

Lecture notes on stationary critical and super-critical SPDEs*

March 25, 2024

Giuseppe Cannizzaro¹, Fabio Toninelli²

¹University of Warwick, UK, ²Technical University of Vienna, Austria

Email: giuseppe.cannizzaro@warwick.ac.uk,
fabio.toninelli@tuwien.ac.at

Abstract

The goal of these lecture notes is to present recent results regarding the large-scale behaviour of critical and super-critical non-linear stochastic PDEs, that fall outside the realm of the theory of Regularity Structures. These include the two-dimensional Anisotropic KPZ equation, the stochastic Burgers equation in dimension $d \geq 2$ and the stochastic Navier-Stokes equation with divergence-free noise in dimension $d = 2$. Rather than providing complete proofs, we try to emphasise the main ideas, and some crucial aspects of our approach: the role of the *generator equation* and of the *fluctuation-dissipation theorem* to identify the limit process; *Wiener chaos decomposition* with respect to the stationary measure and its truncation; and the so-called *Replacement Lemma*, which controls the *weak coupling limit* of the equations in the critical dimension and identifies the limiting diffusivity. For pedagogical reasons, we will focus exclusively on the stochastic Burgers equation. The notes are based on works in collaboration with Dirk Erhard and Massimiliano Gubinelli.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic Partial Differential Equations, critical and super-critical dimension, KPZ and Burgers equation, weak coupling scaling, diffusion coefficient, asymmetric simple exclusion

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	The equations	3
1.2	Common features and stationary measures	6
1.3	The results: an overview	8
1.4	Some related works	11

*Notes for the lecture series “Large-scale behavior of (super)-critical stochastic PDEs” by F. Toninelli, CIME summer school “Statistical Mechanics and Stochastic PDEs”, Cetraro (Italy), 2023

2	The equation and main result	12
2.1	Open problems	15
2.2	Idea of the proof	16
3	The main tools: Chaos decomposition and the generator	18
3.1	A primer on Wiener-chaos analysis	18
3.2	The equation, its generator	21
3.3	Estimates on the antisymmetric part of the generator	26
3.4	The Itô trick	29
4	The approach	31
4.1	Tightness	31
4.2	A martingale formulation for the limit	32
4.3	The Fluctuation-Dissipation theorem	34
4.4	Proof of the main result	36
5	Characterisation of limit points: the Fluctuation-Dissipation relation	39
5.1	The critical dimension $d = 2$: the Replacement Lemma	42
5.2	The super-critical case: $d \geq 3$	52

1 Introduction

The study of (singular) Stochastic Partial Differential Equations (SPDEs) has known tremendous advances in recent years. Thanks to the groundbreaking theory of regularity structures [Hai14], paracontrolled calculus [GIP15] or renormalization group techniques [Kup14], a local solution theory can be shown to hold for a large family of SPDEs in the so-called *sub-critical* dimensions (see [Hai14] for the notion of *sub-criticality* in this context). In contrast, SPDEs in the *critical* and *super-critical* dimensions are, from a mathematical viewpoint, much less explored and still poorly understood.

In a series of works in collaboration with Dirk Erhard and Massimiliano Gubinelli (in various combinations), we rigorously determined the large-scale (Gaussian) fluctuations for a class of SPDEs at and above criticality under (suitable) diffusive scaling. As detailed below, the class of equations to which our approach applies include the two-dimensional Anisotropic KPZ equation [Wol91, CES21], the stochastic Burgers equation in dimension $d \geq 2$ [vBKS85] and the stochastic Navier-Stokes equation with divergence-free noise in dimension $d = 2$. Moreover, the methods we established have proven versatile enough to study the large-scale limit of critical, singular SDEs, such as the diffusion in the curl of the 2-d GFF [TV12, CHST22], as well as the self-repelling Brownian polymer [TV12, CG24] (works [CHST22, CG24] in collaboration with Levi Haunschmid-Sibitz and Harry Giles, respectively). The aim of these lecture notes is to give an account of these recent developments focusing on the main ideas, heuristics and novel technical tools rather than to provide the complete the proofs, for which we address the interested reader to the corresponding papers.

Before delving into the details, let us informally introduce the type of S(P)DEs which can be analysed thanks to the methods presented in these notes and provide

an overview of the main results we obtained. From Section 2 on, we will focus on a specific example, the Stochastic Burgers Equation (SBE) in dimension $d \geq 2$.

1.1 The equations

The stochastic Burgers Equation

The stochastic Burgers equation (SBE) is a SPDE which, in any spatial dimension $d \geq 1$, can (formally) be written as

$$\partial_t \eta = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \eta + \mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla \eta^2 + \operatorname{div} \xi \quad (1.1)$$

where the scalar field $\eta = \eta(x, t)$ depends on $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d \geq 1$, $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a fixed vector and $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d)$ is a d -dimensional space-time white noise on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. a centred d -dimensional Gaussian process whose covariance is formally given by $\mathbf{E}[\xi_i(t, x)\xi_j(s, y)] = \delta(t - s)\delta(x - y)\mathbb{1}_{i=j}$.

The SBE in (1.1) was introduced by van Beijeren, Kutner and Spohn in [vBKS85] as an approximation of the fluctuations of general driven diffusion systems with one conserved quantity, e.g. the Asymmetric Simple Exclusion Process (ASEP) on \mathbb{Z}^d . The nonlinear term expresses the fact that the velocity at which the fluctuation density travels depends on its magnitude. In the context of ASEP, this comes from the gradient of the current and is due to its asymmetry, so that in particular the vector \mathfrak{w} models how the ASEP under consideration is asymmetric in the different spatial directions. In the *sub-critical* dimension $d = 1$, (1.1) reduces to the (spatial derivative of the) celebrated Kardar–Parisi–Zhang (KPZ) equation [KPZ86] whose local solution theory is by now well-understood [Hai13, GP17, GJ14, GP18] and whose large-scale statistics have been recently determined [QS23, Vir20]. In higher dimensions the only available results prior to our recent work [CGT24] were in the discrete setting. For $d \geq 3$, corresponding to the super-critical case, ASEP has been shown to be diffusive at large scales [EMY94, LY97] – its fluctuations are Gaussian and given by the solution of a Stochastic Heat equation (SHE) with additive noise, see [CLO01, LOY04] and [KLO12] for a review. The critical dimension $d = 2$ is more subtle. Only qualitative information is available and no scaling limit had been obtained before [CGT24], either in the discrete or continuous setting. The most important result in this respect is that of [Yau04], which states that the two-dimensional ASEP is logarithmically superdiffusive, meaning that the bulk diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{bulk}}(t)$ (see Section 1.3.1 below) satisfies $D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \sim (\log t)^{2/3}$ for t large.¹

The Anisotropic KPZ equation

The so-called Anisotropic two-dimensional KPZ equation (or just AKPZ for short) is formally written as

$$\partial_t h = \frac{1}{2} \Delta h + \lambda \nabla h \cdot Q \nabla h + \xi \quad (1.2)$$

¹The diffusivity measures how the correlations of a process grow in space as a function of time so that, denoting by $\ell(t)$ the correlation length, it formally satisfies $\ell(t) \sim \sqrt{t D_{\text{bulk}}(t)}$.

where $h = h(x, t)$ is a scalar field, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is a coupling parameter, $Q = Q_{\text{AKPZ}}$ is the 2×2 symmetric diagonal matrix with diagonal entries 1 and -1 (so that the nonlinearity is $(\partial_1 h)^2 - (\partial_2 h)^2$), and ξ is a space-time white noise, $\mathbf{E}[\xi(t, x)\xi(s, y)] = \delta(t - s)\delta(x - y)$. Note that, in contrast to (1.1), the noise is not conservative i.e., it is not in divergence form.

Introduced in the work of Wolf [Wol91] for generic Q , (1.2) was originally derived as a description of the fluctuations of general $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional (with “2” the spatial and “1” the time dimension) stochastic growth: the Laplacian is a smoothing term that overall flattens the interface, the noise models the microscopic local randomness, while the non-linear term encodes the slope-dependence of the growth mechanism. Indeed, at a heuristic level, the connection between a specific (microscopic) growth model and (1.2) is that Q is proportional to the Hessian D^2v of the average speed of growth v of the microscopic model, seen as a function of the average interface slope.

The (spatial) dimension $d = 2$ is critical, in that (1.2) is formally scale invariant under diffusive scaling, and finer features of the equation, and in particular the nature of the slope dependence determined by the matrix Q , are expected to influence its properties. Via non-rigorous one-loop Renormalisation Group computations, [Wol91] conjectured that its large scale behaviour will depend on the sign of $\det Q$ - in the Isotropic case, corresponding to $\det Q > 0$, $D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \sim t^\beta$ for some universal $\beta > 0$ (known only numerically), while in the Anisotropic case, corresponding to $\det Q \leq 0$, $D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \sim t^\beta$ for $\beta = 0$. There are by now several mathematically rigorous results which support Wolf’s conjecture regarding the different nature of isotropic and anisotropic cases, but it is only for the specific choice of $Q = Q_{\text{AKPZ}}$ as above that the asymptotic behaviour of $D_{\text{bulk}}(t)$ has been characterised: in our work [CET23a], it is shown that $D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \sim (\log t)^{1/2}$ for t large.

Let us mention that there are several microscopic $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional growth models that are known to belong to the AKPZ universality class, in the sense that their speed of growth satisfies $\det(D^2v) \leq 0$. These include the Gates-Westcott model [PS97, Ler20], certain two-dimensional arrays of interlaced particle systems [BF14] and the domino shuffling algorithm [CTar] just to mention a few (other growth processes like the 6-vertex dynamics of [BB17] and the q -Whittaker particle system [BC14] should belong to this class, but an explicit computation of v is not possible since their stationary measures are non-determinantal; see also [Ton18] for further references). Even though several results have been obtained in the discrete setting, the large-scale diffusivity (or super-diffusivity) properties of these models is currently unknown and we believe it would be extremely interesting to study.

The stochastic Navier–Stokes equation

The incompressible stochastic Navier–Stokes equation (SNS) of interest for us is

$$\partial_t v = \frac{1}{2}\Delta v - \lambda v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla p - f, \quad \nabla \cdot v = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where the velocity field $v = v(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, is subject to the incompressibility condition (second equation in the display above), i.e. it is divergence-free, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is the *coupling constant* which tunes the strength of the nonlinearity, p is the pressure which ensures that dynamics preserves the incompressibility condition, $f = \nabla^\perp \xi$ for $\nabla^\perp \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\partial_2, -\partial_1)$ and ξ a two-dimensional space-time white noise.

For generic f , the SNS equation describes the motion of an incompressible fluid subject to an external random forcing and it has been studied under a variety of assumptions on f . Most of the literature focuses on the case of trace-class noise, for which existence, uniqueness of solutions and ergodicity were proved (see e.g. [FG95, DPD03, HMo6, FRo8, RZZ14] and references therein). The case of even rougher noises, e.g. space-time white noise and its derivatives, which is relevant in the description of motion of turbulent fluids [MR04], was first considered in $d = 2$ in [DPD02], and later in dimension three [ZZ15] (see also [HZZ23] for a global existence result in this latter case).

The interest in our choice of noise is that the dynamics formally leaves the *energy measure*, i.e. the law of a vector-valued incompressible white noise, invariant and the equation is, once again, formally scale invariant under diffusive scaling. In particular, this is precisely the point at which the work [GT20] breaks (they consider a fractional version of (1.3) in which the Laplacian is replaced by $-(-\Delta)^\theta$ and the noise by $(-\Delta)^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} \xi$, and their well-posedness result holds for $\theta > 1$).

Beyond SPDEs: (self-)interacting diffusions

If we move away from the SPDE setting, there are interesting models of (self-)interacting diffusions which can be analysed in our framework. The first example is the so-called Diffusion in the Curl of the 2d-GFF (DCGFF) [TV12], that is, the SDE

$$dX_t = \omega(X_t)dt + dB_t, \quad X_0 = 0 \quad (1.4)$$

where $X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)})$ is a two-dimensional process, B is a standard Brownian motion on \mathbb{R}^2 and $\omega(\cdot) = (\omega_1(\cdot), \omega_2(\cdot))$ is a quenched, ergodic random vector field, given by the curl of the two-dimensional Gaussian Free Field, i.e. $\omega = \nabla^\perp \xi$ with ξ the centered Gaussian field with covariance given by the Green's function of the 2-dimensional Laplacian. The DCGFF is a toy model for the motion of a tracer particle in a two-dimensional turbulent, incompressible fluid, a role played by ω that indeed satisfies $\text{div } \omega = 0$.

Yet another example is the so-called Self-repelling Brownian polymer (SRBP) [APP83, TV12], described by the two-dimensional SDE

$$dX_t = -\nabla L_t(X_t)dt + dB_t, \quad (1.5)$$

where L_t is the occupation measure of $(X_s)_{s \leq t}$ up to time t . What (1.5) says, is that the tracer is repelled by its previous trajectory, in that the drift is *minus* the gradient

of the occupation measure (hence the name “self-repelling Brownian polymer”). Note that the SRBP has long memory and is not Markovian.

As discussed below, both models are conjectured (and in the first instance proved) to be logarithmically superdiffusive, i.e. the mean-square displacement is expected to grow as $t\sqrt{\log t}$ for t large. For further references on DCGFF and SRBP, see the introductions of [CHST22, CG24].

1.2 Common features and stationary measures

The equations discussed in the previous sections are very different in nature and are used to describe a variety of unrelated phenomena. Yet, our techniques are applicable in each of these cases. It is therefore natural to ask what are the features they share and which among those ensure that our approach is viable.

Singularity and (super-)criticality

First of all, they are all ill-posed (*singular*): for the SPDEs, the noise is merely a distribution and it is too irregular for the nonlinearity to be analytically defined (it is not allowed to square a generalised function). Similarly, for the SDEs, the drift is too singular as, not only it is unclear how to evaluate it on a (Brownian path), but its spatial regularity is even below the threshold identified in [CC18, DD16]². That said, what is expected to be universal about the equations above is not their solutions but its large-scale behaviour. As a consequence, we are lead to study a regularised (or microscopic) version of them. In the case of the SDEs, this is very natural and amounts to convolve the drift with a smooth compactly supported function. For the SPDEs instead, the regularisation can be done various ways and we choose to smoothen the non-linearity so that the solution is still rough but the dynamics is well-posed. (An alternative option would be to smoothen the noise via a convolution with a smooth kernel, so that the resulting solution would also be smooth.) For instance, for the Burgers equation, we replace the formal expression η^2 in (1.1) by

$$\Pi_1[(\Pi_1\eta)^2], \quad (1.6)$$

where Π_a denotes the projection over the Fourier modes with $|k| \leq a$ (the choice of the constant $a = 1$ is arbitrary). Similarly, for AKPZ one replaces the non-linearity by

$$\lambda\Pi_1[\nabla\Pi_1h \cdot Q_{\text{AKPZ}}\nabla\Pi_1h]. \quad (1.7)$$

Let us remark that there is nothing special about the Fourier projection Π_1 : we could have replaced *every* instance of it by the convolution in space with any sufficiently regular radial mollifier. What is technically important though is that the regularisation preserves the symmetries of the stationary measure (see next item).

²To witness, for the DCGFF, the $2d$ GFF is in \mathcal{C}^α , $\alpha < 0$, the latter being the space of Hölder distributions with regularity α (see [CC18] for the definition), so that $\omega \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha-1}$. In the aforementioned works, the threshold regularity is $-2/3$ so that (1.4) falls indeed out of their scope.

We are now in possession of a microscopic well-defined object, and our goal is to move to large scales. As will be apparent in Section 2, when we rescale the equation diffusively, i.e. $(x, t) \rightarrow (x/\varepsilon, t/\varepsilon^2)$, the cut-off parameter is automatically removed in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, the reader can readily check that, in dimension $d = 2$, such rescaling has *no effect* on the coefficients of the equations above (for the DCGFF, the key observation is that the GFF is itself scale invariant; for the SRBP, see [CG24, Eq. (1.4)]), which means that the equations are *critical*. The SBE in dimension $d > 2$ is instead *super-critical* since, under diffusive rescaling, the coefficient of the nonlinearity gets multiplied by $\varepsilon^{d/2-1}$, which vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (see (2.3)-(2.5) below).

Stationarity

All the stochastic processes described in the previous section have a *Gaussian stationary measure* (with the regularisation we choose, the measure is actually independent of the value of the cut-off parameter) and, in fact, all our results consider the *stationary process*. This will allow to use tools from Wiener chaos decomposition of Gaussian Hilbert spaces. In particular, the stationary measure of the SBE is the space white noise, for AKPZ it is the Gaussian Free Field on the plane and for SNS, the curl of the Gaussian Free Field. As for the SDEs (1.4) and (1.5), we cannot expect the solution itself to be stationary. Instead, we need to look at *the environment seen from the particle* (which in turn solves a SPDE of transport type) and the latter admits a Gaussian stationary measure.

One way to guess whether or not the SPDE at hand has a Gaussian stationary measure (or to consider a noise for which this is the case) is to see if there exists a Hilbert space H such that the non-linearity tested against the solution is 0. H would then be the Cameron-Martin space associated to the Gaussian measure of interest. In the case of the SBE for example, this amounts to verify (see (3.19)) that for any $a > 0$ we have

$$\langle \mathbf{w} \cdot \Pi_a[\nabla(\Pi_a\eta)^2], \eta \rangle_{L^2} = 0.$$

This suggests that the invariant measure for the process is a space white noise since $H = L^2$ is the Cameron-Martin space associated to it.

Let us emphasise that, while the law of all these processes at any fixed time is Gaussian, the law of the processes in space-time *is not Gaussian*. Another important remark is that, if the cut-off function did not respect the symmetries of the stationary measure, we would lose stationarity and it is not clear at present how to adjust our techniques to still recover the same results.

Nature of the nonlinearity

At the more technical level, another common feature of these stochastic processes is that they have a quadratic non-linearity. While this is obvious for AKPZ, SBE and SNS, for the two self-interacting diffusions introduced above, this can be seen by

looking at the SPDE solved by them (see e.g. [CG24, Eq. (1.12)]). Even though we do not expect such aspect to be essential for our approach, it is not obvious what happens when considering more general non-linearities. That said, in the critical dimension progress has been made [CKnt].

1.3 The results: an overview

In this section, we give an informal overview of the results, following a logical rather than chronological order. From that point on, we will focus exclusively on the scaling limit results of Sections 1.3.2 and 1.3.3, in the case of the SBE.

