ . We also recall that, given a topological space  $W$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(W)$  denotes its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra.

In this section we explain how to extend [8, Theorem 4.4] by removing the restrictive Assumption (A9) present there. In order to state our final result and give a self-contained presentation (accessible also without reading [8]), we recall some results of [8]. We consider the same setting of the previous section, but we restrict to purely atomic measures as described below. Let us recap our setting.

We have a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . When modeling a disordered medium, elements of  $\Omega$  are usually called *environments* and encode all the local randomness of the medium. The group  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  or  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$  acts on the probability space by the action  $(\theta_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  is supposed to be  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant and ergodic for this action (Assumption 1 of Section 3). We consider the translations  $(\tau_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  given in (3) where  $V$  is an invertible matrix. We also assume to have a random measure  $\mu_\omega$  which is purely atomic (i.e. pure point) with locally finite support for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ . In particular, we have

$$\mu_\omega = \sum_{x \in \hat{\omega}} n_x(\omega) \delta_x, \quad n_x(\omega) := \mu_\omega(\{x\}), \quad \hat{\omega} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : n_x(\omega) > 0\} \quad (10)$$

and  $\hat{\omega}$  is a locally finite set (we note that the map  $\omega \mapsto \hat{\omega}$  then defines a simple point process according to [3]). Finally, we assume that  $\mu_{\theta_g \omega} = \tau_g \mu_\omega$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$  and all  $\omega$  varying in a suitable  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\Omega_* \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_*) = 1$  (Assumption 2\* of Section 3).

We enrich the above setting by assuming to have a measurable function

$$r : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \ni (\omega, x, y) \mapsto r_{x,y}(\omega) \in [0, +\infty).$$

As it will be clear below, only the value of  $r_{x,y}(\omega)$  with  $x \neq y$  in  $\hat{\omega}$  will be relevant. Hence, without loss of generality, we take

$$r_{x,x}(\omega) \equiv 0, \quad r_{x,y}(\omega) \equiv 0 \quad \forall \{x, y\} \not\subset \hat{\omega}.$$

Below  $r_{x,y}(\omega)$ , with  $x, y \in \hat{\omega}$ , will be the jump rates of a continuous time random walk in the environment  $\omega$  with state space  $\hat{\omega}$ . Before introducing this random walk we fix some notation and assumptions.

We recall that, roughly, the intensity  $m$  is the mean density of points in  $\hat{\omega}$  (cf. Definition 3.1). Since we need to deal with the Palm distribution, we need that the intensity  $m$  is finite and non zero (if  $m$  was zero,  $\mu_\omega$  would be the zero measure  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.). Hence we introduce the following:

**Assumption 3:** *The intensity  $m$  is finite and positive.*

We call  $\mathbb{P}_0$  the Palm distribution associated to  $\mathbb{P}$  and the random measure  $\mu_\omega$ . Below we recall the definition of  $\mathbb{P}_0$  (the interested reader can see [8, Section 2.3] and references therein for a detailed exposition and proofs, although not necessary below).

For  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $V = \mathbb{I}$  the Palm distribution  $\mathbb{P}_0$  is the probability measure on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  such that, for any  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with Lebesgue measure  $\ell(U) \in (0, +\infty)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_0(A) := \frac{1}{m\ell(U)} \int_{\Omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \int_U d\mu_\omega(x) \mathbf{1}_A(\theta_x \omega), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}.$$

The probability measure  $\mathbb{P}_0$  has support inside the set  $\Omega_0 := \{\omega \in \Omega : n_0(\omega) > 0\}$ . We refer to [8, Section 2.3] for the case  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $V$  generic (this case is not common, hence we do not detail it here).

For  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $V = \mathbb{I}$ , and  $\hat{\omega} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  (this case will be called *special discrete case*), the Palm distribution  $\mathbb{P}_0$  can be identified with the probability measure concentrated on the set  $\Omega_0 := \{\omega \in \Omega : n_0(\omega) > 0\}$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}_0(A) := \mathbb{E}[n_0 \mathbf{1}_A] / \mathbb{E}[n_0] \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (11)$$

In this particular case the intensity of the random measure is given by  $m = \mathbb{E}[n_0]$ .

In general, for  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ , the Palm distribution  $\mathbb{P}_0$  is the probability measure on  $(\Omega \times \Delta, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\Delta))$  (where  $\Delta$  is the parallelepiped (5)) such that

$$\mathbb{P}_0(A) := \frac{1}{m\ell(\Delta)} \int_{\Omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \int_{\Delta} d\mu_\omega(x) \mathbf{1}_A(\omega, x), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\Delta). \quad (12)$$

The probability measure  $\mathbb{P}_0$  has support inside  $\Omega_0 := \{(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \Delta : n_x(\omega) > 0\}$ . If, in addition,  $V = \mathbb{I}$  and  $\hat{\omega} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ , then  $\Delta = [0, 1]^d$  and  $\Omega_0 := \{(\omega, 0) : \omega \in \Omega, n_0(\omega) > 0\}$ . Hence, in the special discrete case, by applying the natural bijection  $(\omega, 0) \mapsto \omega$  between  $\Omega_0$  and  $\{\omega \in \Omega : n_0(\omega) > 0\}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_0$  defined in (12) becomes (11).

We define the function  $\lambda_k : \Omega_0 \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  (for  $k \in [0, \infty)$ ) as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_k(\omega) := \sum_{x \in \hat{\omega}} r_{0,x}(\omega) |x|^k & \text{Case } \mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and} \\ \Omega_0 = \{\omega \in \Omega : n_0(\omega) > 0\} & \text{special discrete case,} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_k(\omega, a) := \sum_{x \in \hat{\omega}} r_{a,x}(\omega) |x - a|^k & \text{Case } \mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d. \\ \Omega_0 := \{(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \Delta : n_x(\omega) > 0\} \end{cases}$$

**Assumption 4.** *We assume that for some  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\Omega_* \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_*) = 1$  the following conditions are fulfilled:*

- (i) *for all  $\omega \in \Omega_*$  and  $g \neq g'$  in  $\mathbb{G}$ , it holds  $\theta_g \omega \neq \theta_{g'} \omega$ ;*
- (ii) *for all  $\omega \in \Omega_*$ ,  $g \in \mathbb{G}$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , it holds  $r_{x,y}(\theta_g \omega) = r_{\tau_g x, \tau_g y}(\omega)$ ;*
- (iii) *for all  $\omega \in \Omega_*$  and  $x, y \in \hat{\omega}$ , it holds  $n_x(\omega) r_{x,y}(\omega) = n_y(\omega) r_{y,x}(\omega)$ ;*
- (iv) *for all  $\omega \in \Omega_*$  and  $x \neq y$  in  $\hat{\omega}$ , there exists a path  $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n = y$  such that  $x_i \in \hat{\omega}$  and  $r_{x_i, x_{i+1}}(\omega) > 0$  for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ ;*
- (v)  $\lambda_0, \lambda_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{P}_0)$ ;
- (vi)  $L^2(\mathbb{P}_0)$  is separable.

Trivially, at cost to take the intersection, the sets  $\Omega_*$  appearing in Assumption 2\* and 4 can be considered the same.

We point out that Assumptions 1, 2\*, 3, 4 correspond to Assumptions (A1), ..., (A8) in [8, Section 2] (indeed (A1) is Assumption 1, (A2) is Assumption 3, (A3) is Item (i) of Assumption 4, (A4) is Assumption 2 plus Item (ii) in Assumption 4, while (A5), (A6), (A7) and (A8) correspond respectively to Items (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) of Assumption 4). They are satisfied in plenty of models as discussed below. For comments on the above assumptions we refer the interested reader to [8, Section 2.2] and [9].

**4.1. The random walk  $(X_t^\omega)_{t \geq 0}$  and stochastic homogenization.** Given  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we consider the continuous-time random walk  $(X_t^\omega)_{t \geq 0}$  with state space  $\hat{\omega}$  and jumping from  $x$  to  $y \neq x$  with probability rate  $r_{x,y}(\omega)$ . In particular, once arrived at  $x \in \hat{\omega}$  the random walk waits there an exponential time with parameter  $r_x(\omega) := \sum_{y \in \hat{\omega}} r_{x,y}(\omega)$ , afterwards it jumps to another site  $y$  in  $\hat{\omega}$  chosen with probability  $r_{x,y}(\omega)/r_x(\omega)$ . Due to [8, Lemma 3.5], under general assumptions which are implied by our Assumptions 1, 2\*, 3, 4, for all  $\omega$  varying in a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set with  $\mathbb{P}$ -probability one the above parameters  $r_x(\omega)$  are finite and positive for all  $x \in \hat{\omega}$ , the random walk  $(X_t^\omega)_{t \geq 0}$  has a.s. no explosion (whatever the starting point) and therefore it is well defined for all  $t \geq 0$ .

We point out that  $(X_t^\omega)_{t \geq 0}$  is a (possibly long-range) random walk on the simple point process  $\hat{\omega}$  with  $\omega$  sampled by  $\mathbb{P}$ . Our modeling covers several examples (see Figure 2). In [8, Section 5] the reader can find the discussion (also about the validity of Assumptions 1, 2\*, 3, 4) of the following models: nearest-neighbor random conductance model on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , random conductance model on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with long conductances, random walk with random conductances on infinite clusters, Mott random walk (whose underlying graph is the complete graph on  $\hat{\omega}$ ), simple random walk on the  $d$ -dimensional Delaunay triangulation (i.e. the




FIGURE 2. Some random graphs with vertex set  $\hat{\omega}$  underlying the random walk  $(X_t^\omega)_{t \geq 0}$ : lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ; the supercritical percolation cluster on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , on the hexagonal lattice and in the Boolean model; the graph dual to the Voronoi tessellation; a complete graph.

graph dual to the Voronoi tessellation) on a Poisson point process, nearest-neighbor random conductance models on lattices. The reader can find the discussion of the validity of Assumptions 1, 2\*, 3, 4 also in [9, Section 3.4] for stochastic lattices and periodic models, and in [7, Section 5] for random conductance models on crystal lattices and for random walks on marked simple point processes. Finally other examples will be provided in [11] and [13].

Let  $D$  be the *effective homogenized matrix*.  $D$  is implicitly defined as solution of a variational problem, moreover  $D$  is a symmetric  $d \times d$  positive semidefinite matrix. When  $V = \mathbb{I}$ , for  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  or in the special discrete case, it holds

$$a \cdot Da = \inf_{f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P}_0)} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} d\mathbb{P}_0(\omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\hat{\omega}(x) r_{0,x}(\omega) (a \cdot x - \nabla f(\omega, x))^2,$$

for any  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\nabla f(\omega, x) := f(\theta_x \omega) - f(\omega)$ . We refer to [8, Definition 3.6] for the general case. We point out that  $D$  can be degenerate and non-zero (see [7, Appendix A] for an example).

Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  we write  $(P_{\omega,t}^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$  for the  $L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$ -Markov semigroup associated to the diffusively rescaled random walk  $(\varepsilon X_{\varepsilon^{-2}t}^\omega)_{t \geq 0}$  on  $\varepsilon \hat{\omega}$ , where

$$\mu_\omega^\varepsilon := \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \varepsilon \hat{\omega}} n_x(\omega) \delta_{\varepsilon x}$$

according to (6) and (10). Simply, given  $f \in L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$ ,  $P_{\omega,t}^\varepsilon f(\varepsilon x)$  is the expectation of  $f(\varepsilon X_{\varepsilon^{-2}t}^\omega)$  when the diffusively rescaled random walk starts at  $\varepsilon x$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup  $(P_{\omega,t}^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ , which is a self-adjoint operator in  $L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$  (see [8] for more details on  $\mathbb{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$ , although not used below). Given  $\lambda > 0$  we write  $R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon : L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \rightarrow L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$  for the  $\lambda$ -resolvent associated to the random walk  $\varepsilon X_{\varepsilon^{-2}t}^\omega$ , i.e.  $R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon := (\lambda - \mathbb{L}_\omega^\varepsilon)^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} P_{\omega,s}^\varepsilon ds$ .

Similarly we write  $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$  for the Markov semigroup on  $L^2(mdx)$  associated to the (possibly degenerate) Brownian motion on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with diffusion matrix  $2D$ . We denote by  $\nabla_*$  the weak gradient along the space  $\text{Ker}(D)^\perp$  (when  $D$  is non-degenerate  $\nabla_*$  reduces to the standard weak gradient). We write  $R_\lambda : L^2(mdx) \rightarrow L^2(mdx)$  for the  $\lambda$ -resolvent associated to the above Brownian motion on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with diffusion matrix  $2D$ . We point out that, by Claim 7.1 in Section 7, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$  the measure  $mdx$  is the limit as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  of  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon$  in the measure space  $\mathcal{M}$  (cf. Section 3).

We recall a classical definition in stochastic homogenization:

**Definition 4.1.** Fix  $\omega \in \Omega$  and a family of  $\varepsilon$ -parametrized functions  $v_\varepsilon \in L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$ . The family  $\{v_\varepsilon\}$  converges weakly to the function  $v \in L^2(mdx)$  (shortly,  $v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v$ ) if  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} < +\infty$  and  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) v_\varepsilon(x) \varphi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx m v(x) \varphi(x)$  for all  $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The family  $\{v_\varepsilon\}$  converges strongly to  $v \in L^2(mdx)$  (shortly,  $v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ ) if  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} < +\infty$  and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) v_\varepsilon(x) g_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx m v(x) g(x)$$

for any family of functions  $g_\varepsilon \in L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$  weakly converging to  $g \in L^2(mdx)$ .

**Remark 4.2.** It is well known, and also recalled in Claim 7.1 in Section 7, that there exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) = 1$  such that (8) is true for all functions in  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . As a consequence, for  $\omega \in \mathcal{B}$ , strong convergence implies weak convergence.

As stated in [8, Theorem 4.1], under Assumptions 1, 2\*, 3, 4 there exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\Omega_{\text{typ}} \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\text{typ}}) = 1$  such that for all  $\omega \in \Omega_{\text{typ}}$  and all  $\lambda > 0$  the massive Poisson equation

$$-\mathbb{L}_\omega^\varepsilon u_\varepsilon + \lambda u_\varepsilon = f_\varepsilon \tag{13}$$

with  $f_\varepsilon \in L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$  stochastically homogenizes towards the effective homogenized equation

$$-\nabla_* \cdot D \nabla_* u + \lambda u = f \tag{14}$$

with  $f \in L^2(mdx)$  when  $f_\varepsilon$  converges (weakly or strongly) to  $f$ . The above homogenization corresponds to the convergence of solutions, i.e.

$$f_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup f \implies u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u, \quad f_\varepsilon \rightarrow f \implies u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u, \tag{15}$$

and the convergence of flows and energies (we refer to [8, Theorem 4.1] for a precise statement of flow and energy convergence, which anyway is not used below). Note that (13) and (14) can be rewritten as  $u_\varepsilon = R_{\omega, \lambda}^\varepsilon f_\varepsilon$  and  $u = R_\lambda f$ , respectively.

In [8, Section 4] we introduced the additional assumption (A9) that we recall here:

**Assumption (A9) in [8]:** At least one of the following properties is fulfilled:

- (i) For  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega \exists C(\omega) > 0$  such that  $\mu_\omega(\tau_k \Delta) \leq C(\omega)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

- (ii) Setting  $N_k(\omega) := \mu_\omega(\tau_k \Delta)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , for some  $C_0 \geq 0$  it holds  $\mathbb{E}[N_0^2] < \infty$  and

$$|\text{Cov}(N_k, N_{k'})| \leq C_0 |k - k'|^{-1} \quad (16)$$

for any  $k \neq k'$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . More generally, we assume that, at cost to enlarge the probability space, one can define random variables  $(N_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$  with  $\mu_\omega(\tau_k \Delta) \leq N_k$ , such that  $\mathbb{E}[N_k], \mathbb{E}[N_k^2]$  are bounded uniformly in  $k$  and such that (16) holds for all  $k \neq k'$ .

Assumption (A9) was introduced to obtain in [8, Theorem 4.4] the limits (19), (20), (21) and (22) of Theorem 4.3 below for  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . We point out that (21) and (22) are crucial in getting the hydrodynamic limit of interacting particle systems (see [7, 11]) and are derived from (19) and (20). The main result of this section, given by Theorem 4.3 below, is that Assumption (A9) is indeed unnecessary and can be removed thanks to our ergodic theorems. Moreover, the above limits are extended to continuous functions  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  decaying suitably fast at infinity. To state this theorem we set

$$\mathcal{G}(r) := \{f \in C(\mathbb{R}^d) : \exists C > 0, \exists \beta > r \text{ with } |f(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-\beta} \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

Note that the functional set  $C_*(\mathbb{R}^d)$  introduced in Definition 3.2 equals  $\bigcap_{r>0} \mathcal{G}(r)$ . Moreover, recall the fundamental cell  $\Delta$  introduced in (5).

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let Assumptions 1, 2\*, 3, 4 be satisfied. Then there exists a measurable set  $\Omega_{\text{typ}}^* \subset \Omega_{\text{typ}}$ ,  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant and with  $\mathbb{P}$ -probability one, such that as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  the following limits hold for any  $\omega \in \Omega_{\text{typ}}^*$ ,  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda > 0$  and  $f \in C_*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ :*

$$L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni P_{\omega,t}^\varepsilon f \rightarrow P_t f \in L^2(\text{md}x), \quad (17)$$

$$L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f \rightarrow R_\lambda f \in L^2(\text{md}x), \quad (18)$$

$$\int |P_{\omega,t}^\varepsilon f(x) - P_t f(x)|^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad (19)$$

$$\int |R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f(x) - R_\lambda f(x)|^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad (20)$$

$$\int |P_{\omega,t}^\varepsilon f(x) - P_t f(x)| d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad (21)$$

$$\int |R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f(x) - R_\lambda f(x)| d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow 0. \quad (22)$$

More specifically, we have

- (i) (17), (18), (19) and (20) hold if  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d+1)$ ; (21) and (22) hold if  $f \in \mathcal{G}(2d+2)$ ;  
(ii) if in addition  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$  for some  $\alpha > 1$ , then (17), (18), (19) and (20) hold when  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d/2)$  while (21) and (22) hold when  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d)$ .

The proof of Theorem 4.3 is given in Section 9.

**4.2. Hydrodynamics.** We conclude by presenting an application of our ergodic Theorem 2.3 to the hydrodynamic limit of interacting particle systems. As discussed in [7] and [8], the limits (21) and (22) are fundamental tools to prove the quenched hydrodynamic behavior of multiple random walks on  $\hat{\omega}$  by adding a site exclusion or zero range interaction (combining stochastic homogenization and duality). We refer also to [2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12] and references therein.

In [7] we have considered the same setting presented above, with  $n_x(\omega) = 1$  and  $r_{x,y}(\omega) = r_{y,x}(\omega)$ . In this case the random walk  $(X_t^\omega)_{t \geq 0}$  on  $\hat{\omega}$  becomes a random conductance model on the simple point process  $\hat{\omega}$  [1]. Let us consider the associated symmetric simple exclusion process (i.e. multiple random walks as above interacting by site exclusion). Roughly its Markov generator is given by

$$\mathcal{L}f(\eta) := \sum_{x \in \hat{\omega}} \sum_{y \in \hat{\omega}} r_{x,y}(\omega) \eta(x)(1 - \eta(y)) (f(\eta^{x,y}) - f(\eta)) ,$$

where  $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^{\hat{\omega}}$ ,  $f$  varies in a suitable set of real functions on  $\{0, 1\}^{\hat{\omega}}$  (including local functions) and  $\eta^{x,y}$  is the configuration obtained by exchanging the occupation numbers  $\eta(x)$  and  $\eta(y)$ . Then, under Assumptions (A1),..., (A9) of [8] (i.e. our present Assumptions 1, 2\*, 3, 4 plus (A9)) and the additional Assumption (SEP)<sup>1</sup> introduced in [7] (the latter used for the construction of the process and the analysis of its Markov generator), we have derived the quenched hydrodynamic limit in path space for the above symmetric simple exclusion process under diffusive scaling. Assumption (A9) was used to get (21) and (22) from [8] (see [7, Proposition 6.1 and Remark 6.2]). Due to our Theorem 4.3 we then have the following consequence:

**Corollary 4.4.** *The quenched hydrodynamic limit in path space stated in [7, Theorem 4.1] and described by the hydrodynamic equation  $\partial_t \rho = \nabla \cdot (D \nabla \rho)$  holds without assuming Assumption (A9) there.*

In [11], using the results we obtained in [10], we will show that also Assumption (SEP) can be removed from [7, Theorem 4.1], hence we refer the interesting reader to [11] for a more detailed discussion.

## 5. PROOF OF THE MAXIMAL INEQUALITY (THEOREM 2.2)

The proof is inspired by the one for the maximal inequality for the action of the group  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with averages on boxes [15, 18], but we use a different covering procedure in order to control the effects of possible non-zero tails of  $\vartheta$ .

The following construction and Lemma 5.1 below are a standard tool to prove the maximal inequality. We recall them for completeness since crucial below and since they are usually stated for boxes. Fix  $I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \dots \subset I_N$  subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Suppose to have a finite set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  and a function  $k : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow$

<sup>1</sup>Assumption (SEP) states the following. Given the environment  $\omega$ , consider the random graph obtained from the vertex set  $\hat{\omega}$  by adding an edge between distinct vertices  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\hat{\omega}$  with probability  $1 - e^{-r_{x,y}(\omega)t}$ , independently for each pair  $\{x, y\}$ . Then,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., for  $t > 0$  small enough this random graph has a.s. only connected components of finite cardinality.