1.3.1 Super-diffusivity in the critical dimension

A way to quantify the (super)-diffusivity of an interacting particle system, or, in the continuum, of a SPDE like (1.1) or (1.2), is via the so-called *bulk diffusion coefficient* D_{bulk} (or bulk diffusion matrix, for models that are not rotationally invariant). For its notion in the framework of interacting lattice gases such as the ASEP, we refer to [Spo12, Ch. II.2] but we only mention that it can be defined either as the mean square displacement of a second-class particle, or as the space-time integral of the correlations of the current associated to the conserved quantity of the process (for ASEP, this is the particle density). The analog in the continuum, for SBE, formally reads

$$D_{\text{bulk}}(t) = \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 \mathbf{E}[\eta(t, x)\eta(0, 0)] dx \quad (1.8)$$

where \mathbf{E} denotes expectation with respect to the space-time law of the stationary process η , while for AKPZ it would be the same but with $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}h$ in place of η . Clearly, the expression in (1.8) is purely formal as both η and $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}h$ are distributions and therefore cannot be evaluated at points. That said, as [CET23a, App. A] heuristically shows, there is an intimate relation between (1.8) and the growth of the non-linearity, which is expressed in terms of a Green-Kubo formula. To be precise, the notion of bulk diffusion coefficient we work with is

$$D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 + \frac{2\lambda^2}{t} \int_0^t ds \int_0^s dr \int dx \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}(r, x)\mathcal{N}(0, 0)], \quad (1.9)$$

where \mathcal{N} the (Fourier regularized version of the) non-linearity $(\partial_{x_1} h)^2 - (\partial_{x_2} h)^2$, cf. (1.2). Note that thanks to the regularisation in (1.7), the above quantity is well-defined. In the case of Burgers instead, we set (see [DGHSnt])

$$D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 + \frac{2|\mathfrak{w}|^2}{t} \int_0^t ds \int_0^s dr \int dx \mathbf{E}[\Pi_1[(\Pi_1\eta)^2] : (r, x) : \Pi_1[(\Pi_1\eta)^2] : (0, 0)], \quad (1.10)$$

where $\Pi_1((\Pi_1\eta)^2)$ denotes the Fourier regularisation of η^2 (see (1.6)) and this time, since the square in the non-linearity is not centred, we replaced the usual product

with the Wick one, i.e. $:\Pi_1[(\Pi_1\eta)^2]: \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_1[(\Pi_1\eta)^2] - \mathbb{E}(\Pi_1[(\Pi_1\eta)^2])$ with \mathbb{E} the expectation with respect to the invariant measure.

The bulk diffusion coefficient is particularly useful as it provides qualitative information regarding the behaviour of our process. Indeed, by (1.9) and (1.10), it is immediate to see that for the linear equations obtained by setting \mathfrak{w} and λ to 0 in (1.1) and (1.2) respectively, $D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \equiv 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. In the following result, we quantify the corrections to the diffusivity and show that this is the case *for neither AKPZ nor SBE*, thus proving that the non-linearity is (*marginally*) *relevant* at large scales.

Theorem 1.1 [CET23a] *For the stationary AKPZ equation (1.2) (with non-linearity regularized in Fourier space), the Laplace transform*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{bulk}}(\mu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} t D_{\text{bulk}}(t) dt$$

of the bulk diffusion coefficient in (1.9) satisfies the bounds

$$c_-(\delta)(\log |\log \mu|)^{-5-\delta} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \mathcal{D}_{\text{bulk}}(\mu)}{\sqrt{|\log \mu|}} \leq c_+(\delta)(\log |\log \mu|)^{5+\delta} \quad (1.11)$$

as $\mu \rightarrow 0$, for any $\delta > 0$, where $c_\pm(\delta)$ are finite positive constants.

Translated into real time, Theorem 1.1 morally says that $D_{\text{bulk}}(t)$ is of order $\sqrt{\log t}$ for $t \rightarrow \infty$, up to possible sub leading multiplicative corrections that are polynomial in $\log \log t$. We believe such corrections to be spurious. It is interesting that such behaviour had not been anticipated in the Mathematics literature (where it was implicitly believed that AKPZ would be diffusive at large scales), and no predictions in this sense had been made in the Physics literature, either.

The result analogous to Theorem 1.1 was proven shortly afterwards in [CHST22] (and later refined in [CMOW23]) for the DCGFF. In this case, the diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{bulk}}(t)$ is defined simply in terms of the mean square displacement of the particle

$$D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{E}[|X_t|^2]}{t},$$

with \mathbf{E} the joint expectation with respect the randomness of the Brownian noise and of the random vector field ω . The behaviour of $\mathcal{D}(\mu)$ turns out to be still of order $\mu^{-2} \sqrt{|\log \mu|}$ for μ small. This had been conjectured in [TV12], where only the bounds $\log |\log \mu| \leq \mu^2 \mathcal{D}(\mu) \leq |\log \mu|$ were obtained.

For the SBE in dimension $d = 2$, $D_{\text{bulk}}(t)$ was predicted by van Beijeren, Kutner and Spohn [vBKS85] to grow logarithmically, but this time with exponent $2/3$ instead of $1/2$, i.e. $D_{\text{bulk}}(t) \approx (\log t)^{2/3}$. This was proven in [Yau04] by H.-T. Yau in the discrete setting for the two-dimensional ASEP, while in the continuum this is the main result of the very recent work [DGHSnt], which we now state.

Theorem 1.2 [DGHSnt] *For the stationary stochastic Burgers equation in dimension $d = 2$, one has*

$$c_-(\delta)(\log \log |\log \mu|)^{-3-\delta} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \mathcal{D}_{\text{bulk}}(\mu)}{|\log \mu|^{2/3}} \leq c_+(\delta)(\log \log |\log \mu|)^{3+\delta} \quad (1.12)$$

as $\mu \rightarrow 0$.

1.3.2 Scaling limits: the critical dimension

The logarithmic divergence (as $t \rightarrow \infty$) of the diffusion coefficient for AKPZ (resp. SBE) in dimension $d = 2$ implies that, if we rescale diffusively the process, by setting $h^\varepsilon(x, t) = h(x/\varepsilon, t/\varepsilon^2)$ (resp. $\eta^\varepsilon(x, t) = \varepsilon^{-1}\eta(x/\varepsilon, t/\varepsilon^2)$), then the diffusion coefficient of the rescaled equation will diverge like $\sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}$ (resp. $|\log \varepsilon|^{2/3}$). In other words, there is no hope for the rescaled equation to have a meaningful limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Let us stress that h^ε and η^ε simply solve the same AKPZ or SBE equations as above, with the “only” difference that the Fourier cut-off parameter is not 1 but $1/\varepsilon$ (i.e., in (1.6) and (1.7), Π_1 is replaced by $\Pi_{1/\varepsilon}$).

In order to obtain meaningful scaling limits, two ways are in principle possible. One possibility is to rescale space-time differently: according to the above theorems, the scaling should be as $(x, t) \rightarrow (x/\varepsilon, t/(\varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon|^\gamma))$ with $\gamma = 1/2$ for AKPZ and $\gamma = 2/3$ for SBE. It would be then extremely interesting (and probably very hard) to determine the non-trivial scaling limit of the process. The second way is to insist on the diffusive scaling $(x, t) \rightarrow (x/\varepsilon, t/\varepsilon^2)$ and tame the growth caused by the non-linearity, by suitably scaling it to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The correct rescaling turns out to be, for both equations, of order $1/\sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}$.

Theorem 1.3 [CET23b] *Let h^ε denote the stationary solution of the AKPZ equation in the weak coupling scaling limit, i.e.*

$$\partial_t h^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \Delta h^\varepsilon + \frac{\hat{\lambda}}{\sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}} \Pi_{1/\varepsilon} [\nabla(\Pi_{1/\varepsilon} h^\varepsilon) \cdot Q_{\text{AKPZ}} \nabla(\Pi_{1/\varepsilon} h^\varepsilon)] + \xi. \quad (1.13)$$

Here, $h^\varepsilon = h^\varepsilon(x, t)$ with x belonging to the two-dimensional unit torus \mathbb{T}^2 and the initial condition is a mean-zero Gaussian Free Field on \mathbb{T}^2 . Then, for each $T > 0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the process h^ε converges in distribution in $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^2))$ to the solution h of

$$\partial_t h = \frac{\nu_{\text{eff}}(\hat{\lambda})}{2} \Delta h + \sqrt{\nu_{\text{eff}}(\hat{\lambda})} \xi, \quad \nu_{\text{eff}}(\hat{\lambda}) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi} \hat{\lambda}^2 + 1}. \quad (1.14)$$

The fact that the limit equation is (up to a non-trivial renormalization, from 1 to $\nu_{\text{eff}}(\hat{\lambda})$, of the diffusion coefficient) the same as the linear equation obtained by setting $\hat{\lambda} = 0$ in (1.13) is due to the fact that AKPZ is invariant under rotations. In more general cases, the Laplacian and the covariance structure of the noise in the scaling limit might not be rotationally invariant and, therefore, genuinely different

from those of the starting linear equation. This is the case for instance for the two-dimensional Burgers equation: in absence of non-linearity ($\mathfrak{w} = 0$) the equation is rotationally invariant, but not so for $\mathfrak{w} \neq 0$. In fact, the limit process obtained in the weak coupling limit does feel the anisotropy: see Theorem 2.3 below.

Further, note that Theorem 1.3 is compatible with Theorem 1.1. In fact, formally setting $\hat{\lambda} = \sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}$ in the expression for $\nu(\hat{\lambda})$, which corresponds to choosing the coupling constant of order 1, one would get a diffusion coefficient of order $\sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}$.

Let us also mention that, very recently, the first author, together with Harry Giles, has proven [CG24] a weak coupling scaling limit for the SRBP. The limiting process is a Brownian motion, with non-trivially renormalised diffusion constant.

1.3.3 Scaling limits: the supercritical case

Super-critical SPDEs are characterised by the fact that, under scaling, the non-linearity is irrelevant at large scales. For instance, rescaling the stochastic Burgers equation diffusively, the non-linearity is multiplied by $\varepsilon^{d/2-1}$, which formally vanishes in the large-scale limit. Therefore, it is expected that the large-scale limit of the equation is diffusive, without having to scale to zero “by hand” the non-linearity, as is done in dimension $d = 2$ in the weak-coupling limit. In the context of interacting particle systems and of diffusions in divergence-free random environment, Gaussian scaling limits in dimension $d \geq 3$ have been proven in a series of works, see e.g. [CLO01, LOY04, HTV12], see also [KLO12] for further references. On the other hand, analogous results were not known in the SPDE setting. Our work [CGT24] fills in part this gap, by proving that the SBE in dimension $d \geq 3$ converges on large scales, under diffusive rescaling, to the stochastic heat equation with additive noise, with non-trivially renormalized Laplacian and noise. See Theorem 2.3 below for a precise statement. In particular, the limit Laplacian is not rotationally invariant, since it contains a term $(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2$ that preserves a trace of the non-linearity of the SBE. In other words, while formally the non-linearity vanishes proportionally to $\varepsilon^{d/2-1}$, it survives in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, in the form of a finite correction to the linear part of the equation.

1.4 Some related works

Let us mention that the study of large-scale Gaussian fluctuations of space-time random fields with local, non-linear, random dynamics is not restricted the context of SPDEs but is a classical topic in probability theory and mathematical physics. From the more general point of view of theoretical physics, large-scale Gaussian fluctuations are expected for equilibrium diffusive systems above their critical dimension and this belief is informally explained via (non-rigorous) Renormalization Group (RG) arguments and effective dynamical field theories.

On the other hand, establishing large-scale Gaussian fluctuations for *dynamical* problems has proven to be challenging and we are not aware of general results in this direction. A lot of attention has been recently devoted to the (Isotropic) KPZ equation in dimension $d \geq 2$, with non-linearity $|\nabla h|^2$, corresponding to the

matrix Q discussed after (1.2) being the $d \times d$ identity. The specific choice $Q = I$ plays a crucial role. Indeed, in this case one can use the Cole–Hopf transformation to linearise the SPDE and turn it into a *linear* multiplicative stochastic heat equation or the associated directed-polymer model. The latter model possesses an “explicit” representation (via, e.g., Feynman-Kac formula) and one can then leverage Malliavin calculus tools to derive the scaling limit (see [DGRZ21, GRZ18b] for the multiplicative stochastic heat equation and [GRZ18a, CCM20, LZ22, CNN20] for KPZ). In this context, let us mention the recent striking results on the fluctuations of KPZ at the critical dimension $d = 2$ in the weak coupling scaling (or the intermediate disorder regime) starting with [CD20, CSZ20, Gu20] (for KPZ) and culminating with the characterisation of the stochastic heat flow [CSZ23]. Let us mention also the recent [DG22], that studies the weak coupling limit of a non-linear multiplicative stochastic heat equation. An alternative approach is that used in [MU18], which is based on re-expressing the SPDE as a functional integral via the Martin–Siggia–Rose formalism (essentially a Girsanov transformation, which again is only possible in view of the specific form of the equation) and then leveraging constructive quantum field theory techniques and RG ideas to control the large scale fluctuations in the regime of small non-linearity.

Organization of the lecture notes

In Section 2 we will precisely formulate the stochastic Burgers equation, state the main result from [CGT24] (Gaussian large-scale limit in dimension $d \geq 3$ and in dimension $d = 2$ in the weak coupling scaling) and outline the ideas behind our arguments. Section 3 introduces the main general tools we need: Wiener-chaos analysis, the Itô trick, a priori estimates. Section 4 explains the high-level structure of the proof of the scaling limits (tightness and identification of the limit), and reduces the main statement to the proof of the so-called Fluctuation-Dissipation Theorem (FDT). Finally, Section 5 gives the main ideas behind the proof of the FDT: the so-called *Replacement Lemma* for $d = 2$ and the path expansion of the resolvent for $d \geq 3$. Some open problems are discussed in Section 2.1.

2 The equation and main result

As already mentioned, we will focus on the $d \geq 2$ -dimensional Burgers equation from now on. As written, the SPDE (1.1) is meaningless as the noise is too irregular for the non-linearity to be well-defined. Nonetheless, as we are interested in the large-scale behaviour, we regularise it, so to have a well-defined field at the microscopic level, and our goal then becomes to control its fluctuations while zooming out at the correct scale. We choose the regularisation in such a way to retain a fundamental property of the solution, namely its (formal) invariant measure. This amounts to smoothening the quadratic term via a Fourier cut-off as follows

$$\partial_t \eta = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \eta + \mathfrak{w} \cdot \Pi_1 \nabla (\Pi_1 \eta)^2 + (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi, \quad (2.1)$$

where for $a > 0$, Π_a acts in Fourier space as

$$\widehat{\Pi_a \eta}(k) = \widehat{\eta}(k) 1_{|k| \leq a}. \quad (2.2)$$

Without loss of generality, we also replaced $\operatorname{div} \xi$ in (1.1) with $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi$ for ξ a space-time white noise (see (2.16) for the definition of the fractional Laplacian), since the two can be easily seen to have the same law. In order to avoid technicalities related to infinite volume issues, we restrict (2.1) to the d -dimensional torus \mathbb{T}_ε^d of side-length $2\pi/\varepsilon$. Here, ε is the ‘‘scale’’ parameter which will later be sent to 0.

Remark 2.1 In principle, the results below can be shown to hold using the same techniques of the present paper, even if instead of the Fourier cut-off we used a more general mollifier. This would correspond to taking the nonlinearity in (2.1) as $\mathfrak{w} \cdot \varrho * \nabla(\varrho * \eta)^2$, for ϱ (smooth) radially symmetric function decaying at infinity sufficiently fast, which means replacing the indicator function in (2.2) with $\widehat{\varrho}$. For definiteness, we stick to Π_1 . In [CGT24], to simplify some (minor but annoying) technical points, it was further assumed that

- for $d \geq 3$, $1/\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N} + \frac{1}{2}$ and that the norm in (2.2) is the sup-norm $|\cdot|_\infty$,
- for $d = 2$, the norm in (2.2) is the Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$ (no further assumption on ε is made).

In the present informal lecture notes, these details will play no role.

Note that via the diffusive rescaling

$$\eta^\varepsilon(x, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \eta(x/\varepsilon, t/\varepsilon^2), \quad (2.3)$$

equation (2.1) becomes

$$\partial_t \eta^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \eta^\varepsilon + \lambda_\varepsilon \mathfrak{w} \cdot \Pi_{1/\varepsilon} \nabla (\Pi_{1/\varepsilon} \eta^\varepsilon)^2 + (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi \quad (2.4)$$

where now the spatial variable takes values in the d -dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{T}_1^d$ of side-length 2π , and ξ is a space-time white noise on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T}^d$. The coefficient λ_ε depends on the dimension and is defined as

$$\lambda_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log \varepsilon^{-2}}} & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}-1} & \text{if } d \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

While in the super-critical case $d \geq 3$, λ_ε is directly determined by (2.3), for $d = 2$, (1.1) is formally scale invariant under the diffusive scaling (another reason why such dimension is critical) so that one would have $\lambda_\varepsilon = 1$. The choice made in (2.5) corresponds to the so-called *weak coupling* scaling alluded to earlier and we will comment more on it after we state the main result. Before doing so, let us give the notion of solution for (2.4) we will be working with.

Definition 2.2 We say that η^ε is a stationary solution to (2.4) with coupling constant λ_ε if η^ε solves (2.4) and its initial condition is $\eta(0, \cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu$, for μ a spatial white noise on \mathbb{T}^d , i.e. a mean zero Gaussian distribution on \mathbb{T}^d such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu(\varphi)\mu(\psi)] = \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2}, \quad \text{for all real } \varphi, \psi \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \quad (2.6)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$ is the usual scalar product in $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is the space of zero-average square integrable functions on \mathbb{T}^d . We will denote by \mathbb{P} the law of μ and by \mathbb{E} the corresponding expectation.

The reason why the solution η^ε of (2.4) started from a spatial white noise is called *stationary* is that \mathbb{P} is its invariant measure and, as we will prove in Lemma 3.3 below, this holds irrespective of the choice of $\mathfrak{w}, \varepsilon$. Instead, the law \mathbf{P} (with corresponding expectation \mathbf{E}) of a stationary solution to (2.4) clearly depends on $\mathfrak{w}, \varepsilon$.