$\{1, \dots, N\}$ . Define  $\mathfrak{M}_N$  as a maximal collection of points  $z \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $k(z) = N$  and the sets  $z + I_N$  with  $z \in \mathfrak{M}_N$  are disjoint. Then define  $\mathfrak{M}_{N-1}$  as a maximal collection of points  $z \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $k(z) = N - 1$  and the sets  $z + I_{N-1}$  with  $z \in \mathfrak{M}_{N-1}$  are reciprocally disjoint and disjoint from the sets  $v + I_N$  with  $v \in \mathfrak{M}_N$ . Proceed in this way until defining  $\mathfrak{M}_1$  as a maximal collection of points  $z \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $k(z) = 1$  and the sets  $z + I_1$  with  $z \in \mathfrak{M}_1$  are reciprocally disjoint and disjoint from the sets  $v + I_{k(v)}$  with  $v \in \mathfrak{M}_2 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{M}_N$ . Finally, we define

$$\mathcal{B}' := \mathfrak{M}_1 \cup \mathfrak{M}_2 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{M}_N.$$

We stress that by construction all sets  $z + I_{k(z)}$ ,  $k \in \mathcal{B}'$ , are disjoint.

Below we use the standard notation  $z + A - B := \{z + a - b : a \in A, b \in B\}$ .

**Lemma 5.1.**  $\mathcal{B} \subset \cup_{z \in \mathcal{B}'} (z + I_{k(z)} - I_{k(z)})$  and  $|\mathcal{B}| \leq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{B}'} |I_{k(z)} - I_{k(z)}|$ .

The proof is similar to the proof of [15, Lemma 2.5, Section 6.2]. We give it for completeness.

*Proof.* Let us prove that  $\mathcal{B} \subset \cup_{z \in \mathcal{B}'} (z + I_{k(z)} - I_{k(z)})$  (the conclusion then follows immediately). Let  $y \in \mathcal{B}$ . By the maximality of  $\mathfrak{M}_{k(y)}$ , there are two possible cases: either  $y \in \mathfrak{M}_{k(y)}$  or  $y + I_{k(y)}$  intersects some  $v + I_{k(v)}$  with  $k(v) \geq k(y)$  and  $v \in \mathfrak{M}_{k(v)}$  (hence  $v \in \mathcal{B}'$ ). In the first case,  $y \in \mathcal{B}'$  and trivially  $y \in y + I_{k(y)} - I_{k(y)}$ . In the second case, there exist  $a \in I_{k(y)} \subset I_{k(v)}$  and  $b \in I_{k(v)}$  such that  $y + a = v + b$ , thus implying that  $y = v + b - a \in v + I_{k(v)} - I_{k(v)}$ .  $\square$

We can start the proof of Theorem 2.2. To this aim let  $\alpha > 0$  and let  $N \leq \ell$  be positive integers. All constants of type  $c, C$  below have to be thought of as finite, positive, determined only by  $d, \vartheta, \rho, \kappa$  (hence, independent from  $\alpha, \ell, N, f$ ) and can change from line to line.

Recall (2). We define

$$E_N(\alpha) := \{\omega \in \Omega : \sup_{1 \leq n \leq N} W_n^\psi(f)(\omega) > \alpha\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega) := \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |z| \leq \ell, T^z \omega \in E_N(\alpha)\}.$$

To lighten the notation, sometimes dependence on the parameters will be omitted (as in the definition of  $\mathcal{A}(\omega)$ , which indeed depends also from  $\alpha, \ell, N$ ).

The core of the proof will consist in proving that, for some  $C > 0$ ,

$$\alpha \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}(\omega)|] \leq C \ell^d \|f\|_1. \quad (23)$$

We first explain how to conclude once having (23). Since each  $T^z$  is measure-preserving, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}(\omega)|] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d: |z| \leq \ell} \mathbf{1}(T^z \omega \in E_N(\alpha))\right] \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d: |z| \leq \ell} \mathbb{P}(T^z \omega \in E_N(\alpha)) \geq c \ell^d \mathbb{P}(E_N(\alpha)). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

By combining (23) with (24) we get  $\mathbb{P}(E_N(\alpha)) \leq C' \|f\|_1 / \alpha$  for each integer  $N \geq 1$  ( $\ell$  has disappeared). To conclude the proof and get the maximal

inequality (1), it is enough to take the limit  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  and use the dominated convergence theorem. It remains now to prove (23).

Fix  $z \in \mathcal{A}(\omega)$ . We know that there exists  $k(z)$  with  $1 \leq k(z) \leq N$  such that  $W_{k(z)}^\psi(f)(T^z\omega) > \alpha$  (in case of multiple possible indexes  $k(z)$ , we take e.g. the minimal one). Hence we have

$$\alpha k(z)^d < k(z)^d W_{k(z)}^\psi(f)(T^z\omega) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi\left(\frac{j-z}{k(z)}\right) f(T^j\omega) \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{A}(\omega). \quad (25)$$

Let us consider the sets

$$D(m, r) := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : mr \leq |x| < (m+1)r\}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, r = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

If  $j \in z + D(m, k(z))$ , then  $mk(z) \leq |j-z| < (m+1)k(z)$ , thus implying that  $\psi\left(\frac{j-z}{k(z)}\right) \leq \vartheta\left(\frac{|j-z|}{k(z)}\right) \leq \vartheta(m)$  (recall that  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing). In particular from (25) and since  $\{z + D(m, r) : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a partition of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $r = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , by taking  $r := k(z)$  we get

$$\alpha k(z)^d < \sum_{m=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \vartheta(m) \mathbf{1}_{z+D(m, k(z))}(j) f(T^j\omega) \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{A}(\omega). \quad (26)$$

At cost to multiply the function  $\rho$  by a positive constant, we can assume that  $\sum_{m=0}^{+\infty} \rho(m) = 1$ . Hence, the l.h.s. of (26) can be rewritten as  $\sum_{m=0}^{+\infty} \alpha k(z)^d \rho(m)$ . As a consequence (recall that  $f \geq 0$ ) there must exist some  $m(z) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\alpha k(z)^d \rho(m(z)) < \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \vartheta(m(z)) \mathbf{1}_{D(z)}(j) f(T^j\omega), \quad (27)$$

where  $D(z) := z + D(m(z), k(z))$  (in case of many possible  $m(z)$ 's we take e.g. the minimal one).

For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $\mathcal{A}_m(\omega) := \{z \in \mathcal{A}(\omega) : m(z) = m\}$  and apply Lemma 5.1 with  $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{A}_m(\omega)$ , function  $k : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  as above and sets  $I_1^m \subset I_2^m \subset \dots \subset I_N^m$  given by

$$I_r^m := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |x| < (m+1)r\} \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

The construction presented before Lemma 5.1 then produces a subset  $\mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)$  of  $\mathcal{A}_m(\omega)$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)$  is the set produced by the construction). By Lemma 5.1 we then have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_m(\omega)| &\leq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)} \left| I_{k(z)}^m - I_{k(z)}^m \right| \leq c(m+1)^d \sum_{z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)} k(z)^d \\ &= c \frac{(m+1)^d}{\alpha \rho(m)} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)} \alpha k(z)^d \rho(m). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Above we used that in general  $I_r^m - I_r^m \subset \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |x| < 2(m+1)r\}$  and the last set has  $c(d, \kappa)(m+1)^d r^d$  points (we recall that  $|x|$  denotes the  $\ell^\kappa$ -norm of

$x$  with  $k \in [1, +\infty]$ ). As a byproduct of (27) and (28), and since  $m(z) = m$  for all  $z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega) \subset \mathcal{A}_m(\omega)$ , we have

$$\alpha |\mathcal{A}_m(\omega)| < c \frac{(m+1)^d}{\rho(m)} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \vartheta(m) \mathbb{1}_{D(z)}(j) f(T^j \omega). \quad (29)$$

Recall that, given  $z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega) \subset \mathcal{A}(\omega)$ ,  $|z| \leq \ell$  and  $k(z) \leq N \leq \ell$ . If  $j \in D(z)$  and  $z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)$ , then  $|j - z| < (m+1)k(z)$ , thus implying that  $|j| \leq |z| + (m+1)k(z) \leq (m+2)\ell$ . In particular, in the r.h.s. of (29) we can restrict to  $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  with  $|j| \leq (m+2)\ell$ . Moreover, by construction the sets  $z + I_{k(z)}^m$  with  $z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)$  are disjoint, while  $D(z) \subset z + I_{k(z)}^m$  for all  $z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)$ . Hence, also all the sets  $D(z)$  with  $z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)$  are disjoint. In particular, given  $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  with  $|j| \leq (m+2)\ell$ , there is at most one  $z \in \mathcal{A}'_m(\omega)$  such that  $j \in D(z)$ . These observations, the non-negativity of  $f$  and (29) lead to

$$\alpha |\mathcal{A}_m(\omega)| < c \frac{(m+1)^d}{\rho(m)} \vartheta(m) \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d: \\ |j| \leq (m+2)\ell}} f(T^j \omega). \quad (30)$$

By taking the expectation of both sides of (30) and using that each  $T^j$  is measure-preserving we get

$$\alpha \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_m(\omega)|] \leq c \frac{(m+2)^{2d}}{\rho(m)} \vartheta(m) \ell^d \|f\|_1. \quad (31)$$

Summing among all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and using that  $\mathcal{A}(\omega)$  is the disjoint union of the  $\mathcal{A}_m(\omega)$ 's, from (31) we finally get (23) with  $C := c \sum_{m=0}^{+\infty} (m+2)^{2d} \vartheta(m) \rho(m)^{-1} < +\infty$  (to get that  $C$  is finite we used that  $\vartheta$  is  $d$ -good, see Definition 2.1).

## 6. PROOF OF THE ERGODIC THEOREM (THEOREM 2.3)

The main part of the proof of Theorem 2.3 follows from the Maximal Inequality of Theorem 2.2 via a rather standard procedure (see e.g. the proof of [15, Theorem 2.8, Section 6.2] and [18, Theorem 2.6]). We prefer to detail the arguments below, both to keep the exposition self-contained and in order to highlight where conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) are used.

Recall our shorthand notation  $W_n^\psi(f)(\omega) := n^{-d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) f(T^j \omega)$ . We call  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} \subset \mathcal{F}$  the  $\sigma$ -subalgebra given by the almost-invariant sets, i.e.  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} := \{A \in \mathcal{F} : \mathbb{P}((T_i^{-1}A) \Delta A) = 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ . Trivially,  $\mathcal{I} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ . It is known that, given  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $A \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  if and only if there exists  $D \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(A \Delta D) = 0$  (for  $d = 1$  see e.g. [4, Exercise 6.1.2-(iii), Chapter 6] and for a generic  $d$  take  $D := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_n^d} T^{-j} A)$  where  $\mathbb{N}_n := \{m \in \mathbb{N} : m \geq n\}$ ). It then follows that  $\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{I}] = \mathbb{E}[f|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}]$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. Hence, we just need to prove Theorem 2.3 with  $\mathbb{E}[f|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}]$  instead of  $\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{I}]$ . In what follows, we call a measurable function  $g$  on  $\Omega$  *almost-invariant* if  $g \circ T_i = g$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  (this is equivalent to the fact that  $g$  is  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ -measurable).

As detailed in the proof of [15, Theorem 2.8, Section 6.2], given  $\varepsilon > 0$  one can write  $f = \sum_{i=1}^d (g_i - g_i \circ T_i) + h + \varphi$ , for suitable functions such that  $g_1, \dots, g_d \in L^\infty$ ,  $h \in L^1$  is almost-invariant for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $\|\varphi\|_1 < \varepsilon$ .

Given a measurable and integrable function  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the function

$$\Delta(u)(\omega) := \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} W_n^\psi(u)(\omega) - \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} W_n^\psi(u)(\omega).$$

The above limsup and liminf are bounded in modulus by  $\sup_{n \geq 1} W_n^{|\psi|}(|u|)(\omega)$ , which is finite  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. by the maximal inequality (applied with  $|\psi|$  instead of  $\psi$ ). As a consequence their difference, i.e.  $\Delta(u)(\omega)$ , is well-defined and finite for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$  and in particular for all  $\omega \in \Gamma(u)$ , where  $\Gamma(u) := \{\omega \in \Omega : \sup_{n \geq 1} W_n^{|\psi|}(|u|)(\omega) < +\infty\}$  (note that  $\Gamma(u) \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma(u)) = 1$ ).

• Our first target is to prove that  $\Delta(f)(\omega) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$ , thus implying that  $\bar{f}(\omega) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} W_n^\psi(f)(\omega)$  is well defined and finite for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$ .

It is simple to check that  $\Delta$  is subadditive, i.e.  $\Delta(f_1 + f_2)(\omega) \leq \Delta(f_1)(\omega) + \Delta(f_2)(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Gamma(f_1) \cap \Gamma(f_2)$ . In particular, by writing our  $f$  as  $f = \sum_{i=1}^d (g_i - g_i \circ T_i) + h + \varphi$  as above, we have

$$\Delta(f)(\omega) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \Delta(g_i - g_i \circ T_i)(\omega) + \Delta(h)(\omega) + \Delta(\varphi)(\omega) \quad (32)$$

for all  $\omega \in \Gamma := \Gamma(f) \cap (\bigcap_{i=1}^d \Gamma(g_i - g_i \circ T_i)) \cap \Gamma(h) \cap \Gamma(\varphi)$ . Note that  $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma) = 1$ .

We claim that  $\Delta(g_i - g_i \circ T_i)(\omega) = 0$  and  $\Delta(h)(\omega) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$  in  $\Gamma$ . Let us start with  $g_i - g_i \circ T_i$ . Since  $g_i$  is bounded and due to Item (ii) in Theorem 2.3, we get

$$\left| W_n^\psi(g_i - g_i \circ T_i)(\omega) \right| \leq \frac{\|g_i\|_\infty}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n) - \psi((j - e_i)/n)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

As a consequence,  $\Delta(g_i - g_i \circ T_i)(\omega) = 0$  for all  $\omega \in \Gamma$ . Let us move to  $\Delta(h)(\omega)$  for  $\omega \in \Gamma$ . The almost-invariance of  $h$  implies that  $h(T^j \omega) = h(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Gamma'$ , where  $\Gamma'$  is a measurable set with  $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma') = 1$ . Due to Item (iii) in Theorem 2.3, we then have

$$W_n^\psi(h)(\omega) = \frac{h(\omega)}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} c(\psi)h(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma'.$$

This implies that  $\Delta(h)(\omega) = 0$  for all  $\omega \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma'$ , thus concluding the proof of our claim.

As a byproduct of (32) and the above claim, we conclude that  $\Delta(f)(\omega) \leq \Delta(\varphi)(\omega)$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega \in \Gamma$ , while  $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma) = 1$ . By this observation, the maximal inequality (cf. Theorem 2.2) and since  $\|\varphi\|_1 < \varepsilon$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Delta(f) > \sqrt{\varepsilon}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\Delta(\varphi) > \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(2 \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi|(j/n) |\varphi|(T^j \omega) > \sqrt{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{2C\|\varphi\|_1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \leq 2C\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $C = C(d, \vartheta, \rho, \kappa)$ . By the arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we conclude that  $\Delta(f)(\omega) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$ .

• We now prove that  $\bar{f}$  is almost-invariant, i.e.  $\bar{f} = \bar{f} \circ T_i$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . By the measure-preserving property of  $T_i$ , the limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} W_n^\psi(f)(T_i\omega)$  exists and is finite  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and according to our notation it is given by  $\bar{f}(T_i\omega)$ . By the Markov inequality and the measure-preserving property of  $T^j$  we get

$$\mathbb{P}(|W_n^\psi(f)(\omega) - W_n^\psi(f)(T_i\omega)| > \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\|f\|_1}{\varepsilon n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n) - \psi((j - e_i)/n)|. \quad (33)$$

Since, by Item (ii),  $\gamma(n) := n^{-d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n) - \psi((j - e_i)/n)| \rightarrow 0$ , for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$  we can find  $n_k \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $\gamma(n_k) \leq k^{-3}$  and such that the sequence  $n_k$  is increasing. At this point, by taking  $n = n_k$  and  $\varepsilon = 1/k$  in (33) and afterwards by applying Borel-Cantelli lemma, we conclude that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} [W_{n_k}^\psi(f)(\omega) - W_{n_k}^\psi(f)(T_i\omega)] = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$ . Since the limit equals  $\bar{f}(\omega) - \bar{f}(T_i\omega)$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$ , we get that  $\bar{f}$  is almost-invariant.

• We now prove that  $W_n^\psi(f) \rightarrow \bar{f}$  in  $L^p$  since  $f \in L^p$ . To this aim, we observe that for  $f \in L^\infty \cap L^p$  this follows (as  $p \in [1, +\infty)$ ) from the above proved a.s. convergence  $W_n^\psi(f) \rightarrow \bar{f}$  and the dominated convergence theorem (for the latter use that  $\|W_n^\psi(f)\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n)|$  and the r.h.s. is bounded uniformly in  $n$  by Item (iii)). To extend the convergence to any  $f \in L^p$ , we proceed as follows. First we point out that, given  $h \in L^p$ , for some  $C = C(\psi)$  it holds

$$\|W_n^\psi(h)\|_p \leq \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n)| \|h \circ T^j\|_p = \frac{\|h\|_p}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi(j/n)| \leq C \|h\|_p. \quad (34)$$

Above, the identity follows from the measure-preserving property of  $T^j$  and the last bound follows from Item (iii). Given  $\delta > 0$  let  $g \in L^\infty \cap L^p$  with  $\|f - g\|_p \leq \delta$  ( $g$  exists since  $L^\infty \cap L^p$  is dense in  $L^p$ ). By (34) applied to  $h = f - g$  and since  $W_n^\psi(g) \rightarrow \bar{g}$  in  $L^p$  we get that  $\|W_n^\psi(f) - \bar{g}\|_p \leq 2C\delta$  for  $n$  large. By the arbitrariness of  $\delta$ , this proves that  $(W_n^\psi(f) : n \geq 1)$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $L^p$  and therefore it converges to some  $\hat{f} \in L^p$ . This implies that  $W_n^\psi(f) \rightarrow \hat{f}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. along a subsequence. Since  $W_n^\psi(f) \rightarrow \bar{f}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., we conclude that  $\hat{f} = \bar{f}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and therefore  $W_n^\psi(f) \rightarrow \bar{f}$  in  $L^p$ .

• Finally we prove that  $\bar{f} = c(\psi)\mathbb{E}[f|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}]$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. To this aim set  $a_n := n^{-d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n)$  and take an almost-invariant (i.e.  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ -measurable) bounded function  $g$ . Then (using that  $g \circ T^{-j} = g$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and  $\mathbb{E}[g|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}] = g$ ) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ g \mathbb{E}[W_n^\psi(f)|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}] \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[g W_n^\psi(f)|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}] \right] = \mathbb{E}[g W_n^\psi(f)] = \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) \mathbb{E}[g(f \circ T^j)] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(j/n) \mathbb{E}[(g \circ T^{-j})f] = a_n \mathbb{E}[gf] = a_n \mathbb{E}[g \mathbb{E}[f|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}]]. \end{aligned}$$

This prove that  $\mathbb{E}[W_n^\psi(f)|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}] = a_n\mathbb{E}[f|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}]$ . We know that  $W_n^\psi(f) \rightarrow \bar{f}$  in  $L^p$ . On the other hand, conditional expectation is a contraction in  $L^p$  (see [4, Theorem 4.1.11, Chapter. 4]), thus implying that  $\mathbb{E}[W_n^\psi(f)|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\bar{f}|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}]$  in  $L^p$ . Since  $\bar{f}$  is almost-invariant we have  $\mathbb{E}[\bar{f}|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}] = \bar{f}$ . By combining the above observations we have that  $a_n\mathbb{E}[f|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}] \rightarrow \bar{f}$  in  $L^p$ . On the other hand,  $a_n \rightarrow c(\psi)$  by Item (iii) and this allows to conclude that  $\bar{f} = c(\psi)\mathbb{E}[f|\tilde{\mathcal{I}}]$ .

## 7. APPLICATIONS TO RANDOM MEASURES: PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3 AND LEMMA 3.4

In this section we first show how to derive Theorem 3.3 from Lemma 3.4, afterwards we prove the latter. In what follows, given  $\ell > 0$  we consider the ball  $B(\ell) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq \ell\}$  and set  $B(\ell)^c := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(\ell)$ .

All constants of type  $c, C$  below have to be considered finite, positive and not dependent from  $\omega$  and the parameters  $\varepsilon, \ell, n$  introduced in the rest. Moreover, their value can change from line to line.

**7.1. Proof of Theorem 3.3.** The conclusion concerning  $C_*(\Omega)$  is trivial and we focus on the rest. Trivially, it is enough to prove the stated property for the family of rational constants  $C > 0$  and  $\beta > 2d + 2$ . By countability, we just need to prove the statement for a fixed  $C > 0$  and a fixed  $\beta > 2d + 2$ . Without loss of generality we can assume  $C = 1$ . We set  $\vartheta(r) := (1+r)^{-\beta}$  for  $r \geq 0$  and take  $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $|\varphi(x)| \leq \vartheta(|x|)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

By Lemma 3.4 the integral  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(x)| d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x)$  is finite for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$ . From now on we restrict to  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$ . Given a positive  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  take  $\varphi_\ell \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\varphi_\ell = \varphi$  on the ball  $B(\ell)$  and  $|\varphi_\ell(x)| \leq \vartheta(|x|)$  for all  $x$ . Then,  $|\varphi - \varphi_\ell|$  is zero on  $B(\ell)$  and is bounded by  $2\vartheta(|\cdot|)$ . This implies that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\ell(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \right| \leq 2 \int_{B(\ell)^c} \vartheta(|x|) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \quad (35)$$

and

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(u) du - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\ell(u) du \right| \leq 2 \int_{B(\ell)^c} \vartheta(|u|) du. \quad (36)$$

The last integral goes to zero as  $\ell \rightarrow +\infty$  since  $\vartheta(|\cdot|)$  is integrable on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Claim 7.1.** *There exists a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant set  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) = 1$  such that (8) is true for all functions in  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

The above claim is usually stated without any proof. Since the derivation is short, we give it for completeness in Appendix A.

Due to Claim 7.1, for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \mathcal{B}$  we have  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\ell(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\ell(x) dx$ . By the above observation, (35) and (36) the conclusion follows from Lemma 3.4 and by taking  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C}$  with  $\mathcal{C}$  as in Lemma 3.4.