For $T > 0$, let us denote by $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$ the space of continuous functions with values in the space of distributions $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and by \mathcal{F} the Fourier transform on $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (see (2.13) for a definition). We are now ready to state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2.3 *Let $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $T > 0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let λ_ε be defined according to (2.5) and η^ε be the stationary solution of (2.4) started from a spatial white noise μ . Then, there exists a constant $D_{\text{SHE}} > 0$, depending only on the dimension d and the norm $|\mathfrak{w}|$ of \mathfrak{w} , such that, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, η^ε converges in law in $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$ to the unique stationary solution η of*

$$\partial_t \eta = \frac{1}{2}(\Delta + D_{\text{SHE}}(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2)\eta + (-\Delta - D_{\text{SHE}}(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi, \quad \eta(0, \cdot) = \mu, \quad (2.7)$$

where $(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2$ is the linear operator defined as $\mathcal{F}((\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2 \varphi)(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -(\mathfrak{w} \cdot k)^2 \mathcal{F}(\varphi)(k)$, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

In the case $d = 2$, D_{SHE} is explicit and given by the formula

$$D_{\text{SHE}} = \frac{1}{|\mathfrak{w}|^2} \left[\left(\frac{3|\mathfrak{w}|^2}{2\pi} + 1 \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} - 1 \right], \quad (2.8)$$

$|\mathfrak{w}|$ being the Euclidean norm of \mathfrak{w} .

We will let

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2, \quad \mathcal{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\text{SHE}} \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}. \quad (2.9)$$

Before proceeding to the proof of the above theorem, let us make a few comments on its statement and on the choice of λ_ε in (2.5). Notice that in any dimension $d \geq 2$, the constant D_{SHE} appearing in the limiting equation is *strictly* positive. Hence, despite the presence of the vanishing factor λ_ε in front of the nonlinearity,

not only the quadratic term does not go to 0 but actually produces a new ‘‘Laplacian’’ and a new noise. Further, this new Laplacian (and noise), in a sense, ‘‘feels’’ the small-scale behaviour of the field η in (2.1) as it depends on the vector \mathfrak{w} , which in turn describes its microscopic dynamics. A similar phenomenon has already been observed for other critical and super-critical SPDEs, even though we are not aware of examples in which a Laplacian of the form above was derived.

We have already pointed out that in $d = 2$ (1.1) is formally scale invariant. That said, the above mentioned result in [Yau04] for ASEP suggests that also (2.1) is logarithmically superdiffusive and the additional diffusivity can only come from the non-linear term. What the previous theorem shows is that the choice in (2.5) guarantees that the nonlinearity ultimately gives a non-vanishing order 1 contribution. What might appear puzzling is that, by translating the result of Yau to (2.4), the diffusivity $D^\varepsilon(t)$ of the scaled process grows as $|\log \varepsilon|^{2/3}$ so that one might be led to think that λ_ε should be chosen accordingly as $|\log \varepsilon|^{-2/3}$. While this is not the case, the expression in (2.8) formally implies the result of Yau, as can be seen by taking $\mathfrak{w} = \mathfrak{w}_\varepsilon$ such that $|\mathfrak{w}_\varepsilon| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}$, so that

$$D_{\text{SHE}}(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2 \approx \left(\frac{3|\log \varepsilon|}{2\pi} \right)^{2/3} (\hat{\mathfrak{w}} \cdot \nabla)^2$$

and $\hat{\mathfrak{w}}$ is the unit vector parallel to \mathfrak{w} .

Furthermore, a similar scaling has been considered in the critical dimension $d = 2$ in the context of the KPZ equation [CD20, CSZ20, Gu20, CSZ23], of the Anisotropic KPZ equation [CES21, CET23b] and of the stochastic Navier–Stokes equation [CK23]. What is interesting is that, even though these latter examples in principle have different large scale diffusivity, i.e., $D(t) \sim t^\beta$ for some $\beta > 0$ [FT90] for KPZ, $D(t) \sim \sqrt{\log t}$ for AKPZ and Navier–Stokes [CET23a, WAG71], they all display *non-trivial* (in that the non-linearity nontrivially contributes to the limit) *Gaussian fluctuations* under the same weak coupling scaling $\lambda_\varepsilon = |\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, thus suggesting some sort of universality for it. This is to be compared with the one-dimensional case, in which, setting $\lambda_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, one recovers the so-called *weakly asymmetric* scaling under which convergence of ASEP to the one-dimensional KPZ equation was first shown in [BG97] and since then for a wide variety of models.

2.1 Open problems

Our results raise several interesting questions, as

- obtain Gaussian fluctuations for (1.1) in the case of more general non-linearity, i.e. $\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla \eta^2$ replaced by $\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla F(\eta)$, for instance for polynomial F . The main difficulty is to obtain operator estimates similar to those of Lemma 3.8, which though seem highly non-trivial.
- Prove the analog of Theorem 2.3 (for $d = 2$) for ASEP on \mathbb{Z}^2 in the same limit of weak asymmetry.
- In dimension $d = 2$, define $\tilde{\eta}^\varepsilon(x, t) = \varepsilon^{-1} \eta(x/\varepsilon, t/(\varepsilon^2 \tau(\varepsilon)))$ (to be compared with (2.3)) and find the right correction $\tau(\varepsilon)$ to the diffusive scaling so that a

non-trivial scaling limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ exists. This corresponds to a *strong coupling regime*. On the basis of [Yau04], the natural guess is $\tau(\varepsilon) = |\log \varepsilon|^{2/3}$ but the identification of the limit is hard as the regularising properties of the Laplacian vanish.

More challenging will be to move towards models for which the invariant measure is non-Gaussian or non-explicit. One guiding heuristic could be that the limiting Gaussian fluctuations and associated Gaussian stationary distribution could still provide a good setting for the analysis.

2.2 Idea of the proof

The idea of the proof finds its roots in the approach detailed in [KLO12] in the context of interacting particle systems. To summarise it and see how it translates to the present context, let us consider the weak formulation of (2.4) started from a spatial white noise μ , which, for a given test function φ , reads

$$\eta_t^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \mu(\varphi) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \eta_s^\varepsilon(\Delta\varphi) ds - \int_0^t \mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds = M_t(\varphi) \quad (2.10)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon$ stands for the nonlinearity tested against φ and M is the martingale associated to the space-time white noise ξ . Now, upon assuming the sequence $\{\eta^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ to be tight in the space $C([0, T]\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$, we see that all the terms in the above expression converge (at least along subsequences) but we have no information concerning the nonlinearity. For Theorem 2.3 to be true, we need this latter term to produce both a *dissipation* term of the form $\eta(\mathcal{D}\varphi)$, with $\mathcal{D} = \frac{1}{2} D_{SHE}(\mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)^2$ defined in (2.9), and a *fluctuation* part which should encode the additional noise in (2.7). (See Theorem 4.4 below about the well-posedness of the martingale problem associated to the limit equation (2.7)). In other words, the problem is to identify a *fluctuation-dissipation* relation [LY97], i.e. to determine $D_{SHE} > 0$ and \mathcal{W}^ε such that

$$\mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta^\varepsilon) = -\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon \mathcal{W}^\varepsilon(\eta^\varepsilon) + \eta^\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}\varphi) \quad (2.11)$$

where \mathcal{L}^ε is the generator of η^ε . Indeed, since by Dynkin's formula, there exists a martingale $\mathcal{M}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\mathcal{W}^\varepsilon(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{W}^\varepsilon(\mu) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon \mathcal{W}^\varepsilon(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds = \mathcal{M}_t^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^\varepsilon),$$

given (2.11), we could rewrite the nonlinear term in (2.10) as

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds = \int_0^t \eta_s^\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}\varphi) ds - \mathcal{M}_t^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^\varepsilon) + o(1), \quad (2.12)$$

where $o(1)$ is a vanishing summand which contains the boundary terms. The advantage of the above is that we have expressed the nonlinearity in terms of a drift which captures the additional diffusivity and a martingale part which instead encodes the extra noise. At this point, tightness would ensure convergence of the

former and we would be left to prove that the sequence $\mathcal{M}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^\varepsilon)$ converges to a martingale with the correct quadratic variation.

The (hardest) problem is clearly the derivation of the fluctuation-dissipation relation and this is the point from which our analysis departs from that in [KLO12]. Even though, as we will see, it is enough to determine (2.11) approximately (i.e. that the difference of left and right hand side is small in a suitable sense), in the equation there are two unknowns, D_{SHE} which is *not* apriori given to us, and \mathcal{W}^ε which, even if we were given the previous, is the solution of an infinite dimensional equation. To separate the two issues, we introduce a suitable truncation which removes the second summand from the right hand side of (2.11), so that we can first solve for \mathcal{W}^ε and then project back and determine $\mathcal{D} = D_{\text{SHE}}\mathcal{L}_0^\text{tr}$. This is done in $d \geq 3$ and $d = 2$ in very different ways. In the former case, we will control \mathcal{W}^ε similarly to [LY97], as we can show it satisfies a graded sector condition in the spirit of [KLO12, Section 2.7.4]. Nonetheless, their functional analytic approach does not apply in our setting and in particular, for the identification of D_{SHE} and \mathcal{L}_0^tr , we devise a new method which is detailed in Section 5.2. For $d = 2$ instead, we introduce a novel Ansatz which is based on the idea that at large scales the generator of η^ε should approximate a *modulated version* of the generator of (2.7). This Ansatz simplifies dramatically the (iterative) analysis performed in [CET23b] and is heavily based on the Replacement Lemma in Section 5.1.

Notations and function spaces

We let \mathbb{T}^d be the d -dimensional torus of side length 2π . We denote by $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ the Fourier basis defined via $e_k(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} e^{ik \cdot x}$ which, for all $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, satisfies $\langle e_k, e_j \rangle_{L^2} = \mathbb{1}_{k=j}$, where the scalar product at the right hand side is the usual complex scalar product.

The Fourier transform of a function $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\varphi)$ or $\hat{\varphi}$ and, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is given by the formula

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi)(k) = \hat{\varphi}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \varphi, e_k \rangle_{L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varphi(x) e_{-k}(x) dx, \quad (2.13)$$

so that in particular

$$\varphi = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{\varphi}(k) e_k, \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{T}^d). \quad (2.14)$$

Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be the space of smooth real-valued functions on \mathbb{T}^d and $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the space of real-valued distributions given by the dual of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. For any $\eta \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we will denote its Fourier transform by

$$\hat{\eta}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \eta(e_{-k}) = \eta(\text{Re}(e_{-k})) + \nu \eta(\text{Im}(e_{-k})). \quad (2.15)$$

Note that $\overline{\hat{\eta}(k)} = \hat{\eta}(-k)$. Since the zero mode $\hat{\eta}(0)$ of the solution of the Burgers equation is constant in time we will set it to be 0, and therefore we will only care

about $\hat{\eta}(k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$. Moreover, we recall that the Laplacian Δ on \mathbb{T}^d has eigenfunctions $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ with eigenvalues $\{-|k|^2 : k \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$, so that the operator $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is defined by its action on the basis elements

$$(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} e_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |k| e_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (2.16)$$

In particular, $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is an invertible linear bijection on distributions with null 0-th Fourier mode. We denote by $H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the space of mean-zero functions φ such that the norm

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^1}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d} |k|^2 |\hat{\varphi}(k)|^2$$

is finite.

Throughout the notes, we will write $a \lesssim b$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $a \leq Cb$. We will adopt the previous notations only in case in which the hidden constants do not depend on any quantity which is relevant for the result. When we write \lesssim_T for some quantity T , it means that the constant C implicit in the bound depends on T .

3 The main tools: Chaos decomposition and the generator

In this section, we introduce the main technical tools we will use in our analysis. More specifically, we will first recall a few elements of Wiener-space analysis following the classical book of Nualart [Nua06]. Then, we will derive the generator of (2.4) and provide some preliminary estimates on its action over suitable observables.

3.1 A primer on Wiener-chaos analysis

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and η be a mean-zero spatial white noise on the d -dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^d , i.e. η is a Gaussian field with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta(\varphi)\eta(\psi)] = \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2} \quad (3.1)$$

where $\varphi, \psi \in H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the space of square-integrable functions with 0 total mass, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$ is the usual scalar product in $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

Wiener-chaos decomposition. In the language of [Nua06, Ch. 1], the process $\eta = \{\eta(\varphi) : \varphi \in H\}$ is an isonormal Gaussian process. One of the advantages of working with isonormal Gaussian processes is that the space of square integrable random variables with respect to their law \mathbb{P} , i.e. the space $L^2(\Omega) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, admits an orthogonal decomposition in terms of the so-called homogeneous Wiener chaoses $(\mathcal{H}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{H}_n is the closed linear subspace of $L^2(\Omega)$ generated by the random variables $\{H_n(\eta(\varphi)) : \varphi \in H\}$ where H_n is the Hermite polynomial of order n defined according to

$$H_n(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^n e^{\frac{x^2}{2}} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}.$$

As can be readily checked, the Hermite polynomials and the corresponding homogeneous chaoses for $n = 0, 1, 2$ are

$$\begin{aligned} n = 0 & \quad H_0(x) = 1, & \quad \mathcal{H}_0 &= \mathbb{R} \\ n = 1 & \quad H_1(x) = x, & \quad \mathcal{H}_1 &= \text{span}\{\eta(\varphi) : \varphi \in H\} \\ n = 2 & \quad H_2(x) = x^2 - 1, & \quad \mathcal{H}_2 &= \text{span}\{\eta(\varphi)^2 - \|\varphi\|^2 : \varphi \in H\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

What [Nua06, Theorem 1.1.1] tells us is that whenever $m \neq n$, \mathcal{H}_n and \mathcal{H}_m are orthogonal, i.e. if $X \in \mathcal{H}_m$ and $Y \in \mathcal{H}_n$ then $\mathbb{E}[XY] = 0$, and

$$L^2(\Omega) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}_n.$$

Gaussian Hypercontractivity. There is another property which makes the Wiener-chaos analysis particularly convenient, namely Gaussian hypercontractivity. It states that, for random variables in a fixed chaos, all moments are equivalent, which is to say that $\mathcal{H}_n \subset \bigcap_{p \in (0, \infty)} L^p(\Omega)$. More precisely, (see [Jan97, Theorem 5.10]), for every $p, q \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a constant $C = C(p, q) > 0$ such that for all $X \in \mathcal{H}_n$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|X|^q]^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C^n \mathbb{E}[|X|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (3.3)$$

We will use (3.3) in the form of a reversed Jensen's inequality, i.e. for $q \leq p$. In other words, Gaussian hypercontractivity allows to bound higher moments of random variables in a given chaos in terms of its lower ones, thus being an extremely useful tool when it comes to apply Kolmogorov's type criterion (and consequently prove tightness), see Sections 3.4 and 4.1. Clearly, for this to be possible there is a price to pay, namely the constant C^n appearing at the right hand side. According to [Jan97, Remark 5.11], $C(2, q) = \sqrt{q-1}$ so that for $q > 2$ the bound worsens exponentially in n . That said, we will mainly use (3.3) at fixed n .

From Wiener-chaos to Fock spaces. From the expressions at the right hand side (3.2), it is then not hard to believe that we can be associate each element in \mathcal{H}_n to an element in the n -th Fock space $\Gamma L_n^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_{\text{sym}}^2((\mathbb{T}^d)^n)$, the latter being the space of functions in $L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^{dn})$ which are symmetric with respect to permutation of variables. To continue with the example in (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} n = 0 & \quad \Gamma L_0^2 = \mathbb{R} \\ n = 1 & \quad \Gamma L_1^2 = \text{span}\{\varphi : \varphi \in H\} = H \\ n = 2 & \quad \Gamma L_2^2 = \text{span}\{\varphi \otimes \varphi - \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 : \varphi \in H\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Setting $\Gamma L^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \Gamma L_n^2$, it can be rigorously shown (see [Nua06, Eq. (1.9)]) that there exists an isomorphism $I : \Gamma L^2 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ whose restriction I_n to ΓL_n^2 is itself an isomorphism onto \mathcal{H}_n . By [Nua06, Theorem 1.1.2], for every $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ there exists a family of kernels $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Gamma L^2$ such that $F = \sum_{n \geq 0} I_n(f_n)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[F^2] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|F\|^2 = \sum_{n \geq 0} n! \|f_n\|_{L_n^2}^2 \quad (3.5)$$

where $L_n^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L^2((\mathbb{T}^d)^n)$, and we take the right hand side as the definition of the scalar product on ΓL^2 , i.e.

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{n \geq 0} \langle f_n, g_n \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n \geq 0} n! \langle f_n, g_n \rangle_{L_n^2}. \quad (3.6)$$

In particular, (3.5) shows that I (and I_n) is an isometry between $(\Gamma L^2, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ (resp. $(\Gamma L_n^2, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$) and $(L^2(\Omega), \mathbb{E}[\cdot])$ (resp. $(\mathcal{H}_n, \mathbb{E}[\cdot])$).

Remark 3.1 In view of the isometry between ΓL^2 and $L^2(\Omega)$, throughout the paper, we will abuse notation and denote with the same symbol operators acting on ΓL^2 and their composition with the isometry I , which is an operator acting on $L^2(\Omega)$. More precisely, if $\mathcal{H}_n \ni F_n = I_n(f_n)$ and $\mathcal{O} = (\mathcal{O}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is an operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{O}_n: \mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \Gamma L^2$, then we will write $\mathcal{O}F = \mathcal{O}_n I_n(f_n) = I(\mathcal{O}_n f_n)$.

Malliavin Derivative. Let us introduce the notion of Malliavin derivative [Nua06, Definition 1.2.1]. Let F be a cylinder random variable, i.e. $F(\eta) = f(\eta(\varphi_1), \dots, \eta(\varphi_n))$ with $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth and growing at most polynomially at infinity, and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in H$. We define the Malliavin derivative of F as the element $DF \in L^2(\Omega, H)$ given by

$$DF(\eta)(\cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i f(\eta(\varphi_1), \dots, \eta(\varphi_n)) \varphi_i(\cdot) \quad (3.7)$$

and, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d$, denote its Fourier transform by

$$D_k F(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{F}(DF(v))(k) = \langle DF, e_k \rangle_{L^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

Note that by definition, if $F \in \mathcal{H}_n$ then $DF \in \mathcal{H}_{n-1}$.