**7.2. Proof of Lemma 3.4.** Since the integral in (9) is decreasing in  $\ell$ , (9) with  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_+$  is equivalent to (9) with  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . From now on  $\ell$  has to be considered in  $\mathbb{N}$ . We set  $\psi(x) := \vartheta(|x|)$  and  $\psi_\ell(x) := \vartheta(|x|)\mathbf{1}(|x| \geq \ell)$ . Then (9) in Lemma 3.4 can be restated as

$$\lim_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(u) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(u) = 0. \quad (37)$$

We call  $\mathcal{C}$  the set of  $\omega \in \Omega$  satisfying (37), i.e.

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \lim_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(u) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(u) = 0 \right\}. \quad (38)$$

To prove Lemma 3.4 it is enough to show the following:  $\mathcal{C}$  is measurable,  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant, for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  the integral  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x)$  is finite,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ . The first three properties correspond (with a different order) to Claims 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 below. We first show here how the ergodic Theorem 2.3 implies that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ . To this aim we let  $\Delta(z) := \tau_z \Delta$  (recall (5)) and set  $f(\omega) := \mu_\omega(\Delta) = \mu_\omega(\Delta(0))$ . Then, by Assumption 2, we have

$$\mu_\omega(\Delta(z)) = \mu_\omega(\tau_z \Delta) = \mu_{\theta_z \omega}(\Delta) = f(\theta_z \omega) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \subset \mathbb{G}. \quad (39)$$

Note that  $\int_\Omega |f(\omega)| d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = m\ell(\Delta) < +\infty$ , hence  $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ . As stated in Claim 7.5 below, (37) is satisfied whenever

$$\lim_{\ell \uparrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \uparrow \infty} n^{-d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_\ell(z/n) f(\theta_z \omega) = 0, \quad (40)$$

where  $\ell, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, to prove that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ , we just need to show that the measurable set of the  $\omega$ 's satisfying (40) has probability one.

Let  $e_1, \dots, e_d$  be the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, d$  we define  $T_i : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  as  $T_i = \theta_{e_i}$ . Then  $T_1, \dots, T_d$  are  $d$  commuting measure-preserving bijective maps on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  (by Assumption 1 and since  $\mathbb{Z}^d \subset \mathbb{G}$ ). Moreover the map  $T^g := T_1^{g_1} \circ T_2^{g_2} \circ \dots \circ T_d^{g_d}$  equals  $\theta_g$  for all  $g = (g_1, g_2, \dots, g_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Hence in (40) we can replace  $\theta_z$  by  $T^z$ . By Theorem 2.3 with  $\psi = \psi_\ell$  and with  $\vartheta(r) = (1+r)^{-\beta}$ ,  $\beta > 2d+2$ , there exists  $\mathcal{C}_* \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_*) = 1$  such that for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_*$  the following holds: for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$

$$\lim_{n \uparrow +\infty} n^{-d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_\ell(z/n) f(\theta_z \omega) = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{I}](\omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(u) du, \quad (41)$$

where  $\mathcal{I} := \{A \in \mathcal{F} : \theta_z A = A \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{I}](\omega)$  is a fixed version of the conditional probability of  $f$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{I}$ . Since the integral in the r.h.s. of (41) goes to zero as  $\ell \rightarrow +\infty$ , we conclude that (40) holds for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_*$  and therefore  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.3 once having Claims 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5. The rest of the section is devoted to the above claims and their proofs.

**Claim 7.2.** *If  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$ , then  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x)$  is finite for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

*Proof.* By (7) the above integral  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x)$  equals  $\varepsilon^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(\varepsilon u) d\mu_\omega(u)$ . Hence for  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$  there exists  $\ell$  such that  $\varepsilon^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(\varepsilon u) d\mu_\omega(u) \leq 1$  for  $\varepsilon$  small.

Since  $\mu_\omega$  is locally finite, we then have that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(\varepsilon u) d\mu_\omega(u) < +\infty$  for  $\varepsilon$  small. This property extends to all  $\varepsilon > 0$  since the integral  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(\varepsilon u) d\mu_\omega(u)$  is non-increasing in  $\varepsilon$  as  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing.  $\square$

**Claim 7.3.** *The limit (37) holds if and only if it holds with  $\varepsilon$  varying in  $\{1/n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{C}$  is measurable.*

*Proof.* We observe that given  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  with  $(n+1)^{-1} \leq \varepsilon \leq n^{-1}$ , we have (since  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing and due to (7))

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) &= \varepsilon^d \int_{\{|\varepsilon x| \geq \ell\}} \psi(\varepsilon x) dx \leq n^{-d} \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell n\}} \psi(x/(n+1)) dx \\ &\leq C(n+1)^{-d} \int_{\{|x| \geq \frac{\ell}{2}(n+1)\}} \psi(x/(n+1)) dx = C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(x) d\mu_\omega^{1/(n+1)}(x) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) &\geq (n+1)^{-d} \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell(n+1)\}} \psi(x/n) dx \\ &\geq cn^{-d} \int_{\{|x| \geq 2\ell n\}} \psi(x/n) dx = c \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_{2\ell}(x) d\mu_\omega^{1/n}(x). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, (37) is equivalent to the same expression but with  $\varepsilon \in \{1/n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ . Dealing with a countable family of parameters  $\varepsilon, \ell$  one obtains the measurability of  $\mathcal{C}$  since the map  $\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \in \mathbb{R}$  is measurable.  $\square$

**Claim 7.4.**  *$\mathcal{C}$  is  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant.*

*Proof.* It is enough to prove that for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $g \in \mathbb{G}$  it holds  $\theta_g \omega \in \mathcal{C}$ . Indeed, this means that  $\theta_g \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ . By applying  $\theta_g^{-1} = \theta_{-g}$  to both sides, we get  $\mathcal{C} \subset \theta_{-g} \mathcal{C}$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{C} \subset \theta_g \mathcal{C}$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ . Hence  $\theta_g \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}$  for all  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ .

Take  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ . Due to (4) and (7) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(x) d\mu_{\theta_g \omega}^\varepsilon(x) &= \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell\}} \psi(x) d\mu_{\theta_g \omega}^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^d \int_{\{|\varepsilon x| \geq \ell\}} \psi(\varepsilon x) d\mu_{\theta_g \omega}(x) \\ &= \varepsilon^d \int_{\{|\varepsilon(x-Vg)| \geq \ell\}} \psi(\varepsilon(x-Vg)) d\mu_\omega(x). \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Since  $g$  is fixed, given  $\ell > 0$ , for  $\varepsilon$  small we have  $|\varepsilon Vg| \leq \ell/2$  and therefore the set  $\{x : |\varepsilon(x-Vg)| \geq \ell\}$  is included in the set  $\{x : |\varepsilon x| \geq \ell/2\}$ . Moreover, for  $\varepsilon$  small, we have  $|\varepsilon Vg| \leq \ell/4$  and therefore, given  $x$  satisfying  $|\varepsilon x| \geq \ell/2$ , we have  $|\varepsilon(x-Vg)| \geq |\varepsilon x| - |\varepsilon Vg| \geq |\varepsilon x| - \ell/4 \geq |(\varepsilon/2)x|$ . Since  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing, the last bound implies that  $\psi(\varepsilon(x-Vg)) \leq \psi((\varepsilon/2)x)$ . Hence, we can estimate the last integral in (42) by first integrating on  $\{x : |\varepsilon x| \geq \ell/2\}$ , then by replacing the integrand with  $\psi((\varepsilon/2)x)$  and afterwards by extending the integration to  $\{x : |\varepsilon x| \geq \ell/4\}$ . The above observations and (42) finally



imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(x) d\mu_{\theta_g \omega}^\varepsilon(x) \leq \\ & \overline{\lim}_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} 2^d (\varepsilon/2)^d \int_{\{ |(\varepsilon/2)x| \geq \ell/4 \}} \psi((\varepsilon/2)x) d\mu_\omega(x) = \\ & 2^d \overline{\lim}_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell/4\}} \psi(x) d\mu_\omega^{\varepsilon/2}(x). \end{aligned}$$

To conclude it is enough to observe that the above r.h.s. is zero since  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$ . We have therefore proven that  $\theta_g \omega \in \mathcal{C}$ .  $\square$

**Claim 7.5.** *If  $\omega$  satisfies (40), then  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is divided in two steps. First we show that for some  $c > 0$  it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(u) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(u) \leq c \varepsilon^d \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_{\ell-1}(\varepsilon Vz) f(\theta_z \omega). \quad (43)$$

Afterwards we show how to remove  $V$  from (43) getting that, for some  $C, c > 0$ , it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\ell(u) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(u) \leq C \varepsilon^d \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_{\frac{\ell-1}{c}}(\varepsilon z) f(\theta_z \omega). \quad (44)$$

Since by Claim 7.3 we can vary  $\varepsilon$  among  $\{1/n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$  and due to (44), (37) is satisfied whenever (40) holds, thus proving our claim.

- Proof of (43). By the form of  $\vartheta$  there exists  $c > 0$  such that

$$\vartheta(r) \leq c \vartheta(s) \quad \forall r, s \geq 0 \text{ with } |s - r| \leq 1. \quad (45)$$

From now on we restrict to  $\varepsilon \leq \text{diam}(\Delta)^{-1}$ , where  $\text{diam}(\Delta)$  denotes the Euclidean diameter of  $\Delta$ . Then, by (45), for  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $x \in \Delta(z)$  we can bound  $\psi(\varepsilon x) \leq c \psi(\varepsilon Vz)$ . Indeed, since  $\Delta(z) = \tau_z \Delta$  and  $0 \in \Delta$ , both  $x$  and  $\tau_z 0 = Vz$  belong to  $\Delta(z)$  and therefore

$$| |\varepsilon x| - |\varepsilon Vz| | \leq \varepsilon |x - Vz| \leq \varepsilon \text{diam}(\Delta) \leq 1. \quad (46)$$

The above bound and (45) allow to conclude that  $\psi(\varepsilon x) \leq c \psi(\varepsilon Vz)$  for all  $x \in \Delta(z)$ . By combining this result with the identity  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(\varepsilon \Delta(z)) = \varepsilon^d f(\theta_z \omega)$  (which follows from (6) and (39)), we get

$$\int_{\varepsilon \Delta(z)} \psi(u) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(u) \leq c \varepsilon^d \psi(\varepsilon Vz) f(\theta_z \omega). \quad (47)$$

By (46), if  $|\varepsilon x| \geq \ell$  and  $x \in \Delta(z)$  then  $|\varepsilon Vz| \geq \ell - 1$ . This observation and (47) imply (43).

- Proof of (44). Since  $V$  is invertible, we have  $c_1 |x| \leq |Vx| \leq c_2 |x|$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for some constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ . Hence we have

$$\psi(\varepsilon Vz) \leq (1 + \varepsilon c_1 |z|)^{-\beta} \leq (\min\{1, c_1\})^{-\beta} (1 + \varepsilon |z|)^{-\beta} = (\min\{1, c_1\})^{-\beta} \psi(\varepsilon z),$$

while  $|\varepsilon Vz| \geq \ell - 1$  implies  $|\varepsilon z| \geq (\ell - 1)/c_2$ . Hence, from (43), we get (44).  $\square$

## 8. APPLICATIONS TO RANDOM MEASURES: PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5 AND LEMMA 3.6

As in the proof of Theorem 3.3, Theorem 3.5 can be derived from Lemma 3.6, which we now focus on. We set  $\psi(x) := \vartheta(|x|)$  and  $\psi_\ell(x) = \vartheta(|x|)\mathbf{1}(|x| \geq \ell)$ . We define  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_\vartheta$  as in (38). Then Claims 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 of the previous section are still valid, with the same proofs (we use there only that  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing).

It remains to prove that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ . To this aim we will use [22, Proposition 5.3] when  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  as detailed in Section 8.1 below, thus completing the proof for  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$ . We point out that [22, Proposition 5.3] is thought of only for the action of the group  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  on  $\Omega$  and cannot be applied directly to the case  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ . To overcome this problem for  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ , inspired by some methods known in homogenization theory, in Section 8.2 we build a new probability space on which the group  $\mathbb{R}^d$  acts and a new random measure, suitably related to the original ones. The results proved for the case  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and applied to this new context will imply that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$  also for  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

**8.1. Proof that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$  for  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$ .** Before entering the technical details we present the main part of the proof. Since  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  is ergodic, [22, Proposition 5.3] with  $t_n := n$  implies the following. Consider a measurable function  $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $h$  is non-increasing, is convex on  $[a, +\infty)$  for some  $a > 0$  and satisfies  $\int_0^\infty r^{d-1}h(r)dr < +\infty$ . Then, fixed a measurable function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $f \in L^\alpha$  and  $\alpha > 1$ , for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.a.  $\omega$  it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} n^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x|/n) f(\theta_x \omega) dx = \mathbb{E}[f] \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x|) dx. \quad (48)$$

Note that the integral in the l.h.s. of (48) is w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure and not w.r.t.  $\mu_\omega$ . To infer from (48) some information on  $\mu_\omega$  itself, in part similarly to the proof of [3, Theorem 10.2.IV], we apply (48) with  $f(\omega) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_\delta(x) d\mu_\omega(x)$  and  $h(r) := \vartheta(\min\{0, r - \delta\})$ , where  $(\gamma_\delta)_{\delta > 0}$  is a family of mollifiers described below. This will allow us to prove that, for some set  $\mathcal{C}_1 \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_1) = 1$ , for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_1$  it holds

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vartheta(\varepsilon|x|) d\mu_\omega(x) \leq m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vartheta(|x|) dx. \quad (49)$$

We postpone the proof of (49) and we first explain how to conclude. The strategy is to show that  $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\mathcal{B}$  is as in Claim 7.1. Since  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_1) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) = 1$ , this implies that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ . To show that  $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{C}$ , we proceed as follows. From Claim 7.1 it is trivial<sup>2</sup> to get for any  $\omega \in \mathcal{B}$  and any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \int_{\{\varepsilon|x| < \ell\}} \vartheta(\varepsilon|x|) d\mu_\omega(x) = m \int_{\{|x| < \ell\}} \vartheta(|x|) dx.$$

<sup>2</sup>It is enough to approximate from above and below the map  $y \mapsto \mathbf{1}(|y| < \ell)$  by suitable functions in  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Subtracting the above limit from (49) and then taking the limit  $\ell \uparrow +\infty$ , we get

$$\overline{\lim}_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell\}} \vartheta(\varepsilon|x|) d\mu_\omega(x) \leq m \overline{\lim}_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell\}} \vartheta(|x|) dx = 0 \quad (50)$$

for any  $\omega \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C}_1$ . Note that the equality in (50) is due to the integrability of  $\vartheta(|x|)$ , which follows from our assumptions. Due to (7), (50) leads to (37), hence  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$ . This proves that  $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{C}$ .

At this point, we have just to prove (49). In order to simplify the computations below, we first show that we can assume  $V = \mathbb{I}$  without any loss of generality. To this aim we define  $\tilde{\theta}_g := \theta_{V^{-1}g}$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_g := \tau_{V^{-1}g}$ . Note that  $\tilde{\tau}_g x = x + V(V^{-1}g) = x + g = x + \mathbb{I}g$  and, by Assumption 2,

$$\mu_{\tilde{\theta}_g \omega} = \mu_{\theta_{V^{-1}g} \omega} = \tau_{V^{-1}g} \mu_\omega = \tilde{\tau}_g \mu_\omega.$$

Since  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  it is then trivial to check that the actions  $(\tilde{\theta}_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  and  $(\tilde{\tau}_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$ , together with the random measure  $\mu_\omega$ , satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2 and that a set  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  is  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant for the action  $(\tilde{\theta}_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  if and only if the same holds for the action  $(\theta_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$ . In particular, if the claim in Lemma 3.6 is valid for the new setting with the new actions, then it is valid also for the original one. Then, at cost to pass to the actions  $(\tilde{\theta}_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$  and  $(\tilde{\tau}_g)_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$ , we can (and we do) assume that  $V = \mathbb{I}$ .

We fix a smooth function  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\gamma(x)$  determined by  $|x|$ , with support in  $B(1) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| = 1\}$  and satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma(x) dx = 1$ . Given  $\delta > 0$  we consider the mollifier  $\gamma_\delta(x) := \delta^{-d} \gamma(x/\delta)$  (which is a probability kernel with support in  $B(\delta)$ ).

Similarly to the proof of [3, Theorem 10.2.IV] we consider  $f : \Omega \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  defined as  $f(\omega) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_\delta(x) d\mu_\omega(x)$ , moreover we set  $h(r) := \vartheta(\min\{0, r - \delta\})$  (the dependence of  $f$  and  $h$  from  $\delta$  is omitted in the notation). Since  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(B(\delta))^\alpha] < +\infty$  (by our moment assumption on  $\mu_\omega(\Delta)$ ) and  $\gamma_\delta$  is uniformly bounded, we get that  $f \in L^\alpha$ . In particular, by (48) and by varying  $\delta$  in the countable set  $\{1/k : k \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ , there exists a set  $\mathcal{C}_1 \in \mathcal{F}$  such that (48) is valid for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_1$  and for all  $\delta$  as above. By stationarity  $\mathbb{E}[f] = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_\delta(x) dx = m$ . On the other hand, by Assumption 2, we can write (see (4)) and use that  $\tau_{-x} y = y - x$  as  $V = \mathbb{I}$

$$f(\theta_x \omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_\delta(y) d\mu_{\theta_x \omega}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_\delta(y - x) d\mu_\omega(y).$$

Setting  $z = x - y$  and using also that  $\gamma(z) = \gamma(-z)$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x|/n) f(\theta_x \omega) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx h(|x|/n) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_\delta(x - y) d\mu_\omega(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\mu_\omega(y) \int_{B(\delta)} h(|y + z|/n) \gamma_\delta(z) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

For  $z \in B(\delta)$  we have  $-\delta + |y + z|/n \leq |y|/n$  and since  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing we get  $h(|y + z|/n) \geq \vartheta(|y|/n)$ . Hence from (51) we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x|/n) f(\theta_x \omega) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vartheta(|y|/n) d\mu_\omega(y). \quad (52)$$

By combining (48) with (52) and using that  $\mathbb{E}[f] = m$ , we get for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_1$  that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} n^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vartheta(|x|/n) d\mu_\omega(x) \leq m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x|) dx. \quad (53)$$

Trivially the last integral converges to  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vartheta(|x|) dx$  as  $\delta \downarrow 0$ . Since moreover  $\vartheta$  is non-increasing (given  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  take  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  with  $(n+1)^{-1} \leq \varepsilon < n^{-1}$ ), from (53) we finally get (49) for all  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_1$ .

**8.2. Proof that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$  for  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ .** As already mentioned, we move from the action of the group  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  to the action of the group  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by a standard method in homogenization theory. In particular, below we will apply some results of [8, Section 6] that we will recall along the proof (there we treated locally bounded atomic random measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , but the results remain valid for generic locally bounded random measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ). To simplify the presentation and the notation we consider only the case  $V = \mathbb{I}$  (the treatment in [8] is for all  $V$ ). In this case  $\Delta = [0, 1]^d$ .

We set  $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega \times [0, 1]^d$  and call  $\mathcal{B}$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -field of  $[0, 1]^d$ . We consider the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}$  and the product probability measure  $\bar{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P} \otimes dx$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Then  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$  is a probability space.

Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  let  $z(x) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $r(x) \in [0, 1]^d$  be such that  $x = z(x) + r(x)$  (they are univocally defined). Set  $\bar{\theta}_x : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$  as  $\bar{\theta}_x(\omega, a) := (\theta_{z(x+a)}\omega, r(x+a))$ . Then one can prove that  $(\bar{\theta}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$  is a action of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$  and  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$  is stationary and ergodic for this action [8, Section 6]. In addition, define  $\bar{\mu}_{(\omega, a)}(\cdot) := \mu_\omega(\cdot + a)$  for all  $(\omega, a) \in \bar{\Omega}$ . Then, by [8, Eq. (61)], we have again the covariant relation  $\bar{\mu}_{\theta_x(\omega, a)} = \bar{\tau}_x \bar{\mu}_{(\omega, a)}$ , where  $(\bar{\tau}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$  is the action of the group  $\mathbb{R}^d$  on the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by translations  $\bar{\tau}_x y := \tau_x = y + x$ . In conclusion, the new setting given by the group  $\bar{\mathbb{G}} := \mathbb{R}^d$ , the probability space  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ , the actions  $(\bar{\theta}_x)_{x \in \bar{\mathbb{G}}}$  and  $(\bar{\tau}_x)_{x \in \bar{\mathbb{G}}}$ , the random measures  $\bar{\mu}_{\bar{\omega}}$  with  $\bar{\omega} \in \bar{\Omega}$  satisfies Assumptions 1 and 2.

Let us now show that  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\bar{\mu}_{\bar{\omega}}(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$ , where  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation w.r.t.  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ . This follows from the bound  $\mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] < +\infty$  and the observation (based also on the stationarity of  $\mathbb{P}$ ) that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\bar{\mu}_{\bar{\omega}}(\Delta)^\alpha] &= \int_{\bar{\Omega}} d\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{\omega}) \int_{\Delta} da \bar{\mu}_{(\omega, a)}(\Delta)^\alpha = \int_{\bar{\Omega}} d\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{\omega}) \int_{\Delta} da \mu_\omega(\Delta + a)^\alpha \\ &= \int_{\Delta} da \mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta + a)^\alpha] = \int_{\Delta} da \mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha] = \mathbb{E}[\mu_\omega(\Delta)^\alpha]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular the new setting satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.6. As a consequence, the result obtained in Section 8.1 implies that there exists a

$\bar{\mathbb{G}}$ -invariant measurable subset  $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$  with  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) = 1$  such that

$$\lim_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell\}} \vartheta(|x|) d\bar{\mu}_{(\omega, a)}^\varepsilon(x) = 0$$

for any  $(\omega, a) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ . Hence, by the definition of  $\bar{\mu}_{(\omega, a)}^\varepsilon$  and by (4) and (7), for any  $(\omega, a) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  it holds

$$\lim_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \int_{\{|\varepsilon(x-a)| \geq \ell\}} \vartheta(\varepsilon|x-a|) d\mu_\omega(x) = 0. \quad (54)$$

We now define  $\mathcal{C}_* := \{\omega \in \Omega : \exists a \in \Delta \text{ with } (\omega, a) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}\}$ . In general, the projection of a measurable subset in a product measure space does not need to be measurable. We can anyway show that  $\mathcal{C}_* \in \mathcal{F}$  as follows. We know that  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  is measurable and  $\bar{\mathbb{G}}$ -invariant. Take  $(\omega, a) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $a' \in \Delta$ . Then  $\bar{\theta}_{a'-a}(\omega, a) = (\theta_{z(a')}\omega, r(a')) = (\theta_0\omega, a') = (\omega, a')$ . This observation and the  $\bar{\mathbb{G}}$ -invariance of  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  imply that  $(\omega, a') \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  for any  $(\omega, a) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ . Hence,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}_* \times \Delta$ . Since sections are measurable (see [19, Exercise 1.7.18-(iii)]) we conclude that  $\mathcal{C}_*$  is measurable, i.e.  $\mathcal{C}_* \in \mathcal{F}$ . Moreover, since  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) = 1$ , it must be  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_*) = 1$  by Fubini-Tonelli Theorem.