Remark 3.2 In what follows we will often use the Malliavin derivative on random variables which depend explicitly on finitely many Fourier modes of η , i.e. on finite subsets of $\{\hat{\eta}(k) = \eta(e_{-k}) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d\}$ (see (2.15)). For $F = f(\hat{\eta}(k_1), \dots, \hat{\eta}(k_n))$, one should think of $D_k F$ as

$$D_k F = (\partial_{x_k} f)(\hat{\eta}(k_1), \dots, \hat{\eta}(k_n)). \quad (3.9)$$

To see this, let us consider for example $F = \hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2) - \mathbb{1}_{k_1 \neq -k_2}$. Assume for simplicity that $k_1 \neq -k_2$ so that $\mathbb{1}_{k_1 \neq -k_2} = 0$. From (2.15), upon writing $e_k(x) = \cos(k \cdot x) + \iota \sin(k \cdot x) = c_k(x) + \iota s_k(x)$, we have

$$F = \eta(c_{-k_1})\eta(c_{-k_2}) - \eta(s_{-k_1})\eta(s_{-k_2}) + \iota(\eta(c_{-k_1})\eta(s_{-k_2}) + \eta(s_{-k_1})\eta(c_{-k_2}))$$

which means that, extending D by linearity, DF is given by

$$\begin{aligned} DF &= \eta(c_{-k_2})c_{-k_1} + \eta(c_{-k_1})c_{-k_2} - \eta(s_{-k_2})s_{-k_1} - \eta(s_{-k_1})s_{-k_2} \\ &\quad + \iota[\eta(s_{-k_2})c_{-k_1} + \eta(c_{-k_1})s_{-k_2} + \eta(c_{-k_2})s_{-k_1} + \eta(s_{-k_1})c_{-k_2}] \\ &= \eta(c_{-k_2})e_{-k_1} + \eta(c_{-k_1})e_{-k_2} + \iota[\eta(s_{-k_2})e_{-k_1} + \eta(s_{-k_1})e_{-k_2}] \\ &= \eta(e_{-k_2})e_{-k_1} + \eta(e_{-k_1})e_{-k_2} = \hat{\eta}(k_2)e_{-k_1} + \hat{\eta}(k_1)e_{-k_2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

from which the claim follows upon computing $D_k F$ as in (3.8).

Integration by Parts. We conclude this section by recalling the following integration by parts formula on Wiener space. Thanks to [Nuao6, Lemma 1.2.2], this is

$$\mathbb{E}[GD_k F] = \mathbb{E}[G\langle DF, e_k \rangle_{L^2}] = \mathbb{E}[-FD_k G + FG\hat{\eta}(k)]. \quad (3.11)$$

As an illustration of how to apply it, consider $F = f(\eta(\varphi_1), \dots, \eta(\varphi_n))$ as above and $G = \hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2) - \mathbf{1}_{k_1=-k_2}$, with $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d$ (so that $G \in \mathcal{H}_2$). Assume, as above, that $k_1 \neq -k_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2)D_{-k_1-k_2}F(\eta)] &= \mathbb{E}[GD_{-k_1-k_2}F] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[-FD_{-k_1-k_2}G + FG\hat{\eta}(-k_1-k_2)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[-FD_{-k_1-k_2}\hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2) + F\hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2)\hat{\eta}(-k_1-k_2)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F\hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2)\hat{\eta}(-k_1-k_2)] \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where in the last step we used that neither k_1 nor k_2 equals $k_1 + k_2$, so that by (3.10) $D_{-k_1-k_2}G = D_{-k_1-k_2}\hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2) = 0$.

3.2 The equation, its generator

In this section, we want to derive a number of properties of the solution to the (rescaled) Burgers equation, such as its Markovianity, the structure of its generator and how the latter acts on the Fock space ΓL^2 . Let us first write (2.4) in its weak formulation. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $t \geq 0$, it reads

$$\eta_t^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \eta_0^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \eta_s^\varepsilon(\Delta\varphi) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds + \int_0^t \xi(ds, (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi) \quad (3.13)$$

where η_0^ε is the initial condition, ξ is a space-time white noise so that

$$\xi(dt, (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d} |k| \hat{\varphi}(k) dB_t(k) \quad (3.14)$$

for $B(k) = \int_0^t \xi(ds, e_{-k})$ complex valued Brownian motions satisfying $\overline{B(k)} = B(-k)$ and $\mathbf{E}[B_t(k)B_s(\ell)] = (t \wedge s)\langle e_k, e_{-\ell} \rangle_{L^2} = (t \wedge s)\mathbf{1}_{k=-\ell}$, and $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta)$ is the nonlinearity tested against φ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda_\varepsilon \mathbf{w} \cdot \Pi_{1/\varepsilon} \nabla (\Pi_{1/\varepsilon} \eta)^2(\varphi) \\ &= \frac{\iota}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{\ell, m} \mathbb{J}_{\ell, m}^\varepsilon \mathbf{w} \cdot (\ell + m) \hat{\varphi}(-\ell - m) \hat{\eta}(\ell) \hat{\eta}(m) \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

with $\iota = \sqrt{-1}$ and

$$\mathbb{J}_{\ell, m}^\varepsilon = \mathbf{1}\{0 < \varepsilon|\ell|_\infty \leq 1, 0 < \varepsilon|m|_\infty \leq 1, 0 < \varepsilon|\ell + m|_\infty \leq 1\}. \quad (3.16)$$

In accordance with Remark 2.1, for $d = 2$ the sup-norm $|\cdot|_\infty$ in (3.16) is replaced by the Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$ instead.

Lemma 3.3 *For every deterministic initial condition η_0 , the solution $t \mapsto \eta_t^\varepsilon$ of (3.13) is a strong Markov process which exists globally in time. The generator \mathcal{L}^ε of η^ε can be written as $\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon$ where the action of \mathcal{L}_0 and \mathcal{A}^ε on smooth cylinder functions F is given by*

$$(\mathcal{L}_0 F)(\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d} |k|^2 (-\hat{\eta}(-k) D_k + D_{-k} D_k) F(\eta) \quad (3.17)$$

$$(\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon F)(\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\iota}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{m, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d} \mathbb{J}_{\ell, m}^\varepsilon \mathbf{w} \cdot (\ell + m) \hat{\eta}(m) \hat{\eta}(\ell) D_{-m-\ell} F(\eta). \quad (3.18)$$

Moreover, the law \mathbb{P} of the average-zero space white noise is stationary for η^ε and \mathcal{L}_0 and \mathcal{A}^ε are respectively symmetric and skew-symmetric with respect to \mathbb{P} .

Proof. Very similar arguments were provided in a number of references for equations which share features similar to those of (3.13), e.g. [CES21, GJ13] and, more comprehensively, [Gub19], so we will limit ourselves to sketch some of the proofs.

Strong Markov property and global in time existence. Concerning the strong Markov property, note that, by writing the time derivative of (3.13) in Fourier variables, i.e. taking $\varphi = e_{-k}$, we obtain

$$d\hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k) = \left(-\frac{1}{2} |k|^2 \hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k) + \mathcal{N}_{e_{-k}}^\varepsilon(\eta_t^\varepsilon) \right) dt + |k| dB_t(k).$$

Note that, thanks to the regularisation $\mathbb{J}_{\cdot, \cdot}^\varepsilon$ in (3.16), $\mathcal{N}_{e_{-k}}^\varepsilon(\eta^\varepsilon) = 0$ for every $|k| \geq \varepsilon^{-1}$, so that $\{\hat{\eta}^\varepsilon(k) : |k| \geq \varepsilon^{-1}\}$, evolve like independent (and ε -independent) Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, which are clearly strong Markov and exist for all times. Instead, $\{\hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k) : |k| < \varepsilon^{-1}\}$ forms a finite dimensional system of SDEs, which are strong Markov up to a possibly random explosion time τ . To see that $\tau = \infty$, one can argue as in [GJ13, Section 4] (see also [GP15, Section 2.7]). This amounts to apply Itô's formula to the $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ norm of $\{\hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k) : |k| < \varepsilon^{-1}\}$ given by $A^\varepsilon(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{|k| < \varepsilon^{-1}} |\hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k)|^2$, and get

$$\begin{aligned} dA^\varepsilon(t) &= \left(- \sum_{|k| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |k|^2 |\hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k)|^2 + \sum_{|k| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} \mathcal{N}_{e_{-k}}^\varepsilon(\eta_t^\varepsilon) \hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(-k) + C_\varepsilon \right) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{|k| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |k| \hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k) dB_t(k) \end{aligned}$$

where $C_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|k| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |k|^2 \leq \varepsilon^{-2-d}$. Now, the first term on the right hand side is non-positive, and, more importantly, the second vanishes since for any $\eta \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|k| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} \mathcal{N}_{e_{-k}}^\varepsilon(\eta) \hat{\eta}(-k) &= \mathcal{N}_\eta^\varepsilon(\eta) = \lambda_\varepsilon \langle \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla (\Pi_{1/\varepsilon} \eta)^2, (\Pi_{1/\varepsilon} \eta) \rangle \\ &= \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon}{3} \langle \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla (\Pi_{1/\varepsilon} \eta)^3, 1 \rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Therefore,

$$A^\varepsilon(t)^2 \lesssim A^\varepsilon(0)^2 + C_\varepsilon^2 t^2 + M^\varepsilon(t)^2, \quad M^\varepsilon(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^t \sum_{|k| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |k| \hat{\eta}_s^\varepsilon(k) dB_s(k).$$

Moreover, M^ε is a martingale so that, by definition of quadratic variation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} A^\varepsilon(t)^2 \right] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[A^\varepsilon(0)^2] + T^2 C_\varepsilon^2 + \mathbf{E} \left[\langle M^\varepsilon(\cdot) \rangle_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[A^\varepsilon(0)^2] + T^2 C_\varepsilon^2 + \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^T \sum_{|k| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |k|^2 |\hat{\eta}_t^\varepsilon(k)|^2 dt \right] \\ &\leq T^2 C_\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} \int_0^T \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} A^\varepsilon(s) \right] dt \\ &\leq T^2 C_\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} \int_0^T \mathbf{E} \left[1 + \sup_{s \in [0, t]} A^\varepsilon(s)^2 \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

An application of Gronwall's lemma then gives the result.

The generator. The formulas (3.17) and (3.18) can be easily deduced by applying Itô's formula to a cylinder random variable $F(\eta_t) = f(\eta_t(\varphi_1), \dots, \eta_t(\varphi_n))$, singling out the drift part and writing the resulting expressions in Fourier variables. A similar procedure can be found in [GP20, Section 2.1] (or, for \mathcal{L}_0 , in [Gub19, Section 2.3]) for the one-dimensional version of (1.1).

Invariance and Symmetry. According to Echeverría's criterion in [Ech82], invariance of \mathbb{P} follows provided we can show that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon F] = 0$ for all cylinder F which in turn is implied by the symmetry properties of \mathcal{L}_0^N and \mathcal{A}^ε . Indeed, Assume \mathcal{L}_0 is symmetric and \mathcal{A}^ε skew-symmetric. Then, setting $\mathbf{1}$ to be the random variable constantly equal to 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon F] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1} \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon F] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1} \mathcal{L}_0 F] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1} \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon F] = \mathbb{E}[F \mathcal{L}_0 \mathbf{1}] - \mathbb{E}[F \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon \mathbf{1}]$$

and since $\mathcal{L}_0 \mathbf{1} = 0 = \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon \mathbf{1}$ as $D\mathbf{1} = 0$, the claim follows. Therefore we are left to prove that \mathcal{L}_0 is symmetric and \mathcal{A}^ε skew-symmetric. Let F and G be cylinder functions. By Gaussian Integration by parts (3.11), we immediately have

$$\mathbb{E}[D_{-k} D_k F(\eta) G(\eta)] = \mathbb{E}[D_k F(\eta) G(\eta) \eta_{-k}] - \mathbb{E}[D_k F(\eta) D_{-k} G(\eta)] \quad (3.20)$$

from which we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_0 F(\eta) G(\eta)] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} |k|^2 \mathbb{E}[D_k F(\eta) D_{-k} G(\eta)],$$

and the latter is clearly symmetric. For \mathcal{A}^ε instead, we apply once again (3.11) (see (3.12) for the case in which $G = 1$) and get

$$\mathbb{E}[G \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon F] = -\mathbb{E}[F \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon G]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\iota\lambda_\varepsilon}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \sum_{m,\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \mathbf{w} \cdot (\ell + m) \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{\eta}(-\ell - m) \hat{\eta}(m) \hat{\eta}(\ell) F(\eta) G(\eta) \right] \\
& = -\mathbb{E}[F \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon G] + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{N}_\eta^\varepsilon(\eta) F(\eta) G(\eta) \right] = -\mathbb{E}[F \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon G]
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows by (3.15). Hence, the proof is completed. \square

Remark 3.4 There is also an intuitive explanation as to why the law of the white noise is stationary for the stochastic Burgers equation. In fact, recall that for the Asymmetric Simple Exclusion Process, the product Bernoulli measure $\otimes_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \pi_x(\varrho)$ is stationary for any particle density ϱ , and its scaling limit (after recentering) is just white noise.

Next, we want to determine the action of \mathcal{L}_0 and \mathcal{A}^ε on the Fock space ΓL^2 . To lighten notations, for a set of integers I , we will denote by k_I the vector $(k_i)_{i \in I}$ and

$$|k_I|^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in I} |k_i|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad k_{1:n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} k_{\{1:n\}}, \quad (3.21)$$

where $\{1:n\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Lemma 3.5 *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, \mathcal{L}_0 and \mathcal{A}^ε be the operators defined according to (3.17) and (3.18) respectively. Then, \mathcal{A}^ε can be written as*

$$\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon = \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon = -(\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon)^*. \quad (3.22)$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the action of the operators $\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ on $f \in \Gamma L_n^2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{L}_0 f)(k_{1:n}) &= -\frac{1}{2} |k_{1:n}|^2 \hat{f}(k_{1:n}) \\
\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f)(k_{1:n+1}) &= -\frac{2\iota}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon}{n+1} \times \\
& \quad \times \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+1} [\mathbf{w} \cdot (k_i + k_j)] \mathbb{J}_{k_i, k_j}^\varepsilon \hat{f}(k_i + k_j, k_{\{1:n+1\} \setminus \{i,j\}}) \\
\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon f)(k_{1:n-1}) &= -\frac{2\iota}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} n \lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k_j) \sum_{\ell+m=k_j} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \hat{f}(\ell, m, k_{\{1:n-1\} \setminus \{j\}}),
\end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

and, if $n = 1$, then $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon f$ is identically 0. Moreover, for any $i = 1, \dots, d$, the momentum operator M_i , defined for $f \in \Gamma L_n^2$ as $\mathcal{F}(M_i f)(k_{1:n}) = (\sum_{j=1}^n k_j^i) \hat{f}(k_{1:n})$, with k_j^i the i^{th} component of the vector k_j , commutes with $\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$, i.e. i.e.

$$[\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon, M_i] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon M_i - M_i \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.24)$$

Proof. Regarding (3.24), this is immediate from (3.23) while the proof of the latter is identical to that of [CES21, Lemma 3.5], to which we refer the reader interested in the details. In words, it consists of showing that (3.23) holds for elements $f \in \Gamma L_n^2$ of

the form $f = \otimes^n \varphi$, the latter being the tensor product of φ with itself n times, which is enough by the definition of ΓL_n^2 in Section (3.1). To do so, one applies (3.17) and (3.18) to random variables $F = I_n(f)$, with f as above, and singles out the resulting kernel. While for \mathcal{L}_0 this is quite straightforward, for \mathcal{A}^ε one further needs the product rule for Hermite polynomials [Nuao6, Proposition 1.1.3]. The decomposition $\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon = \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$ with $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$) increasing (resp. decreasing) the chaos by 1 comes exactly from this: the Malliavin derivative decreases the chaos by 1 so that $D_{-\ell-m}F \in \mathcal{H}_{n-1}$; $D_{-\ell-m}F$ is then multiplied by an element in the second chaos, i.e. $\hat{\eta}(\ell)\hat{\eta}(m)$; in its chaos component the product is made of three summands, one in \mathcal{H}_{n+1} , one in \mathcal{H}_{n-1} and one in \mathcal{H}_{n-3} . As it turns out, the latter vanishes because of (3.19), while the others respectively produce $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$. \square

Before moving on, let us briefly comment on the operators in (3.23) and provide an example of how they act on specific functions.

$\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$ are referred to as the *creation* and *annihilation* operators respectively. The reason for this terminology is that if we feed $\mathcal{A}_\pm^\varepsilon$ with a random variable in the n -th Wiener chaos (resp. a function in ΓL_n^2) they produce a random variable (resp. function) in the $(n+1)$ -th chaos (resp. in ΓL_{n+1}^2). More pictorially, if we interpret the Fourier mode of the space white noise, $\hat{\eta}(k)$, as a particle with momentum k , $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ destroys the particle $\hat{\eta}(k)$ and *creates* two new particles $\hat{\eta}(\ell)$, $\hat{\eta}(m)$ whose momenta sum up to k . To see this, let us apply \mathcal{A}^ε to $\hat{\eta}(k)$. By the definition of \mathcal{A}^ε in (3.18), the fact that $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon \upharpoonright \Gamma L_1^2 \equiv 0$ and since $D_{-\ell-m}\hat{\eta}(k) = \mathbb{1}_{\ell+m=-k}$ (see (3.9)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \hat{\eta}(k) &= \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon \hat{\eta}(k) = \frac{\iota}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{m,\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \mathbf{w} \cdot (\ell+m) \hat{\eta}(m) \hat{\eta}(\ell) D_{-m-\ell} \hat{\eta}(k) \\ &= -\frac{\iota}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{\ell+m=k} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \mathbf{w} \cdot (\ell+m) \hat{\eta}(m) \hat{\eta}(\ell) = I_2(\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon e_k). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

In the second line, we plastically see what was described before, namely the particle $\hat{\eta}(k)$ to which we applied \mathcal{A}^ε has disappeared and was replaced by $\hat{\eta}(m)$ and $\hat{\eta}(\ell)$.

The operator $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$ instead acts in the opposite way, it *annihilates* two particles with momenta ℓ and m , say, and replaces them by one whose momentum is given by $\ell+m$. As an example, for $k_1 \neq -k_2$, $|k_1|, |k_2| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}$ take $F = \hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2) \in \mathcal{H}_2$, whose kernel is $f = \frac{1}{2}(e_{-k_1} \otimes e_{-k_2} + e_{-k_2} \otimes e_{-k_1})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon f)(k) &= -\frac{2\iota}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} 2\lambda_\varepsilon (\mathbf{w} \cdot k) \sum_{\ell+m=k} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \hat{f}(\ell, m) \\ &= -\frac{2\iota\lambda_\varepsilon}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k) \sum_{\ell+m=k} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \left(\mathbb{1}_{\ell=-k_1} \mathbb{1}_{m=-k_2} + \mathbb{1}_{\ell=-k_2} \mathbb{1}_{m=-k_1} \right) \\ &= -\frac{4\iota\lambda_\varepsilon}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k) \mathbb{1}_{k=k_1+k_2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

which means that

$$\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon \hat{\eta}(k_1)\hat{\eta}(k_2) = \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon F = -\frac{4\iota\lambda_\varepsilon}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \hat{\eta}(k_1+k_2).$$

Remark 3.6 The example (3.25) also shows why the operator $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ is particularly singular. Indeed, as can be checked from (3.15), the second line corresponds to the k -th Fourier mode of the nonlinearity and we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{N}_{e_{-k}}^\varepsilon(\eta))^2] = \|\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon e_k\|^2 = \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell+m=k} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon(\mathbf{w} \cdot (\ell + m))^2 \approx \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \varepsilon^{-2-d}$$

which, by (2.5), explodes as ε^{-4} in any dimension. In other words, even though the function we applied it to, i.e. e_k , is as smooth as it gets, $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ gives back a function whose L^2 norm diverges as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The problem lies in the fact that we have no control over the momenta of the newly created particles, i.e. $k = \ell + m$ can be $O(1)$ but ℓ and m can be arbitrarily large.