At this point, to conclude the proof of Claim 7.5 (i.e.  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ ), it remains to show that  $\mathcal{C}_* \subset \mathcal{C}$ . To this aim we take  $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_*$ . We know that (54) holds for any  $a \in \Delta$ . By taking  $a = 0$ , (54) reduces to (37).

## 9. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3

We prove Items (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.3. Item (i) trivially implies the limits (17),..., (22) for  $f \in C_*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be as in Remark 4.2 and Claim 7.1. For Item (i) we define  $d_c := 2d + 2$  and  $\Omega_{\text{typ}}^* \in \mathcal{F}$  as  $\Omega_{\text{typ}}^* := \Omega_{\text{typ}} \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  are as in Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 respectively. For Item (ii) we define  $d_c := d$  and  $\Omega_{\text{typ}}^* \in \mathcal{F}$  as  $\Omega_{\text{typ}}^* := \Omega_{\text{typ}} \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  are as in Corollary 3.7. Note that  $\Omega_{\text{typ}}^*$  is measurable,  $\bar{\mathbb{G}}$ -invariant and  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\text{typ}}^*) = 1$ . From now on we restrict to  $\omega \in \Omega_{\text{typ}}^*$ . Due to our definition of  $d_c$ , we need to prove (17),..., (20) for all  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$ , and (21) and (22) for all  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c)$ .

The proof will use the following two technical lemmas proved in Sections 9.6 and 9.7 respectively (the latter is similar to [5, Lemma 6.1]):

**Lemma 9.1.** *Let  $f$  be a measurable function. Let  $t \geq 0$  and  $\lambda > 0$ . If for some  $C, \beta > 0$  it holds  $|f(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then for some  $C'$  it holds  $|P_t f(x)| \leq C'(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  and  $|R_\lambda f(x)| \leq C'(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .*

**Lemma 9.2.** *Given  $h \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$  and given a family  $h_\omega^\varepsilon \in L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$  with  $L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni h_\omega^\varepsilon \rightarrow h \in L^2(mdx)$ , it holds  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |h_\omega^\varepsilon(x) - h(x)|^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = 0$ .*

**9.1. Proof of (17).** The second limit in (15) can be restated as follows: if  $L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni h_\varepsilon \mapsto h \in L^2(mdx)$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ , then  $R_{\omega, \lambda}^\varepsilon h_\varepsilon \rightarrow R_\lambda h$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . As a consequence, by [23, Theorem 9.2], one gets that it also holds  $P_{\omega, t}^\varepsilon h_\varepsilon \rightarrow P_t h$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . Hence, to prove (17), it is enough to prove the strong convergence

$L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni f \mapsto f \in L^2(mdx)$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$ . It is known (see e.g. [8, Remark 3.12]) that the strong convergence follows from the following limits as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ :

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} \rightarrow \|f\|_{L^2(mdx)}, \quad L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni f \rightharpoonup f \in L^2(mdx). \quad (55)$$

By Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.7, we get that  $f \in L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)$  and  $\|f\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x)$  converges to  $\|f\|_{L^2(mdx)}^2 = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)^2 dx$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ , thus proving the first limit in (55). Since  $f\psi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for any  $\psi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the second limit in (55) follows from Claim 7.1 and the definition of weak convergence.

**9.2. Proof of (18).** To prove that  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$  satisfies (18), it is enough to apply (15) where  $u_\varepsilon = R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f$  and  $u = R_\lambda f$  as we have already shown for (17) the strong convergence  $L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni f \rightarrow f \in L^2(mdx)$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ .

**9.3. Proof of (19) and (20).** Let  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$ . We can apply Lemma 9.2 with  $h_\omega^\varepsilon := P_{\omega,t}^\varepsilon f$  and  $h = P_t f$ . Indeed, we know that  $P_t f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$  by Lemma 9.1 and we know that  $L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni h_\omega^\varepsilon \rightarrow h \in L^2(mdx)$  by (17). Then by Lemma 9.2 we get (19). By the same arguments, and using now (18), we get (20).

**9.4. Proof of (22).** We follow the main ideas of [8, Section 20], supplemented with the technical results developed here. Let  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c)$ . Without loss of generality we can take  $f \geq 0$ . We fix  $\beta > d_c$  such that  $0 \leq f(x) \leq C(1+|x|)^{-\beta}$  for some  $C > 0$ . By Lemma 9.1,  $0 \leq R_\lambda f(x) \leq C'(1+|x|)^{-\beta}$  for some  $C' > 0$ . We set  $B(n) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq n\}$ . By using Schwarz inequality to bound  $\|(R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f - R_\lambda f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f - R_\lambda f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} &\leq \|(R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)^c}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} + \|(R_\lambda f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)^c}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + \mu_\omega^\varepsilon(B(n))^{\frac{1}{2}} \|R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f - R_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

The last addendum in the r.h.s. of (56) goes to zero as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  by (20) and since  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(B(n)) \rightarrow m\ell(B(n))$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  by Claim 7.1. For the second addendum we claim that  $\lim_{n \uparrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|(R_\lambda f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)^c}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} = 0$ . Indeed, since

$$\|(R_\lambda f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)^c}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} \leq C' \int_{B(n)^c} (1+|x|)^{-\beta} d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x), \quad (57)$$

one can apply Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.7 to get that the r.h.s. of (57) goes to zero as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  and afterwards  $n \uparrow +\infty$ .

Finally let us show that the first addendum in the r.h.s. of (56) is negligible as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  and afterwards  $n \uparrow +\infty$ . Since  $f \geq 0$  we can write

$$\|(R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)^c}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} = \|R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} - \|(R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)}. \quad (58)$$

A similar formula holds for  $R_\lambda$ . The proof is then completed if we show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} = \|R_\lambda f\|_{L^1(mdx)}, \quad (59)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|(R_{\omega,\lambda}^\varepsilon f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} = \|(R_\lambda f)\mathbb{1}_{B(n)}\|_{L^1(mdx)}. \quad (60)$$

Indeed, by combining (58), (59) and (60), we get  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|(R_{\omega, \lambda}^\varepsilon f) \mathbf{1}_{B(n)^c}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} = \|(R_\lambda f) \mathbf{1}_{B(n)^c}\|_{L^1(mdx)}$  and the last expression goes to zero as  $n \uparrow +\infty$  by the integrability of  $R_\lambda f$ .

Let us prove (59). Since  $f \geq 0$  and by the reversibility of  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon$  for the diffusively rescaled random walk due to Item (iii) of Assumption 4, we have

$$\|R_{\omega, \lambda}^\varepsilon f\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} = \int_0^\infty ds e^{-\lambda s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) P_{\omega, s}^\varepsilon f(x) = \lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) f(x).$$

As  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c)$ , by Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.7, the last term converges to  $\lambda^{-1} m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) dx = \|R_\lambda f\|_{L^1(mdx)}$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . This completes the proof of (59).

Let us prove (60). Since  $f \geq 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \|(R_{\omega, \lambda}^\varepsilon f) \mathbf{1}_{B(n)}\|_{L^1(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} - \|(R_\lambda f) \mathbf{1}_{B(n)}\|_{L^1(mdx)} \right| \\ &= \left| \langle R_{\omega, \lambda}^\varepsilon f - R_\lambda f, \mathbf{1}_{B(n)} \rangle_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} \right| \leq \mu_\omega^\varepsilon(B_n)^{1/2} \|R_{\omega, \lambda}^\varepsilon f - R_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

The r.h.s. goes to zero as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  being equal to the last term in (56).

**9.5. Proof of (21).** Let  $f \in \mathcal{G}(d_c)$ . In light of the arguments used for (22), one can similarly derive (21) from (19) (similarly to the proof of [5, Corollary 2.5]).

**9.6. Proof of Lemma 9.1.** In what follows, given  $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $|a|$  will denote its Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Moreover, below constants of type  $c$  are positive, depend only on  $d, \beta, \lambda$  and can change from line to line. If a constant can depend also from  $t$  in addition to  $d, \beta, \lambda$ , we write  $c(t)$ .

Using that  $\|P_t f\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty$  and  $\|R_\lambda f\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty / \lambda$ , it is enough to prove the bounds on  $|P_t f(x)|$  and  $|R_\lambda f(x)|$  for  $x$  large. We will use this observation later.

Since  $D$  is a positive semidefinite symmetric matrix, it can be diagonalized by an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let us call  $k$  the dimension of  $\text{Ker}(D)^\perp$ . If  $k = 0$ , then  $P_t f(x) = f(x)$  and  $R_\lambda f(x) = f(x) / \lambda$  and trivially the lemma is valid in this case. Let us now take  $k \geq 1$ . Recall that  $P_t$  is the Markov semigroup associated to the Brownian motion on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with diffusion matrix  $2D$ . If for example  $De_i = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and  $De_i = 0$  for  $k < i \leq d$ , then we have

$$P_t f(w, z) := \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{k/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-\frac{|w-y|^2}{4t}} f(y, z) dy \quad \forall (w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{d-k} = \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (61)$$

The general form of  $P_t f$  is similar to (61) in a different orthonormal basis.

In addition note that by our assumptions and due to (61), we have  $|P_t f(w, z)| \leq C(4\pi t)^{-k/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-\frac{|w-y|^2}{4t}} (1 + |(y, z)|)^{-\beta} dy$ . Let us set

$$A(w, z, t) := t^{-\frac{k}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-\frac{|w-y|^2}{t}} (1 + |(y, z)|)^{-\beta} dy \quad \forall (w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{d-k} = \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We write  $A(x, t)$  for  $A(w, z, t)$  when  $x = (w, z)$ . Then, apart from some rescaling and some multiplicative constants, the lemma is proved if we show that, for some  $c(t)$ ,  $c$  and for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|x|$  large enough, it holds

$$|A(x, t)| \leq c(t)(1 + |x|)^{-\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} |A(x, t)| dt \leq c(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}. \quad (62)$$

We first point out that (62) can be easily derived when  $x = (w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{d-k}$  and  $|w| \leq |z|$ . Indeed, it is enough to use in the definition of  $A(w, z, t)$  that  $(1 + |(y, z)|)^{-\beta} \leq (1 + |z|)^{-\beta} \leq c(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$  since  $|x| \leq \sqrt{2}|z|$ .