On the other hand, when applied to a smooth function independent of ε , $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$ is very well-behaved. To witness, if in the example 3.26 k_1 and k_2 are fixed and independent of ε , we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon F\|^2 = \sum_k \frac{16\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{(2\pi)^d} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2 \mathbf{1}_{k=k_1+k_2} = \frac{16\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{(2\pi)^d} (\mathbf{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2))^2 \quad (3.27)$$

which converges to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

3.3 Estimates on the antisymmetric part of the generator

In this section we present an important estimate on \mathcal{A}^ε and derive the so-called *graded sector condition* in the setting of the SBE. To introduce it and discuss its importance, let us define the *number operator*.

Definition 3.7 We define the *number operator* $\mathcal{N} : \Gamma L^2 \rightarrow \Gamma L^2$ to be the linear operator acting on $\psi = (\psi_n)_n \in \Gamma L^2$ as $(\mathcal{N}\psi)_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n\psi_n$.

The graded sector condition (GSC) is a condition on the antisymmetric part of the generator which originally appeared in [SVY00] in the context of the asymmetric simple exclusion process. It requires that the growth in the number operator induced by $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ is (strictly) sublinear, i.e. $\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Gamma L^2 \rightarrow \Gamma L^2} \lesssim \mathcal{N}^\beta$, for some $\beta \in [0, 1)$. As we state in the next lemma, the previous bound holds in the context of SBE with $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$.

Lemma 3.8 (Graded Sector Condition) For $d \geq 2$ here exist a constant $C = C(d) > 0$ such that for every $\psi \in \Gamma L^2$ the following estimate holds

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_\sigma^\varepsilon \psi\| \leq C \|\sqrt{\mathcal{N}} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|, \quad (3.28)$$

for $\sigma \in \{+, -\}$. In particular, for $\sigma \in \{+, -\}$, it implies

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_\sigma^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi\| \leq C \|\sqrt{\mathcal{N}} \psi\|. \quad (3.29)$$

As shown in [KLO12, Section 2.7.4], the GSC is very powerful in that it *generally* implies a central limit theorem for additive functionals of the (non-reversible) Markov processes for which it holds. That said, our setting is very different and the proof of the implication in the above-mentioned reference fails. Indeed, in all the works which have exploited the GSC thus far, the operator was *scale-independent* (i.e. there was no explicit dependence on ε) and the stationary measure was either discrete and in product form or supported on smooth functions. This is not the case here and this will have important repercussions on our analysis.

Before proceeding, let us prove Lemma 3.8.

Proof. Clearly, once we establish (3.28), (3.29) follows immediately by choosing ψ to be $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varrho$ for $\varrho \in \Gamma L^2$.

For (3.28), we claim that we only need to prove that for any $\psi \in \Gamma L_n^\varepsilon$ and $\varrho \in \Gamma L_{n+1}^2$, we have

$$|\langle \varrho, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi \rangle| \lesssim \sqrt{n} \left(\gamma \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right). \quad (3.30)$$

We will show (3.30) at the end. Assuming it holds, we first derive (3.28) for $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$. The variational characterisation of the $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma L^2$ -norm gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi\|^2 &= \sup_{\varrho \in \Gamma L_{n+1}^2} \left(2\langle \varrho, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi \rangle - \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\varrho \in \Gamma L_{n+1}^2} \left(2C_0 \sqrt{n} \left(\gamma \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right) - \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim n \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 = \|\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the first step we used (3.30) (and C_0 is the universal constant implicit in that inequality) while in the last we chose $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2C_0 \sqrt{n}$.

For $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$ instead, we use that, by (3.22), $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon = -(\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon)^*$. Invoking again the variational formula above, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon \psi\|^2 &= \sup_{\varrho \in \Gamma L_{n-1}^2} \left(2\langle \varrho, \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon \psi \rangle - \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right) \\ &= \sup_{\varrho \in \Gamma L_{n-1}^2} \left(-2\langle \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \varrho, \psi \rangle - \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\varrho \in \Gamma L_{n-1}^2} \left(2C_0 \sqrt{n} \left(\gamma \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 \right) - \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim n \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 = \|\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where this time we chose $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/(2C_0 \sqrt{n})$.

It remains to prove (3.30). By definition of $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$, we have

$$|\langle \varrho, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi \rangle| = n! \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \lambda_\varepsilon \left| \sum_{k_{1:n+1}} \hat{\varrho}(-k_{1:n+1}) \times \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+1} [\mathbf{w} \cdot (k_i + k_j)] \mathbb{J}_{k_i, k_j}^\varepsilon \hat{\psi}(k_i + k_j, k_{\{1:n+1\} \setminus \{i, j\}}) \Big| \\ & = \frac{(n+1)!n}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \lambda_\varepsilon \Big| \sum_{k_{1:n+1}} \hat{\varrho}(-k_{1:n+1}) [\mathbf{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2)] \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon \hat{\psi}(k_1 + k_2, k_{3:n+1}) \Big|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us look at the sum over k_1, k_2 . This equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k_{1:2}} \hat{\varrho}(-k_{1:n+1}) [\mathbf{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2)] \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon \hat{\psi}(k_1 + k_2, k_{3:n+1}) \right| \\ & = \left| \sum_q (\mathbf{w} \cdot q) \hat{\psi}(q, k_{3:n+1}) \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon \hat{\varrho}(-k_{1:n+1}) \right| \\ & \lesssim \left(\sum_q (\mathbf{w} \cdot q)^2 |\hat{\psi}(q, k_{3:n+1})|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_q \left| \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon \hat{\varrho}(-k_{1:n+1}) \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & =: A \times (\text{I}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

We leave A as it stands and focus on (I). Note that this can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{I}) & = \left(\sum_q \left| \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon \hat{\varrho}(-k_{1:n+1}) \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_q \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} |k_{1:2}|^2 |\hat{\varrho}(-k_{1:n+1})|^2 \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon}{|k_{1:2}|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} \left(\sum_q \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} |k_{1:2}|^2 |\hat{\varrho}(k_{1:n+1})|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} =: \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} B \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

where we used that for $d = 2$, $\lambda_\varepsilon^2 = (\log \varepsilon^{-2})^{-1}$ and

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon}{|k_{1:2}|^2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log \varepsilon^{-2}} \sum_{\varepsilon < |\varepsilon k_1| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|\varepsilon k_1|^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\log \varepsilon^{-2}} \int_{|x| \in [\varepsilon, 1]} \frac{dx}{|x|^2} \lesssim 1 \tag{3.33}$$

while for $d \geq 3$, $\lambda_\varepsilon^2 = \varepsilon^{d-2}$ and

$$\varepsilon^{d-2} \sum_{k_1+k_2=q} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon}{|k_{1:2}|^2} \leq \varepsilon^d \sum_{|\varepsilon k_1| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|\varepsilon k_1|^2} \lesssim \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{dx}{|x|^2} \lesssim 1. \tag{3.34}$$

As a consequence, for any $\gamma > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varrho, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi \rangle| & \lesssim (n+1)!n \sum_{k_{3:n+1}} AB \leq (n+1)!n \left(\frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k_{3:n+1}} A^2 + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\gamma} \sum_{k_{3:n+1}} B^2 \right) \\ & \leq (n+1)!n \left(\frac{1}{n!} \frac{\gamma}{n^{3/2}} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 + \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \frac{n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\gamma} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \sqrt{n} \gamma \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\gamma} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varrho\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

where we used that, by the definition of A and B in (3.31) and (3.32) respectively, we have

$$\sum_{k_{3:n+1}} A^2 \lesssim \sum_{k_{1:n}} |k_1|^2 |\hat{\psi}(k_{1:n})|^2 \leq \frac{n^{-1}}{n!} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2$$

and similarly for B . Then, (3.30) follows. \square

3.4 The Itô trick

Another crucial tool in our analysis is the so-called Itô trick, which first appeared in [GJ13] and has later been used in various forms in several different contexts (see e.g. [GJ13, DGP17, GT20, CES21, CG24]). It represents a refined version of the celebrated Kipnis-Varadhan lemma (see [KLO12, Lemma 2.4]), as it allows to estimate arbitrary moments of additive functionals of Markov processes. Let us recall its statement.

Lemma 3.9 (Itô trick) *Let $d \geq 2$, η^ε be the stationary solution to (2.4) with λ_ε given as in (2.5). For any $p \geq 2$, $T > 0$ and $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ with finite chaos expansion, i.e. $F \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}_j$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C = C(p, n) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t F(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \right|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq CT^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} F\|. \quad (3.36)$$

For $p = 2$ the constant C is independent of n .

Notice that, while the expectation at the left hand side of (3.36) is with respect to the law of the whole process $(\eta_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$, the quantity at the right hand side is an expectation only with respect to the law of η^ε at a fixed time. In other words, the Itô trick allows to reduce the problem of controlling complicated functionals of η^ε at multiple times to equilibrium estimates which are generally easier to obtain. This will be crucial not only in obtaining tightness for η^ε but also to identify the limit point.

Proof. Let F be as in the statement and G to be the solution of $-\mathcal{L}_0 G = F$. Notice that, since F has no component in \mathcal{H}_0 and has finite chaos expansion, such G exists, is unique and lives in $\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}_j$. Its explicit expression can be found by exploiting the form of \mathcal{L}_0 in (3.23).

Thanks to Itô's formula, we can write

$$G(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - G(\eta_0^\varepsilon) = \int_0^t (\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon) G(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds + M_t(G), \quad (3.37)$$

where $M_t(G)$ is the martingale whose quadratic variation is

$$d\langle M(F) \rangle_t = \mathfrak{E}(G)(\eta_t^\varepsilon) dt \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d} |k|^2 |D_k G(\eta_t^\varepsilon)|^2 dt. \quad (3.38)$$

For fixed $T > 0$, the backward process $\bar{\eta}_t^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \eta_{T-t}^\varepsilon$ is itself Markov and its generator is given by the adjoint of \mathcal{L}^ε , i.e. $(\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^* = \mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon$. In particular, applying again Itô's formula, but this time to $G(\bar{\eta}_t^\varepsilon)$, we get

$$G(\bar{\eta}_T^\varepsilon) - G(\bar{\eta}_{T-t}^\varepsilon) = \int_{T-t}^T (\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon)G(\bar{\eta}_s^\varepsilon) ds + \bar{M}_T(G) - \bar{M}_{T-t}(G), \quad (3.39)$$

where $\bar{M}(G)$ is a martingale with respect to the *backward* filtration, generated by the process $\bar{\eta}^\varepsilon$, and its quadratic variation is that in (3.38) but with $\bar{\eta}^\varepsilon$ replacing η^ε . By a simple change of variables, and using the fact that $\bar{\eta}^\varepsilon$ is the time-reversed η^ε , we see that (3.39) becomes

$$G(\eta_0^\varepsilon) - G(\eta_t^\varepsilon) = \int_0^t (\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon)G(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds + \bar{M}_T(G) - \bar{M}_{T-t}(G). \quad (3.40)$$

Hence, adding up (3.37) and (3.40), we obtain

$$2 \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_0 G(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds = -M_t(G) - \bar{M}_T(G) + \bar{M}_{T-t}(G).$$

Therefore, applying Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality to the right hand side of the previous, we immediately obtain that there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ (which might change from line to line) such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t F(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \right|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} = \mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_0 G(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \right|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \mathbf{E} \left[\langle M(G) \rangle_T^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

For the last term, we use (3.38) so that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\langle M(G) \rangle_T^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} = \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\int_0^T \mathfrak{E}(G)(\eta_t^\varepsilon) dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\int_0^T \mathbf{E} \left[|\mathfrak{E}(G)(\eta_t^\varepsilon)|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Notice that the argument of the expectation depends only on η^ε at a given time, so that since η^ε is stationary we get

$$\left(\int_0^T \mathbf{E} \left[|\mathfrak{E}(G)(\eta_t^\varepsilon)|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{E} \left[|\mathfrak{E}(G)|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{E} \left[\mathfrak{E}(G) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where in the last step we used Gaussian hypercontractivity (3.3) and therefore the hidden constant depends on both n and p , unless $p = 2$.

To conclude, we are left to analyse the expectation of $\mathfrak{E}(G)$. For this, notice that, by taking $F = G$ in (3.20) and using that, for G real-valued, $D_{-k}G = \overline{D_k G}$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\eta)D_{-k}D_k G(\eta)] = \mathbb{E}[G(\eta)\hat{\eta}(-k)D_k G(\eta)] - \mathbb{E}[|D_k G(\eta)|^2]$$

so that, by (3.17), we deduce

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} F\|^2 = \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} G\|^2 = \mathbb{E}[G(\eta)(-\mathcal{L}_0)G(\eta)]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_k |k|^2 \mathbb{E}[G(\eta)(\eta_{-k} D_k G(\eta) - D_{-k} D_k G(\eta))] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_k |k|^2 \mathbb{E}[|D_k G(\eta)|^2] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{G}(G)],
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed. \square

4 The approach

As the title suggests, in this section we present the approach we follow in order to establish Theorem 2.3. It consists of three steps

1. show tightness for the sequence η^ε (Section 4.1),
2. derive a suitable characterisation of the law of the conjectured limit, i.e. the solution of (2.7) (Section 4.2),
3. prove that the law of every limit point of η^ε is that identified in the previous point.

While the proof of the first item follows by an easy application of the Itô trick (Lemma 3.9) and the second is classical, the third point is delicate and requires a refined analysis. This is where the novelty of our approach lies, so we will motivate it carefully providing several heuristics that, we hope, will help the reader navigating the details.

4.1 Tightness

As mentioned above, our first goal is to show that the sequence η^ε is tight in the (weakest) space in which we expect the limit to live, i.e. the space of continuous functions in time with values in the space of distributions.

Theorem 4.1 *The sequence $\{\eta^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ is tight in $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$.*

Proof. By Mitoma's criterion [Mit83, Theorem 3.1], the sequence $\{\eta^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ is tight in $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$ if and only if $\{\eta^\varepsilon(\varphi)\}_\varepsilon$ is tight in $C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Therefore, let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be fixed and consider $t \mapsto \eta_t^\varepsilon(\varphi)$. A convenient way to prove tightness is Kolmogorov's criterion [Kal21, Theorem 23.7] which requires a uniform control over the moments of the time increments of $\eta^\varepsilon(\varphi)$. The Markov property and stationarity imply that for all $0 \leq r < t \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}|\eta_t^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \eta_r^\varepsilon(\varphi)|^p &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[|\eta_t^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \eta_r^\varepsilon(\varphi)|^p | \mathcal{G}_r]] \\
&= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}^{\eta_r^\varepsilon(\varphi)}[|\eta_{t-r}^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \eta_0^\varepsilon(\varphi)|^p]] = \mathbf{E}|\eta_{t-r}^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \eta_0^\varepsilon(\varphi)|^p
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\{\mathcal{G}_r\}_r$ is the filtration generated by η^ε , so that we can reduce to the case of $r = 0$. By (3.13), we have

$$\mathbf{E}[|\eta_t^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \eta_0^\varepsilon(\varphi)|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

$$\leq \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \eta_s^\varepsilon(\Delta\varphi) ds \right|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \right|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \xi(ds, (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi) \right|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

and we will separately analyse each of the summands at the right hand side starting with the last as it is the easiest. Indeed, since the space-time white noise ξ is Gaussian, an immediate application of Gaussian hypercontractivity (3.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \xi(ds, (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi) \right|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} &\lesssim_p \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \xi(ds, (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi) \right|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} = t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where in the last step we used (3.14) and Itô isometry.

We now turn to the other two summands in (4.1). As announced, we use Lemma 3.9 and obtain, for the first,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \eta_s^\varepsilon(\Delta\varphi) ds \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Delta\varphi)\| = t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \quad (4.3)$$

where we further exploited the definition of \mathcal{L}_0 in (3.23), while for the second

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} &\lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \varphi\| \\ &\lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi\| = t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where we used that the kernel of $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta^\varepsilon)$ is $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \varphi$ as can be seen by (3.25), and (3.28). By putting together (4.3), (4.4) and (4.2) the assumption of Kolmogorov's criterion are satisfied and the statement follows at once. \square

Remark 4.2 Let us make a couple of comments regarding the space in which tightness is obtained. First, as it is standard in the applications of Kolmogorov's criterion, the proof above shows that tightness holds in the space of α -Hölder continuous functions in time with values in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$, for any $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. Furthermore, a slightly more involved argument could upgrade the space of Schwarz distributions to a Besov space of (optimal) negative regularity. This is what was done in [CES21, Theorem 4.5] and, with minor adjustments, could have been done here as well. Since we will not need any of these results, we refrained from following this route in these notes.

4.2 A martingale formulation for the limit

Theorem 4.1 implies that the sequence $\{\eta^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ converges along subsequences. Our goal is then to show that all the limit points have the same law and, to do so, it is convenient to have an independent characterisation of the law of the expected limit, which is the linear stochastic heat equation (SHE) given by

$$\partial_t \eta = \frac{1}{2}(\Delta + D_{\text{SHE}}(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2) \eta + (-\Delta - D_{\text{SHE}}(\mathfrak{w} \cdot \nabla)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi, \quad \eta(0, \cdot) = \mu, \quad (4.5)$$

where $D_{\text{SHE}} > 0$ and $(\mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)^2$ are given as in Theorem 2.3 and μ is a space white noise. The characterisation which best fits into our framework is in terms of a martingale problem. Before stating it, let us set $\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathbf{w}}$ and \mathcal{D} be the operators on $L^2(\Omega)$ whose action on $f \in \Gamma L_n^2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathbf{w}} f)(k_{1:n}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)_{1:n}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{w} \cdot k_i)^2 \hat{f}(k_{1:n}), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{D} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\text{SHE}} \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathbf{w}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

so that, in particular, $\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)^2$ on ΓL_1^2 .

Definition 4.3 Let $T > 0$, $\Omega = C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$ and \mathcal{B} the canonical Borel σ -algebra on $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Let μ be a zero-average space white noise on \mathbb{T}^d and \mathcal{D} the operator in (2.9). We say that a probability measure \mathbf{P} on (Ω, \mathcal{B}) solves the martingale problem for $\mathcal{L}^{\text{eff}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{D}$ with initial distribution μ , if for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the canonical process η under \mathbf{P} is such that

$$\mathbf{M}_t(F_j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F_j(\eta_t) - F_j(\mu) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{eff}} F_j(\eta_s) ds, \quad j = 1, 2 \quad (4.7)$$

is a local martingale, where $F_1(\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \eta(\varphi)$ and $F_2(\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \eta(\varphi)^2 - \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2$.

Crucially, the martingale problem stated above is well-posed and indeed uniquely characterises the law of (4.5).

Theorem 4.4 *The martingale problem for \mathcal{L}^{eff} with initial distribution μ in Definition 4.3 has a unique solution and uniquely characterises the law of the solution to (4.5) on $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$.*

The proof of the above statement is rather classical and therefore omitted. A good reference for it is [MW17, Appendix D] together with the proof of [CGT24, Theorem 3.4]. In general, when dealing with the well-posedness of martingale problems (see e.g. [EK86, Chapter 4]), the challenge is to identify a sufficiently large class of observables F for which the fact that the right hand side of (4.7) is a martingale suffices to characterise uniquely the probability measure \mathbf{P} . Now, (4.5) admits a unique analytically weak and probabilistically strong (and therefore probabilistically weak) solution, which means that given a probability space which supports both a space white noise μ and space-time white noise ξ , there exists a unique η such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$\eta_t(\varphi) - \mu(\varphi) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{eff}} \eta_s(\varphi) ds \quad (4.8)$$

is not just *some* martingale, but it is precisely *the* martingale given by

$$\mathbf{M}_t(\varphi) = \int_0^t \xi(ds, (-\Delta - D_{\text{SHE}}(\mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi).$$

The martingale above is 0 at time 0, continuous and Gaussian, and therefore its law is uniquely characterised by its quadratic variation. Getting back to the martingale problem in Definition 4.3, we can now understand the reason why we only need observables F which are either linear or quadratic: the former ensure that (4.8) is indeed a martingale while the latter uniquely characterise its quadratic variation and thus its law (see the proof of [CGT24, Theorem 3.4], for the connection between quadratic variation and quadratic functionals).

4.3 The Fluctuation-Dissipation theorem

Once we have tightness, we would like to use the martingale problem in Definition 4.3 to identify the limit. Since by Theorem 4.4 the latter has a unique solution, we only need to prove that every limit point satisfies (4.7). Note that, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $F_1(\eta) = \eta(\varphi)$, $F_2(\eta) = \eta(\varphi)^2 - \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^D)}^2$, Dynkin's formula gives that

$$F_j(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - F_j(\mu) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_0 F_j(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds - \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon F_j(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds - \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon F_j(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \quad (4.9)$$

is a martingale. Since we have tightness in $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$, the first three terms can be immediately seen to converge to $F_j(\eta_t)$, $F_j(\mu)$ and $\int_0^t \mathcal{L}_0 F_j(\eta_s) ds$ respectively, where η is any limit point of the sequence $\{\eta^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$. In light of Remark 3.6 (see in particular (3.27)), the fourth instead vanishes as F_j is smooth (see (4.30) below for the proof).

The analysis of the last summand is more delicate, as it should, since, e.g. for $j = 1$, (3.25) morally shows that $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon F_1(\eta)$ is nothing but the nonlinearity $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\eta)$ in (3.15), which is precisely what we need to make sense of! According to the discussion in Section 2.2, one expects this term to converge to $\int_0^t \mathcal{D}F_j(\eta_s) ds$ plus a martingale. By taking conditional expectation with respect to the initial condition η_0 (so to remove the martingale contribution), we should have

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon F_j(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \mid \eta_0 \right] - \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{D}F_j(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \mid \eta_0 \right] \approx 0 \quad (4.10)$$

where we recall that \mathcal{D} is the operator in (2.9) and the approximation is to be understood in the sense that the left-hand side, as a function of the initial condition η_0 , is small in $L^2(\mathbb{P})$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The problem is that (4.10) is all but trivial. Indeed, a naive application of the Itô trick simply gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t (\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon F_j - \mathcal{D}F_j)(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds \right|^2 \right] &\lesssim t \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_j - \mathcal{D}f_j)\|^2 \\ &= \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_j\|^2 + \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}f_j\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we denoted by $f_j \in \Gamma L_j^2$ the kernel associated to $F_j \in \mathcal{H}_j$, and the last is an equality since $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_j \in \Gamma L_{j+1}^2$ and $\mathcal{D}f_j \in \Gamma L_j^2$ live in different chaoses and are therefore orthogonal. The right hand side is the sum of positive quantities, the second of which does not even depend on ε , and therefore cannot be small in ε .

What the above suggests is that the observables F_j 's are not rich enough to capture the complexity of $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon F_j$ and a larger class of observables is needed in order to describe its large scale-behaviour. The next theorem, which we will refer to as the *Fluctuation-Dissipation relation*, identifies such class and states the conditions its elements need to satisfy to conclude the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 4.5 *Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be fixed and, for $j = 1, 2$, $f_j \in \Gamma L_j^2$ be given by*

$$f_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi \quad \text{and} \quad f_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\varphi \otimes \psi]_{\text{sym}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\varphi \otimes \psi + \psi \otimes \varphi}{2}. \quad (4.11)$$

Then, for every $i \in \{2, 3\}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $w^{\varepsilon, n} \in \bigoplus_{j=i}^n \Gamma L_j^2$ such that $\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} w^{\varepsilon, n}\|$ is bounded uniformly in ε and n , and the following limits hold

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w^{\varepsilon, n}\| = 0, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon w^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^{\varepsilon, n})\| = 0, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{D} f_{i-1}]\| = 0, \quad (4.14)$$

where \mathcal{D} is defined in (2.9).

In the rest of the section, we will show how Theorem 4.5 implies Theorem 2.3 but before that we want to give a heuristic which explains how to choose the functions $w^{\varepsilon, n}$ and why the conditions (4.12)-(4.14) are needed.

As pointed out at the beginning of this subsection, the goal is to show (4.10). Taking a Laplace transform with respect to t , and ignoring the issue of exchanging the limit in ε and the integral in t , the validity of (4.10) for every $t > 0$ is essentially equivalent to proving that, for every $\mu > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\approx \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon F_j(\eta_s^\varepsilon) e^{-\mu s} ds \middle| \eta_0 \right] - \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} \mathcal{D} F_j(\eta_s^\varepsilon) e^{-\mu s} ds \middle| \eta_0 \right] \\ &= (\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon F_j(\eta_0) - (\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{D} F_j(\eta_0) \end{aligned}$$

the last equality being a consequence of $\mathbf{E}(G(\eta_s^\varepsilon) | \eta_0) = [e^{\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon s} G](\eta_0)$. To be consistent with the statement above, denote, for $i \in \{2, 3\}$, by f_{i-1} the kernel associated to F_{i-1} so that in the language of Fock spaces the previous condition reads

$$(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} - (\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{D} f_{i-1} \approx 0 \quad (4.15)$$

where this time the left-hand side is an element of ΓL^2 and the approximation means that its norm is small as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Since (4.15) *cannot* be a consequence $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} \approx \mathcal{D} f_{i-1}$ (right and left hand side are orthogonal and the right-hand side is not small), we introduce the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\geq i}^\varepsilon = P_{\geq i} \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon P_{\geq i}$, with $P_{\geq i}$ the orthogonal projection onto $\bigoplus_{j \geq i} \Gamma L_j^2$, and define

$$w^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_{\geq i}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1}, \quad (4.16)$$

which belongs to $\oplus_{j \geq i} \Gamma L_j^2$ as $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} \in \Gamma L_i^2$. Note that (4.16) implies

$$(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)w^\varepsilon = \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^\varepsilon, \quad (4.17)$$

so that, inverting $(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)$ and adding and subtracting $(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{D} f_{i-1}$, we obtain

$$(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} - (\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{D} f_{i-1} = w^\varepsilon + (\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} [\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^\varepsilon - \mathcal{D} f_{i-1}].$$

In other words, we have re-expressed the left-hand side of (4.15) in terms of the solution to (4.16), thus showing that (4.15) is equivalent to proving

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w^\varepsilon\|^2 = 0, \quad (4.18)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} [\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^\varepsilon - \mathcal{D} f_{i-1}]\|^2 = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

The limit (4.18) clearly corresponds to (4.12), while to see that (4.19) is implied by (4.14), it suffices to note that, for any ψ ,

$$\|(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \psi\| \lesssim \|(\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|. \quad (4.20)$$

Indeed, by positivity of \mathcal{L}_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \psi\| &= \|(-\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi\| \\ &\leq \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi\| \\ &\leq \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi\| \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)^{-1} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= (-\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon)^{-1} (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= (I - (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and this operator is bounded by 1 in norm, since $(\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon (\mu - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is antisymmetric and hence has purely imaginary spectrum.

The above heuristics not only motivates (4.12) and (4.14) but suggests that our family of observables should be taken as the elements of ΓL^2 defined according to (4.16). The problem is that, when written in its chaos components, the latter is an infinite system of equations and it is not even a priori clear whether or not it admits a solution. This is the reason why we will have to further truncate the system in n , which in turn will cause (4.17) not to be an equality thus giving condition (4.13).

4.4 Proof of the main result

In this section, we will rigorously prove Gaussian fluctuations for the Burgers equation assuming Theorem 4.5.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. By Theorem 4.1, we know that the sequence $\{\eta^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ is tight in $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$, hence it converges along subsequences. If we prove that any limit point is a solution of the martingale problem in Definition 4.3 then the statement follows by Theorem 4.4.

Let $\eta \in C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$ be a limit point. To verify that η satisfies the martingale problem, we need to show that for every given $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the processes $\mathbf{M}(f_{i-1})$, $i = 2, 3$, defined according to (4.7) with $f_1 = \eta(\varphi)$ and $f_2 = \eta(\varphi)^2 - \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2$, are local martingales. In turn, this follows if we prove that for every $s \in [0, T]$ and $G: C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ bounded continuous we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\delta_{s,t} \mathbf{M}(f_{i-1}) G(\eta|_{[0,s]})] = 0, \quad (4.21)$$

where we introduced a convenient notation for the time increment, i.e. $\delta_{s,t} f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(t) - f(s)$. Now, by the definition of $\mathbf{M}(f_{i-1})$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[(\mathbf{M}_t(f_{i-1}) - \mathbf{M}_s(f_{i-1})) G(\eta|_{[0,s]})] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\left(f_{i-1}(\eta_t) - f_{i-1}(\eta_s) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{eff}} f_{i-1}(\eta_r) dr\right) G(\eta|_{[0,s]})\right] \quad (4.22) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E}\left[\left(f_{i-1}(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - f_{i-1}(\eta_s^\varepsilon) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{eff}} f_{i-1}(\eta_r^\varepsilon) dr\right) G(\eta^\varepsilon|_{[0,s]})\right] \end{aligned}$$

where we used that η^ε converges in law to η in $C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d))$ together with [CET23b, Eq. (5.11)] to approximate the first factor in the expectation with bounded continuous functionals. To analyse this latter term, let us write the equation for η^ε in such a way that we can identify the elements which are relevant to the limit.

By Dynkin's formula and the weak formulation of (2.4) in (3.13), we have

$$f_{i-1}(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - f_{i-1}(\eta_s^\varepsilon) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}_0 f_{i-1}(\eta_r^\varepsilon) dr - \int_s^t \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon f_{i-1}(\eta_r^\varepsilon) dr = \delta_{s,t} M^\varepsilon(f_{i-1}) \quad (4.23)$$

where $M^\varepsilon(f_{i-1})$ is the martingale whose quadratic variation is given by

$$\langle M^\varepsilon(f) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \sum_k |k|^2 |[D_k f](\eta_s^\varepsilon)|^2 ds \quad (4.24)$$

and D_k is the Malliavin derivative in (3.8).

The term which is responsible for creating the new noise and the new Laplacian, is that containing $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1}$. In order to describe it, notice that the kernel of f_1 in ΓL^2 is $f_1 = \varphi$, while that of f_2 is $\varphi \otimes \varphi$. Then, we consider the random variable $\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n} \in L^2(\mathbb{P})$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, whose kernel is $w^{\varepsilon,n}$ in the statement. By Dynkin's formula applied to $\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_s^\varepsilon) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon \mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_r^\varepsilon) dr = \delta_{s,t} M^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}) \quad (4.25)$$

where $M^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n})$ is the martingale whose quadratic variation is the same as (4.24) with f_{i-1} replaced by $\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}$. We now go back to (4.23) which we rewrite as

$$f_{i-1}(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - f_{i-1}(\eta_s^\varepsilon) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{eff}} f_{i-1}(\eta_r^\varepsilon) dr = \delta_{s,t}(M^\varepsilon(f_{i-1}) + M^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n})) + \delta_{s,t}R^{\varepsilon,n} \quad (4.26)$$

for $R^{\varepsilon,n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^4 R_j^{\varepsilon,n}$ and the $R_j^{\varepsilon,n}$'s are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^{\varepsilon,n}(t) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\mu) - \mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_t^\varepsilon), \\ R_2^{\varepsilon,n}(t) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^t \left(\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon \mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n} + \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon \mathcal{W}_i^{\varepsilon,n} \right) (\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds, \\ R_3^{\varepsilon,n}(t) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^t \left(\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon \mathcal{W}_i^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_s^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{D} f_{i-1}(\eta_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds, \\ R_4^{\varepsilon,n}(t) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon f_{i-1}(\eta_s^\varepsilon) ds. \end{aligned}$$

We now get back to (4.22), which, in view of (4.25) equals

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\delta_{s,t}(M^\varepsilon(f_{i-1}) + M^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n})) + \delta_{s,t}R^{\varepsilon,n} \right) G(\eta^\varepsilon \upharpoonright_{[0,s]}) \right].$$

Since $M^\varepsilon(f_{i-1})$ and $M^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n})$ are martingales, for every n and every ε we have

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\delta_{s,t}(M^\varepsilon(f_{i-1}) + M^\varepsilon(\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n})) G(\eta^\varepsilon \upharpoonright_{[0,s]}) \right] = 0. \quad (4.27)$$

For the other term instead, we apply Cauchy-Schwarz and exploit the boundedness of G , from which we obtain

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\delta_{s,t} R^{\varepsilon,n} G(\eta^\varepsilon \upharpoonright_{[0,s]}) \right] \leq \|G\|_\infty \mathbf{E} \left[|\delta_{s,t} R^{\varepsilon,n}|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|G\|_\infty \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathbf{E} \left[|\delta_{s,t} R_j^{\varepsilon,n}|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

so that we are left to show that each of the summands at the right hand side converges to 0. Let us begin with the first, which can be controlled as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[|\delta_{s,t} R_1^{\varepsilon,n}|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \mathbf{E} \left[|\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_t^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_s^\varepsilon)|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[|\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_t^\varepsilon)|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbf{E} \left[|\mathcal{W}^{\varepsilon,n}(\eta_s^\varepsilon)|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = 2\|w^{\varepsilon,n}\| \end{aligned}$$

and the right hand side converges to 0 as ε goes to 0 by (4.12). For the others, we apply the Itô trick, Lemma 3.9, which gives

$$\mathbf{E} \left[(\delta_{s,t} R_2^{\varepsilon,n})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon w^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^{\varepsilon,n})\|, \quad (4.28)$$

$$\mathbf{E} \left[(\delta_{s,t} R_3^{\varepsilon,n})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathcal{D} f_{i-1}]\|, \quad (4.29)$$

$$\mathbf{E} \left[(\delta_{s,t} R_4^{\varepsilon,n})^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C t^{\frac{1}{2}} \| (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon f_{i-1} \|, \quad (4.30)$$

with C independent of n . Now, (4.28) and (4.29) converge to 0 in the double limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ first and $n \rightarrow \infty$ then, by (4.13) and (4.14). Concerning (4.30), for $i = 2$, $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon f_1 = 0$, while for $i = 3$ we leverage the smoothness of f_2 . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \| (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon f_2 \|^2 &\leq \sum_k \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2}{|k|^2} \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \left(\sum_{\ell+m=k} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \hat{f}_2(\ell, m) \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{|\ell| < \varepsilon^{-1}} \frac{1}{|\ell|^{2\alpha}} \right) \sum_{\ell, m} (|\ell|^2 + |m|^2)^\alpha |\hat{f}_2(\ell, m)|^2 \\ &= \left(\lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell} \frac{1}{|\ell|^{2\alpha}} \right) \| (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\alpha/2} f_2 \|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha > 1$. The last norm is finite and it is not hard to see that the quantity in parenthesis is converging to 0, thus implying that the $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit of (4.30) is 0.

Collecting the results above together with (4.22) and (4.27), (4.21) follows at once so that the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

As it should be clear by now, the bulk of our work is to establish the existence of functions $\{w^{\varepsilon,n}\}_{n,\varepsilon}$ satisfying conditions (4.12)-(4.14) in Theorem 4.5. This is quite subtle and we will adopt different strategies for $d = 2$ and $d \geq 3$. In both cases, the rationale behind the search for $w^{\varepsilon,n}$ is dictated by (4.16).