Let us consider now the case  $x = (w, z)$  with  $|w| > |z|$ . In this case  $|w| \leq |x| \leq \sqrt{2}|w|$ . Using in the definition of  $A(w, z, t)$  that  $(1 + |(y, z)|)^{-\beta} \leq (1 + |y|)^{-\beta}$  and at the end that  $(1 + |w|)^{-\beta} \leq c(1 + |x|)^{-\beta}$ , to prove (62) it is enough to show for  $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $|w|$  large enough (let us say for  $|w| \geq 1$ ) that

$$|C(w, t)| \leq c(t)(1 + |w|)^{-\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} |C(w, t)| dt \leq c(1 + |w|)^{-\beta}, \quad (63)$$

where  $C(w, t) := t^{-\frac{k}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-\frac{|w-y|^2}{t}} (1 + |y|)^{-\beta} dy$ . Let us set

$$C_1(w, t) := t^{-\frac{k}{2}} \int_{\{|y| \leq |w|/2\}} e^{-\frac{|w-y|^2}{t}} (1 + |y|)^{-\beta} dy,$$

$$C_2(w, t) := t^{-\frac{k}{2}} \int_{\{|y| > |w|/2\}} e^{-\frac{|w-y|^2}{t}} (1 + |y|)^{-\beta} dy.$$

Then  $C(w, t) = C_1(w, t) + C_2(w, t)$  and

$$C_1(w, t) \leq t^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{4t}} \int_{\{|y| \leq |w|/2\}} 1 dy \leq ct^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{4t}} (1 + |w|)^k, \quad (64)$$

$$C_2(w, t) \leq (1 + |w|/2)^{-\beta} t^{-\frac{k}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-\frac{|w-y|^2}{t}} dy \leq c(1 + |w|)^{-\beta}. \quad (65)$$

The estimates (64) and (65) imply the first bound in (63).

We move to the second bound in (63). Recall that  $|w| \geq 1$ . We can bound  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{4t}} dt$  by treating separately the integral over  $\{t > |w|\}$  and the integral over  $\{0 \leq t \leq |w|\}$ . The former is bounded by  $\int_{|w|}^\infty e^{-\lambda t} dt = e^{-\lambda|w|}/\lambda$ .

The latter is bounded by  $e^{-\frac{|w|}{8}} \int_0^{|w|} t^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{8t}} dt$ , which is bounded by

$$e^{-\frac{|w|}{8}} |w|^{-k} \int_0^{|w|} (t/|w|^2)^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{8t}} dt \leq ce^{-\frac{|w|}{8}} |w|^{1-k}$$

(we have used that  $s^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{8s}}$  is bounded on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ ). The above bounds imply that  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{k}{2}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{4t}} dt \leq ce^{-c'|w|}$  for  $|w| \geq 1$ . By combining this last estimate with (64) and (65), we get  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} C(w, t) dt \leq c(1 + |w|)^{-\beta}$  for  $|w| \geq 1$ .

**9.7. Proof of Lemma 9.2.** The proof is similar to the proof of [5, Lemma 6.1], where we considered random walks on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  for which it was immediate to check the ergodic theorems with weights proved here. We give the proof to make clear where the ergodic issues play an important role.

Since  $h \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$  and therefore  $h^2 \in \mathcal{G}(d_c)$ , by Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.7, we have  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . Let us show that also  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . To get this limit it is enough to observe that, by Remark 4.2,  $h_\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup h$  and this allows to take  $g_\varepsilon := h_\omega^\varepsilon$  and



$g := h$  when applying Definition 4.1 to the strong convergence  $L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon) \ni h_\omega^\varepsilon \rightarrow h \in L^2(mdx)$ . This implies that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx$ .

As  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx$ , to conclude the proof of our claim we show that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)h(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx$ . Since  $h \in \mathcal{G}(d_c/2)$  we have  $|h(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)^{-\beta}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , for some  $C > 0$  and  $\beta > d_c/2$ . Given an integer  $\ell > 0$  we fix a function  $g_\ell \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $g_\ell(x) = h(x)$  for  $|x| \leq \ell$  and  $|g_\ell(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)^{-\beta}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, using the weak convergence  $h_\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup h$ , we get

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)g_\ell(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)g_\ell(x) dx,$$

which trivially implies that

$$\lim_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)g_\ell(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx. \quad (66)$$

On the other hand, by Schwarz inequality and our bounds on  $h$  and  $g_\ell$  and recalling that  $B(\ell) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq \ell\}$ , we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)(h(x) - g_\ell(x)) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \right| &\leq \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} \|h(x) - g_\ell(x)\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq 2C \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} \|\mathbf{1}_{B(\ell)^c}(x)(1+|x|)^{-\beta}\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Since  $2\beta > d_c$  and due to Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.7, we have that

$$\overline{\lim}_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|\mathbf{1}_{B(\ell)^c}(x)(1+|x|)^{-\beta}\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)}^2 = \overline{\lim}_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\{|x| \geq \ell\}} (1+|x|)^{-2\beta} d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = 0.$$

By the above estimate, (67) and since  $\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)} < +\infty$  by our assumption that  $h_\omega^\varepsilon \rightarrow h$ , we conclude that

$$\lim_{\ell \uparrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)(h(x) - g_\ell(x)) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \right| = 0. \quad (68)$$

To get that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_\omega^\varepsilon(x)h(x) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ , it is now enough to combine (66) and (68).

## APPENDIX A. PROOF OF CLAIM 7.1

We take  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^d$  (the case  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$  can be done by similar arguments). Let  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Omega$  be the measurable set given by the  $\omega \in \Omega$  for which the limit (8) holds with  $\varphi$  replaced by any indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_{(a,b]}$ , where  $(a,b] := \prod_{i=1}^d (a_i, b_i]$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}^d$ ,  $a_i < b_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . By [3, Theorem 10.2.IV] (based on the results in [20]) we get that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) = 1$ . Since any function in  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with support in some ball  $B(r)$  can be approximated from above and from below by linear combinations of indicator functions  $\mathbf{1}_{(a,b]}$  as above with  $(a,b] \subset B(r+1)$  and since the approximation can be done with arbitrarily small error in uniform distance, it is simple to get that (8) holds for any  $\omega \in \mathcal{B}$  and any function in  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Let us prove that  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant. Take  $\omega \in \mathcal{B}$ . Recall that  $\mu_{\theta_g\omega} = \tau_g\omega$  by Assumption 2. Since by (4) and (7)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\mu_{\theta_g\omega}^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\varepsilon(\tau_{-g}y)) d\mu_\omega(y) = \varepsilon^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\varepsilon y - \varepsilon Vg) d\mu_\omega(y)$$

and  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is uniformly continuous, we get that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\mu_{\theta_g\omega}^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) dx$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  for any  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (we use that (8) holds for functions in  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  since  $\omega \in \mathcal{B}$ ). By suitably approximating by functions in  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$  any indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_{(a,b]}$  with  $a, b$  as above, we then get that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{(a,b]}(x) d\mu_{\theta_g\omega}^\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{(a,b]}(x) dx$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  and for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}^d$  with  $a_i < b_i$ . Hence  $\theta_g\omega \in \mathcal{B}$ . This concludes the proof that  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant.

**Acknowledgements.** I thank Prof. A. Tempelman for useful discussions. I thank the anonymous referees for stimulating comments and corrections. As stated at the beginning, I warmly thank Francis Comets

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Biskup; *Recent progress on the random conductance model*. Probability Surveys **8**, 294–373 (2011).
- [2] A. Chiarini, S. Floreani, F. Sau; *From quenched invariance principle to semigroup convergence with applications to exclusion processes*. Electron. Commun. Probab. **29**, 1–17 (2024).
- [3] D.J. Daley, D. Vere-Jones; *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes*. New York, Springer Verlag, 1988.
- [4] R. Durrett; *Probability: theory and examples*. Fifth edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2019.
- [5] A. Faggionato; *Random walks and exclusion processes among random conductances on random infinite clusters: homogenization and hydrodynamic limit*. Electron. J. Probab. **13**, 2217–2247 (2008).
- [6] A. Faggionato; *Hydrodynamic limit of zero range processes among random conductances on the supercritical percolation cluster*. Electron. J. Probab. **15**, 259–291 (2010).
- [7] A. Faggionato; *Hydrodynamic limit of simple exclusion processes in symmetric random environments via duality and homogenization*. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields. **184**, 1093–1137 (2022).
- [8] A. Faggionato; *Stochastic homogenization of random walks on point processes*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **59**, 662–705 (2023).
- [9] A. Faggionato; *Scaling limit of the directional conductivity of random resistor networks on simple point processes*. Preprint arXiv:2108.11258. To appear on Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.
- [10] A. Faggionato; *Graphical constructions of simple exclusion processes with applications to random environments*. arXiv:2304.07703, ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat., to appear.
- [11] A. Faggionato; *Graphs with random conductances on point processes: RW homogenization, SSEP hydrodynamics and resistor networks*. In preparation.
- [12] A. Faggionato, M. Jara, C. Landim; *Hydrodynamic behavior of 1D subdiffusive exclusion processes with random conductances*. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **144**, 633–667 (2009).
- [13] A. Faggionato, C. Tagliaferri; *Homogenization, simple exclusion processes and random resistor networks on d-dimensional Delaunay triangulations*. In preparation.
- [14] D.L. Hanson, G. Pledger; *On the mean ergodic theorem for weighted averages*. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete **13**, 141–149 (1969).

- [15] U. Krengel; *Ergodic theorems* (with a supplement by Antoine Brunel). Berlin, De Gruyter, 1985.
- [16] X.X. Nguyen, H. Zessin; *Punktprozesse mit Wechselwirkung*. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete **37**, 91–126 (1976).
- [17] X.X. Nguyen, H. Zessin; *Ergodic theorems for spatial processes*. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete **48**, 133–158 (1979).
- [18] O. Sarig; *Lecture Notes on Ergodic Theory*. Version dated 3 April 2023. Available online.
- [19] T. Tao; *An introduction to measure theory*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics **126**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2011.
- [20] A.A. Tempel'man; *Ergodic theorems for general dynamical systems*. Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obsc. **26**, 95–132 (1972) [Translation in Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **26**, 94–132, (1972)]
- [21] A.A. Tempelman; *Ergodic theorems for group action: informational and thermodynamical aspects*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers 1992.
- [22] A. Tempelman, A. Shulman; *Dominated and pointwise ergodic theorems with "weighted" averages for bounded Lamperti representations of amenable groups*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **474**, 23–58 (2019).
- [23] V.V. Zhikov, A.L. Pyatnitskii; *Homogenization of random singular structures and random measures*. (Russian) *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.* **70**, no. 1, 23–74 (2006); translation in *Izv. Math.* **70**, no. 1, 19–67 (2006).

ALESSANDRA FAGGIONATO. DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY LA SAPIENZA,  
P.LE ALDO MORO 2, 00185 ROME, ITALY  
*Email address:* faggiona@mat.uniroma1.it