5 Characterisation of limit points: the Fluctuation-Dissipation relation

According to the heuristic provided in the previous section, we would like to choose w^ε as in (4.16) but without the mass μ . Taking a (slightly) more general perspective, we consider, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, u^ε solving

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\geq i}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = g, \quad (5.1)$$

where we recall that $\mathcal{L}_{\geq i}^\varepsilon = P_{\geq i} \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon P_{\geq i}$, with $P_{\geq i}$ the orthogonal projection onto $\bigoplus_{j \geq i} \Gamma L_j^2$, and g is an arbitrary element of $\bigoplus_{j \geq i} \Gamma L_j^2$. Later on we will mostly consider the case of $g = \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1}$ for f_{i-1} as in (4.11). When decomposed in its chaos components (5.1) becomes an infinite system

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdots \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_n^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_{n+1}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-1}^\varepsilon &= g_n \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_{n-1}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_n^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-2}^\varepsilon &= g_{n-1} \\ &\vdots \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_{i+1}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_{i+2}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_i^\varepsilon &= g_{i+1} \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_i^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_{i+1}^\varepsilon &= g_i. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Note the absence of $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{i-1}^\varepsilon$ from the last equation due to the projection. As we mentioned, it is not a priori clear that the (5.2) admits a solution, not even if g is regular and with finite chaos decomposition. Therefore, we are lead to introduce a second truncation which removes all high chaoses. To be precise, for $i, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $g \in \bigoplus_{j=i}^m \Gamma L_j^2$ and $i \leq m \leq n$. Define $u^{\varepsilon, n}$ as the unique solution of the *truncated generator equation* which is defined as

$$-\mathcal{L}_{i,n}^\varepsilon u^{\varepsilon, n} = g, \quad (5.3)$$

where, analogously to the above, $\mathcal{L}_{i,n}^\varepsilon = P_{i,n} \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon P_{i,n}$, with $P_{i,n}$ the orthogonal projection onto $\bigoplus_{j=i}^n \Gamma L_j^2$. In other words, $u^{\varepsilon, n}$ solves the finite system of equations given by

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_0 u_n^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon, n} &= 0 \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_n^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-2}^{\varepsilon, n} &= 0 \\ &\vdots \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_m^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_{m+1}^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{m-1}^{\varepsilon, n} &= g_m \\ &\vdots \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_{i+1}^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_{i+2}^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_i^{\varepsilon, n} &= g_{i+1} \\ -\mathcal{L}_0 u_i^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_{i+1}^{\varepsilon, n} &= g_i. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Our first result, we obtain a weighted a priori estimate which ensures that *uniformly in ε* the high chaoses of $u^{\varepsilon, n}$ decay polynomially in the number operator.

Proposition 5.1 *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $i < m$ and $g \in \bigoplus_{j=i+1}^m \Gamma L_j^2$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq m$, let $u^{\varepsilon, n}$ be the solution of the truncated generator equation in (5.3) in any dimension $d \geq 2$. Then, there exists a positive constant $C = C(m, k)$ independent of n, ε and g , such that*

$$\|\mathcal{N}^k (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} u^{\varepsilon, n}\| \leq C \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} g\|, \quad (5.5)$$

where \mathcal{N} is the number operator in Definition 3.7.

Proof. The proof follows closely that of [LY97, Lemma 2.5] (see also [CGT24, Proposition 2.8]) and crucially uses the antisymmetry of the operator \mathcal{A}^ε in (3.18), its decomposition $\mathcal{A}_\pm^\varepsilon$ in (3.23) and the fact that it maps ΓL_j^2 into $\Gamma L_{j+1}^2 \oplus \Gamma L_{j-1}^2$. For the sake of completeness, we provide the details below.

As n and ε are fixed throughout, we will write u and u_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$ in place of $u^{\varepsilon, n}$ and $u_j^{\varepsilon, n}$, respectively. Also, by convention, we let $u_{n+1} = 0 = u_{i-1} = \dots = u_1$. To denote constants which do not depend on ε, n or g we will use C , and such C might change from line to line.

Let us test the j -th component, $j \geq i$, with $\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon u$, which, since by Lemma 3.5 $(\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon)^* = -\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$, gives

$$\langle u_j, \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon u \rangle = \langle u_j, \mathcal{L}_0 u_j \rangle + \langle u_j, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1} \rangle + \langle u_j, \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_{j+1} \rangle$$

$$= \langle u_j, \mathcal{L}_0 u_j \rangle - \left[\langle u_{j+1}, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_j \rangle - \langle u_j, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1} \rangle \right].$$

Via a summation by parts, for any $a > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=i}^n (a + j^{2k}) \langle u_j, (-\mathcal{L}_0) u_j \rangle &= \sum_{j=i}^n (a + j^{2k}) \langle u_j, (-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon) u \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=i}^n (j^{2k} - (j-1)^{2k}) \langle u_j, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Next, note that $-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon u = g - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_n - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon u_i$ so that, by orthogonality of Fock spaces with different indices,

$$|\langle u_j, (-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon) u \rangle| = |\langle u_j, g \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{2} \langle u_j, (-\mathcal{L}_0) u_j \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle g, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} g \rangle.$$

As a consequence, there exists some finite strictly positive constant $C = C(m, k)$, which might change from line to line, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=i}^n (a + j^{2k}) \langle u_j, (-\mathcal{L}_0) u_j \rangle \\ &\leq C \left(\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} g\|^2 + \sum_{j=i}^n (j^{2k} - (j-1)^{2k}) \langle u_j, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1} \rangle \right) \quad (5.6) \\ &\leq C \left(\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} g\|^2 + \sum_{j=i}^n j^{2k-1} \langle u_j, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1} \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C = C(k)$ was chosen in such a way that $(j^{2k} - (j-1)^{2k})\sqrt{j} \leq C j^{2k-\frac{1}{2}}$. To handle the last sum, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle u_j, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1} \rangle| &\leq \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_j\| \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1}\| \\ &\leq C \sqrt{j} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_j\| \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{j-1}\| \quad (5.7) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{j} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_j\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{j-1}\|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second bound we used (3.28) in Lemma 3.8. We now plug the result into (5.6) and rearrange the terms, so that we conclude

$$\sum_{j=i}^n j^{2k} \left(1 + \frac{a}{j^{2k}} - \frac{C}{\sqrt{j}} \right) \langle u_j, (-\mathcal{L}_0) u_j \rangle \leq C (1 + \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} g\|^2). \quad (5.8)$$

Choosing a sufficiently large, in such a way that $(1 + \frac{a}{j^{2k}} - \frac{C}{\sqrt{j}}) \geq 1/2$ for every $j \geq 2$, (5.5) follows. \square

At this point, we want to gather further properties of the solution to (5.1) but for this we will adopt very different strategies in $d = 2$ and $d \geq 3$.

5.1 The critical dimension $d = 2$: the Replacement Lemma

To analyse the critical dimension, we take a closer look at (5.4) and elaborate on the observation made in [LQSY04, Section 2] which we now explain.

For simplicity, assume $g \in \Gamma L_i^2$. As \mathcal{L}_0 is invertible on ΓL_j^2 for all $j \geq 1$, $u_n^{\varepsilon,n}$ can be written in terms of $u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon,n}$ as

$$u_n^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon,n},$$

where $\mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon$ is the operator identically equal to 0. Upon plugging the above expression into the projection of (5.3) on ΓL_{n-1}^2 , we get

$$-\mathcal{L}_0 u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon,n} = \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-2}^{\varepsilon,n}.$$

Now, the operator evidenced in blue is non-negative, self-adjoint and maps each ΓL_j^2 to itself (i.e. its diagonal in the chaos), since by Lemma 3.5, for any $\psi \in \Gamma L_j^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle -\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi, \psi \rangle &= \langle \psi, -\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi \rangle \\ &= \|(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi\|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ is invertible itself and we can express $u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon,n}$ via

$$u_{n-1}^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-2}^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{n-2}^{\varepsilon,n}.$$

By iterating the above procedure, we obtain the recursive expression for the components of $u^{\varepsilon,n}$ given by

$$\begin{cases} u_j^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{n-j}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon u_{j-1}^{\varepsilon,n}, & \text{for } j = i+1, \dots, n \\ u_i^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{n-i}^\varepsilon)^{-1} g \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

where the operators $\mathcal{H}_j^\varepsilon$ are non-negative, self-adjoint and diagonal in the chaos (see [CET23b, Lemma 3.2]), and are inductively defined according to $\mathcal{H}_0^\varepsilon \equiv 0$ and for $j \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{H}_{j+1}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{H}_j^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon. \quad (5.10)$$

Formally, one expects that, by taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_j^{\varepsilon,n}$ converges to the j -th component of the solution u^ε to (5.1). The latter should, heuristically, have the same structure as the right hand side of (5.9) but with the operator $\mathcal{H}_{n-j}^\varepsilon$ replaced by the operator \mathcal{H}^ε given by the fixed point of the relation in (5.10), i.e. \mathcal{H}^ε should satisfy

$$\mathcal{H}^\varepsilon = -\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon. \quad (5.11)$$

Indeed, if such \mathcal{H}^ε existed, were non-negative, self-adjoint and diagonal in chaos, then $z^\varepsilon \in \oplus_{j \geq i} \Gamma L_j^2$ given by

$$z^\varepsilon = (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon z^\varepsilon + (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon)^{-1} g \quad (5.12)$$

would be a solution to (5.1) (actually, *the* solution since the equation is linear). To see this, note first that, since $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ increases the chaos by 1, z^ε is defined recursively and therefore it is well-defined. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_{\geq i}^\varepsilon z^\varepsilon &= \left[(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon) z^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon z^\varepsilon \right] - P_{\geq i} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon P_{\geq i} z^\varepsilon + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon z^\varepsilon \\ &= g - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon P_{\geq i+1} \left[(-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon z^\varepsilon + (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon)^{-1} g \right] + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon z^\varepsilon \\ &= g + \left[-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon \right] z^\varepsilon = g \end{aligned}$$

where in the first step we used (5.12), in the second that $g \in \Gamma L_i^2$ and in the last (5.11), so that the claim follows.

That said, it is difficult to directly study \mathcal{H}^ε and, in particular, to accurately describe its behaviour for ε small. The idea then, is to derive an *approximate fixed point* for (5.11) and use the latter to define our family of observables. This is the content of the next subsection.

5.1.1 The Replacement Lemma and Equation

The existence and properties of such an approximate fixed point are detailed in the so-called *Replacement Lemma*, which is one of the main contributions of our work. Before stating it, we need to introduce some notation. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let L^ε be the function defined on $[\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ as

$$L^\varepsilon(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 x} \right). \quad (5.13)$$

Further, let G be the function

$$G(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{|\mathfrak{w}|^2} \left[\left(\frac{3|\mathfrak{w}|^2}{2\pi} x + 1 \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} - 1 \right], \quad (5.14)$$

and \mathcal{G}^ε be the operator on ΓL^2 given by

$$\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G(L^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0)) \quad (5.15)$$

which means that for $\psi \in \Gamma L_n^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the action of \mathcal{G}^ε on ψ is

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon \psi)(k_{1:n}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:n}|^2)) \hat{\psi}(k_{1:n}), \quad k_{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}_0^{2n}.$$

Lemma 5.2 (Replacement Lemma) *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \Gamma L^2$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \langle [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon] \psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle \right| \\ & \leq C \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{N}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_1\| \|\mathcal{N}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_2\| \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

where \mathcal{G}^ε and $\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}$ are the operators defined respectively according to (5.15) and (2.9).

Before proving the statement, let us make a few remarks and see how to use the Replacement Lemma to define a family of observables which satisfy conditions (4.12)-(4.14) in Theorem 4.5.

An immediate corollary of (5.16) is that

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}[-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon](-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Gamma L_n^2 \rightarrow \Gamma L_n^2}^2 \lesssim \lambda_\varepsilon^2 n$$

which, since we assume λ_ε to be chosen according to weak coupling, i.e. as in (2.5), implies that for n fixed, the left hand side vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In other words, on any given chaos, $\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon$ is an *approximate fixed point* to (5.11) uniformly over ε . As we will see, this is enough for our purposes and, in line with the heuristic z^ε in (5.12) (but with the choice of $g = \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f$), we can give the definition of the family of observables we will be considering hereafter.

Definition 5.3 (Replacement Equation) For $\varepsilon > 0$, $i \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \Gamma L_{i-1}^2$, we define $v^{\varepsilon, n} \in \bigoplus_{j=i}^n \Gamma L_j^2$ to be the solution of the *replacement equation* with input f , which is given by

$$v^{\varepsilon, n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon P_i^{n-1} v^{\varepsilon, n} + (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f, \quad (5.17)$$

with the convention that for all $j \leq i$, $v_j^{\varepsilon, n} = 0$.

The equation (5.17) morally corresponds to a truncated version of (5.12) but in which the mysterious operator \mathcal{H}^ε is replaced by a fully explicit one, i.e. $-\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon$. Further, the equation admits a unique solution since it is triangular and can be explicitly solved starting from $v_1^{\varepsilon, n} = \dots = v_{i-1}^{\varepsilon, n} = 0$, and then inductively setting

$$v_j^{\varepsilon, n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon v_{j-1}^{\varepsilon, n} + (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f, \quad j \geq i.$$

Our goal in the next subsection is to prove that indeed the solution to the replacement equation (5.17) satisfies (4.12)-(4.14) but before that we want to sketch the proof of Lemma 5.2.

Proof of Lemma 5.2 (Sketch and derivation of G). The proof of the Replacement Lemma is mainly technical and can be found in [CGT24, Lemma 2.5]. For the sake of these notes, we will present the main ideas behind it and provide a heuristic justification as to where the specific G in (5.14) comes about.

Notice first that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the operator $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ maps ΓL_n^2 into itself, so that, to establish (5.16), it suffices to consider $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \Gamma L_n^2$. For simplicity, let us take $\psi_1 = \psi_2 = \psi$, and consider

$$\langle -\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi, \psi \rangle = \|(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi\|^2. \quad (5.18)$$

Let $\mathcal{S}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}$ and denote by $\sigma^\varepsilon = (\sigma_n^\varepsilon)_{n \geq 1}$ its Fourier multiplier, i.e. for $\psi \in \Gamma L_n^2$ $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}^\varepsilon \psi)(k_{1:n}) = \sigma_n^\varepsilon(k_{1:n})\hat{\psi}(k_{1:n})$ where

$$\sigma_n^\varepsilon(k_{1:n}) = \frac{2}{|k_{1:n}|^2 + (\mathfrak{w} \cdot k)_{1:n}^2 G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:n}|^2))}, \quad (5.19)$$

and G, L^ε are as in (5.13) and (5.14) respectively. From (3.23), we deduce that the right hand side of (5.18) equals

$$(n+1)! \sum_{k_{1:n+1}} \sigma_{n+1}^\varepsilon(k_{1:n+1}) \times \\ \times \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2(n+1)^2} \left| \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+1} [\mathbf{w} \cdot (k_i + k_j)] \mathbb{J}_{k_i, k_j}^\varepsilon \hat{\psi}(k_i + k_j, k_{\{1:n+1\} \setminus \{i,j\}}) \right|^2.$$

Now, expanding the square we obtain a sum over 4 indices, i, j, i' and j' with $i < j$ and $i' < j'$, which we split into a *diagonal part*, corresponding to the choice $i = i'$ and $j = j'$, and an *off-diagonal part*, in which instead the cardinality of $\{i, j\} \cap \{i', j'\}$ is less or equal to 1. We will neglect the off-diagonal part as, via a clever Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (see the proof of Lemma 2.5 in [CGT24]), it can be shown to be bounded precisely by the right hand side of (5.16) and is that responsible for the growth in the number operator. The diagonal part instead is given by

$$(n+1)! \sum_{k_{1:n+1}} \sigma_{n+1}^\varepsilon(k_{1:n+1}) \times \\ \times \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2(n+1)^2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+1} [\mathbf{w} \cdot (k_i + k_j)]^2 \mathbb{J}_{k_i, k_j}^\varepsilon |\hat{\psi}(k_i + k_j, k_{\{1:n+1\} \setminus \{i,j\}})|^2 \\ = n!n \sum_{k_{1:n}} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k_1)^2 |\hat{\psi}(k_{1:n})|^2 \left[\frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{\ell+m=k_1} \mathbb{J}_{\ell, m}^\varepsilon \sigma_{n+1}^\varepsilon(\ell, m, k_{2:n}) \right] \quad (5.20)$$

where we applied a simple change of variables. What we immediately see is that the quantity in square brackets is a given function of $k_{1:n}$ independent of $\hat{\psi}$. Let us denote it by Ψ^ε , i.e.

$$\Psi^\varepsilon(k_{1:n}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{\ell+m=k_1} \mathbb{J}_{\ell, m}^\varepsilon \sigma_{n+1}^\varepsilon(\ell, m, k_{2:n}). \quad (5.21)$$

Before proceeding, notice also that the second term at the left hand side of (5.16) is

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon \psi, \psi \rangle = n! \sum_{k_{1:n}} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k)_{1:n}^2 G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:n}|^2)) |\hat{\psi}(k_{1:n})|^2 \\ = n!n \sum_{k_{1:n}} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k_1)^2 G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:n}|^2)) |\hat{\psi}(k_{1:n})|^2 \quad (5.22)$$

where we used the symmetry of both $\hat{\psi}$ and $k_{1:n} \mapsto G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:n}|^2))$. By comparing (5.20) and (5.22), we deduce that these two terms are close provided that

$$\sup_{k_{1:n}} |\Psi^\varepsilon(k_{1:n}) - G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:n}|^2))| \lesssim \lambda_\varepsilon^2, \quad (5.23)$$

whose proof is given in detail in [CGT24, Appendix A].

We do not want to repeat here the whole argument since it is mainly technical. The idea is to perform a series of approximations of Ψ^ε making sure that the error made is of order λ_ε^2 , and thus vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We will split the rest of the proof in two steps. The first provides some insight over the type of approximations required and which *make no use of the explicit form of the function G* . The second instead is devoted to the derivation G , whose expression results from the solution of an ODE. For simplicity, we take n in (5.21) to be equal to 1.

Step 1: Approximation. Consider

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^\varepsilon(k) &= \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{\ell+m=k} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \sigma_2^\varepsilon(\ell, m) \\ &= \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{\ell+m=k} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{\frac{|\ell|^2+|m|^2}{2} + \frac{(\mathbf{w}\cdot\ell)^2+(\mathbf{w}\cdot m)^2}{2} G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\frac{|\ell|^2+|m|^2}{2}))},\end{aligned}$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^\varepsilon(k) &\approx \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{\ell+m=k} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{|\ell|^2 + \frac{|k|^2}{2} + (\mathbf{w}\cdot\ell)^2 G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(|\ell|^2 + \frac{|k|^2}{2}))} \\ &\approx \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{\varepsilon \leq |\varepsilon\ell| \leq 1} \varepsilon^2 \frac{1}{|\varepsilon\ell|^2 + \frac{|\varepsilon k|^2}{2} + (\mathbf{w}\cdot(\varepsilon\ell))^2 G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(|\varepsilon\ell|^2 + \frac{|\varepsilon k|^2}{2})))} \\ &\approx \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{dx}{|x|^2 + \frac{|\varepsilon k|^2}{2} + (\mathbf{w}\cdot x)^2 G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(|x|^2 + \frac{|\varepsilon k|^2}{2})))}\end{aligned}$$

where in the first step we replaced $\frac{1}{2}(|\ell|^2 + |m|^2) \mapsto |\ell|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|k|^2$, $\frac{1}{2}((\mathbf{w}\cdot\ell)^2 + (\mathbf{w}\cdot m)^2) \mapsto (\mathbf{w}\cdot\ell)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w}\cdot k)^2 \mapsto (\mathbf{w}\cdot\ell)^2$, in the second we removed $\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon$ and added the condition $1 \leq |\ell| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}$ and in the last we performed a Riemann-sum approximation. At this point, set $\alpha_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}|\varepsilon k|^2$ and pass to polar coordinates, i.e. define $x = r v_{\theta_x}$ and $\mathbf{w} = |\mathbf{w}| v_{\theta_w}$ for $v_\theta = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_0^1 \frac{r dr}{r^2 + \alpha_\varepsilon + r^2 (\mathbf{w}\cdot v_\theta)^2 G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(r^2 + \alpha_\varepsilon)))} \\ &= \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{2\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_0^1 \frac{dr}{r + \alpha_\varepsilon + r (\mathbf{w}\cdot v_\theta)^2 G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(r + \alpha_\varepsilon)))} \\ &= \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{2\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_0^1 \frac{dr}{r + \alpha_\varepsilon + r |\mathbf{w}|^2 \cos^2(\theta - \theta_w) G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(r + \alpha_\varepsilon)))} \\ &= \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \int_0^1 dr \int_0^\pi \frac{d\theta}{r + \alpha_\varepsilon + r |\mathbf{w}|^2 \cos^2(\theta) G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(r + \alpha_\varepsilon)))} \\ &\approx \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^\pi \frac{d\theta dr}{(r + \alpha_\varepsilon)(r + \alpha_\varepsilon + 1)[1 + |\mathbf{w}|^2 \cos^2(\theta) G(\mathbf{L}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(r + \alpha_\varepsilon)))]}\end{aligned}$$

the second to last step being a consequence of the periodicity of the integrand in θ . We are left with analysing the last integral for which we perform the change of variables

$$y = L^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}(r + \alpha_\varepsilon)) = \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r + \alpha_\varepsilon} \right),$$

$$\frac{dr}{(r + \alpha_\varepsilon)(1 + r + \alpha_\varepsilon)} = -\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2} dy$$

and conclude that it equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^\pi d\theta \int_{L^\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2} + \frac{1}{2}|k|^2)}^{L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)} \frac{dy}{1 + |\mathfrak{w}|^2 \cos^2(\theta)G(y)} \\ & \approx \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^\pi d\theta \int_0^{L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)} \frac{dy}{1 + |\mathfrak{w}|^2 \cos^2(\theta)G(y)} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)} \frac{dy}{\sqrt{1 + |\mathfrak{w}|^2 G(y)}} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we computed the integral in θ exactly.

Step 2: An ODE for G . Summarising, in the previous step we have shown that

$$\Psi^\varepsilon(k) \approx \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)} \frac{dy}{\sqrt{1 + |\mathfrak{w}|^2 G(y)}}.$$

For (5.23) to hold, we need to control

$$|\Psi^\varepsilon(k) - G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2))| \approx \left| \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)} \frac{dy}{\sqrt{1 + |\mathfrak{w}|^2 G(y)}} - G(L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)) \right|$$

uniformly over $|k|$. Both summands are functions of $L^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)$ which is bounded below by 0 and above by 1, uniformly over k and ε . Therefore, (5.23) follows if we choose G such that, for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$G(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^t \frac{dy}{\sqrt{1 + |\mathfrak{w}|^2 G(y)}}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\dot{G} = \frac{1}{\pi(1 + |\mathfrak{w}|^2 G)}, \quad G(0) = 0. \quad (5.24)$$

The ODE in (5.24) has an explicit solution given by (5.14). Hence, the choice of G is justified and the proof of the statement is concluded. \square

5.1.2 Estimates on the Replacement Equation

We now collect all the estimates needed to show that (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14) hold for $v^{\varepsilon, n}$, and conclude the section by proving Theorem 4.5. Let us begin with the first two, for which we will first need to specialise the a priori estimates in Proposition 5.1 to $v^{\varepsilon, n}$.

Lemma 5.4 For $i \in \{2, 3\}$, $f \in \Gamma L_{i-1}^2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 3$, let $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ be the solution of the replacement equation with input f as in Definition 5.3. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon(n, k) > 0$, both independent of f , such that for every $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(n, k)$

$$\|\mathcal{N}^k(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\| \leq C\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}f\|. \quad (5.25)$$

Proof. Throughout the proof i is fixed.

We first prove the result for $k = 0$. Let us look at the way in which the generator \mathcal{L}^ε acts on $v^{\varepsilon, n}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon, n} &= (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)v^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon, n} + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon, n} \\ &= \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f - \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \\ &\quad + [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]P_i^{n-1}v^{\varepsilon, n} \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

where in the last step we used (5.17). Now, $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \in \Gamma L_{n+1}^2$, so that, since $v^{\varepsilon, n} \in \bigoplus_{j=i}^n \Gamma L_j^2$, the two are orthogonal. For the same reason, also $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ and $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f \in \Gamma L_{i-1}^2$ are orthogonal. Therefore, by testing both sides of (5.26) by $v^{\varepsilon, n}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 &= \langle v^{\varepsilon, n}, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f \rangle + \langle v_n^{\varepsilon, n}, \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle v^{\varepsilon, n}, [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]P_i^{n-1}v^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

Now, we bound the first term by Cauchy-Schwarz and neglect the second since it is negative, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v^{\varepsilon, n}, \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{2}\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f\|^2 \\ \langle v_n^{\varepsilon, n}, \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle &= -\|(-\mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}v_n^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the third, we use the Replacement Lemma 5.2, so that, overall (5.27) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2}\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f\|^2 + (\frac{1}{2} + Cn^2\lambda_\varepsilon^2)\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 \\ &\leq C'\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}f\|^2 + (\frac{1}{2} + Cn^2\lambda_\varepsilon^2)\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used (3.28) with $\sigma = +$. At this point, (5.25) for $k = 0$ follows upon choosing $\varepsilon(n, 0)$ in such a way that $Cn^2\lambda_{\varepsilon(n, 0)}^2 < \frac{1}{2}$.

We now turn to $k > 0$. Let $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ be the solution to (5.3) with $\psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f$. Then,

$$\|\mathcal{N}^k(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\| \leq n^k\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n})\| + \|\mathcal{N}^k(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\|. \quad (5.28)$$

In view of Proposition 5.1, the second summand is bounded by (a constant times) $\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f\|$ which, by (3.28), is controlled by $\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}f\|$. For the first, we claim that for any j there exists $C > 0$ such that for ε small enough, we have

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n})\|^2 \leq C(n^{-j} + n^2\lambda_\varepsilon^2)\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}f\|^2. \quad (5.29)$$

Assuming the claim, the proof is concluded as it suffices to choose in (5.29) $j = k$ and $\varepsilon_2(n, k) > 0$ such that $n^{k+2}\lambda_{\varepsilon_2(n, k)} < 1$, to ensure that also the first summand in (5.28) is bounded.

We now prove (5.29). To shorten the notation, set $\psi_\varepsilon^\sharp \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f$. We begin by evaluating $-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon$ on $v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n}$. To do so, we exploit (5.26) and the fact that, as noted in the proof of Proposition 5.1, since $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ solves (5.3), we have

$$-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon v_i^{\varepsilon, n} = -\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n}.$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n}) &= -\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon^\sharp - v_i^{\varepsilon, n}) - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon(v_n^{\varepsilon, n} - v_n^{\varepsilon, n}) + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \quad (5.30) \\ &\quad + [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]P_i^{n-1}v^{\varepsilon, n}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\psi_\varepsilon^\sharp \in \Gamma L_2^2$, $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(\psi_\varepsilon^\sharp - v_i^{\varepsilon, n}) \in \Gamma L_i^2$ and $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon(v_n^{\varepsilon, n} - v_n^{\varepsilon, n}) \in \Gamma L_{n+1}^2$, they are orthogonal to both $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ and $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ as these belong to $\bigoplus_{j=i}^n \Gamma L_j^2$. Hence, testing both sides of (5.30) by $v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n})\|^2 &= \langle v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n}, \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle \quad (5.31) \\ &\quad + \langle v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n}, [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]P_i^{n-1}v^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let us analyse the two terms at the right hand side separately. For the first, note that the operator $\mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon$ is negative, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n}, \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle &= \langle v_n^{\varepsilon, n}, \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle - \langle v_n^{\varepsilon, n}, (-\mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle \\ &\leq \langle -v_n^{\varepsilon, n}, (-\mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)v_n^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle \\ &\lesssim \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v_n^{\varepsilon, n}\| \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v_n^{\varepsilon, n}\| \end{aligned}$$

and in the last bound we used that $-\mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon \lesssim -\mathcal{L}_0$ and that $\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}$ and \mathcal{G}^ε commute. Now, the a priori estimates in Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.4 for $k = 0$ allow to upper bound the previous by

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-k}\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\| \|\mathcal{N}^k(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v_n^{\varepsilon, n}\| &\lesssim n^{-k}\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f\|^2 \\ &\lesssim n^{-k}\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}f\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where, once again, the last step follows by (3.28). For the second term in (5.31), we apply the Replacement Lemma 5.2 first and the same a priori estimates as above, thus getting

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n}, [\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\text{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]P_i^{n-1}v^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle & \\ &\leq C\lambda_\varepsilon^2 n^2 \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n})\| \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}C\lambda_\varepsilon^2 n^2 \left(\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n})\|^2 + \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}C\lambda_\varepsilon^2 n^2 \left(\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon, n} - v^{\varepsilon, n})\|^2 + \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f\|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} C \lambda_\varepsilon^2 n^2 \left(\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon,n} - v^{\varepsilon,n})\|^2 + \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} f\|^2 \right),$$

where the constant C changed in the last two lines. Now, by using that for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(n, k)$, $C n^2 \lambda_\varepsilon^2 < 1$, we see that (5.31) is bounded by

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon,n} - v^{\varepsilon,n})\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} C \lambda_\varepsilon^2 n^2 \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{\varepsilon,n} - v^{\varepsilon,n})\|^2 + C' \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} f\|^2$$

for some constant $C' > 0$, from which (5.29) follows at once. \square

We are now ready to state and prove the proposition from which we will deduce (4.13) and (4.12).

Proposition 5.5 *For $i \in \{2, 3\}$, $f \in \Gamma L_{i-1}^2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 3$, let $v^{\varepsilon,n}$ be the solution of the replacement equation with input f as in Definition 5.3. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on k , and $\varepsilon(n, k) > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(n, k)$ the following estimates hold*

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon v_i^{\varepsilon,n})\| \leq \frac{C}{n^k} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} f\|, \quad (5.32)$$

and

$$\|v^{\varepsilon,n}\| \leq C \lambda_\varepsilon \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} f\|. \quad (5.33)$$

Proof. Let us begin with (5.32). Notice that, by the recursive definition of $v^{\varepsilon,n}$, $v_{i-1}^{\varepsilon,n} = 0$ and therefore

$$v_i^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f.$$

Hence, by (5.26), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon v_i^{\varepsilon,n} &= -\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon v^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f \\ &= -\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon,n} + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon,n} \\ &\quad + [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon] P_i^{n-1} v^{\varepsilon,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for the first two terms we use Lemma 3.8 and $-\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon \lesssim -\mathcal{L}_0$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [-\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon,n} + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon v_n^{\varepsilon,n}]\| &\lesssim \sqrt{n} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} v_n^{\varepsilon,n}\| \\ &\lesssim n^{-k} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} f\| \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows by Lemma 5.4. For the third term, we note that the ΓL^2 -norm satisfies a variational formulation, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon] P_i^{n-1} v^{\varepsilon,n}\| \\ &= \sup_{\|\psi\|=1} \langle \psi, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon] P_i^{n-1} v^{\varepsilon,n} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sup_{\|\psi\|=1} \langle (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi, [-\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon] P_i^{n-1} v^{\varepsilon, n} \rangle \\
 &\lesssim C \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sup_{\|\psi\|=1} \|\psi\| \|\mathcal{N}^2(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} v^{\varepsilon, n}\| = C \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{N}^2(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} v^{\varepsilon, n}\| \\
 &\leq C \lambda_\varepsilon^2 n^2 \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} f\| \tag{5.34}
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the third step we used the Replacement Lemma 5.2 and in the last, Lemma 5.4. By choosing $\varepsilon(n, k) > 0$ such that $\lambda_{\varepsilon_2(n, k)}^2 n^{2+k} < 1$, (4.13) follows at once.

We now turn to (5.33). Note that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\psi \in \Gamma L_j^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\|(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi\|^2 \\
 &\lesssim j^2 \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{k_{1:j+1}} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon (\mathfrak{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2))^2 |\hat{\psi}(k_1 + k_2, k_{3:j+1})|^2}{[\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:j+1}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\mathfrak{w} \cdot k)_{1:j+1}^2 G(\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k_{1:j+1}|^2))]^2} \\
 &\lesssim j^2 \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{k_{1:j}} (\mathfrak{w} \cdot k_1)^2 |\hat{\psi}(k_{1:j})|^2 \sum_{\ell+m=k_1} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell, m}^\varepsilon}{(|\ell|^2 + |m|^2)^2} \tag{5.35}
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, the inner sum is clearly finite, and therefore we deduce

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi\|^2 \lesssim \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{N}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2. \tag{5.36}$$

We apply the previous estimate to the definition of $v^{\varepsilon, n}$, so that we obtain

$$\|v^{\varepsilon, n}\|^2 \leq \|(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon [v^{\varepsilon, n} + f]\|^2 \lesssim \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \|\mathcal{N}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} [v^{\varepsilon, n} + f]\|^2. \tag{5.37}$$

By the weighted a priori estimate on $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ in Lemma 5.4, we see that the norm at the right hand side of (5.37) is bounded uniformly in ε so that (5.33) is proven. \square

We can now turn to the proof of (4.14), which is a very easy consequence of the replacement lemma.

Proposition 5.6 *For $i \in \{2, 3\}$, $f \in \Gamma L_{i-1}^2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 3$, let $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ be the solution of the replacement equation with input f as in Definition 5.3. Let $\mathcal{D} = D_{\text{SHE}} \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}$ be the operator in (2.9) with D_{SHE} given by*

$$D_{\text{SHE}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G(1), \tag{5.38}$$

and G the function in (5.14). Then,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon v_i^{\varepsilon, n} - \mathcal{D}f]\| = 0. \tag{5.39}$$

Proof. The recursive definition of $v^{\varepsilon, n}$ ensures that

$$\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon v_i^{\varepsilon, n} = \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f,$$

hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\mathfrak{A}_-^\varepsilon v_i^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathfrak{D}f]\| \\ & \leq \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\mathfrak{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_+^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]f\| \\ & \quad + \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{D}]f\|. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term at the right hand side, we use the same variational principle as in (5.34) so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}[-\mathfrak{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]f\| \\ & = \sup_{\|\psi\|=1} \langle \psi, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}[-\mathfrak{A}_-^\varepsilon(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon)^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_+^\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon]f \rangle \\ & \lesssim \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sup_{\|\psi\|=1} \|\psi\| \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}f\| = \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}f\| \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the Replacement Lemma 5.2. For the second, we use the explicit expression of $\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}$, \mathcal{G}^ε and \mathfrak{D} , which give

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}}\mathcal{G}^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{D}]f\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{(\mathfrak{w} \cdot k)^4}{|k|^2} \left[G(\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}|k|^2)) - D_{\text{SHE}} \right]^2 |\hat{\varphi}(k)|^2.$$

Since for both $i = 1$ and 2 , f is smooth we can take the limit in ε inside the sum and, provided we take D_{SHE} as in (5.38), the right hand side goes to 0. Hence, the proof of (5.39) is completed. \square

At last, we collect the results above and complete the proof of Theorem 4.5 for $d = 2$.

Proof of Theorem 4.5 for $d = 2$. For $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, let f be either f_1 or f_2 in (4.11). We choose $w^{\varepsilon,n}$ to be $v^{\varepsilon,n}$, the solution of the replacement equation with input f as in Definition 5.3. Then, (5.33) and (5.32) in Proposition 5.5 respectively imply that (4.12) and (4.13) hold. The limit in (4.14) instead follows immediately by (5.39) in Proposition 5.6. Therefore the proof is concluded. \square

5.2 The super-critical case: $d \geq 3$

In this section, we focus on Theorem 4.5 in the super-critical dimensions $d \geq 3$. Recall our goal: given the smooth test functions φ, ψ we define the functions $f_j \in \Gamma L_j^2$, $j = 1, 2$ according to (4.11), i.e. as $f_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi, f_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\varphi \otimes \psi]_{\text{sym}}$, and for $i = 2, 3$, we want to show the existence of a function $w^{\varepsilon,n} \in \bigoplus_{j=i}^n \Gamma L_j^2$ (the inhomogeneous Fock space of index running from i to n) such that (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14) hold, for a suitable choice of the constant D_{SHE} in the definition (2.9) of the operator \mathfrak{D} .

For this purpose, we let $w = w^{\varepsilon,n}$ to be the solution of the truncated generator equation

$$-\mathcal{L}_{i,n}^\varepsilon w^{\varepsilon,n} = \mathfrak{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} \tag{5.40}$$

where we recall that $\mathcal{L}_{i,n}^\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{i,n} \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon P_{i,n}$ is the antisymmetric part of the generator, projected on the chaos components from i to n . This choice is dictated by the heuristic argument in Section 4.3, and in particular by (4.16). Clearly, $w^{\varepsilon,n}$ depends also on the choice of $i = 2, 3$, but we do not add an index i , because we reserve the notation $w_i^{\varepsilon,n}$ for the component of $w^{\varepsilon,n}$ in the Fock space ΓL_i^2 .

The proof of (4.13) is quite simple and is a consequence of the general estimates that we have given above. We note first of all that

$$-\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon w^{\varepsilon,n} - \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_i^{\varepsilon,n} = -\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon w_n^{\varepsilon,n}, \quad (5.41)$$

which simply comes from the definition (5.40) of $w^{\varepsilon,n}$ and of $\mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon$. In fact,

$$\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon = \mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon - \bar{P}_{i,n} \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon \bar{P}_{i,n} + \bar{P}_{i,n} \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon + \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon \bar{P}_{i,n}$$

with $\bar{P}_{i,n} = 1 - P_{i,n}$, i.e., the orthogonal projection on $\bigoplus_{a \notin \{i, \dots, n\}} \Gamma L_a^2$, so that for $i \leq j \leq n$

$$\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon w_j^{\varepsilon,n} = \mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon w_j^{\varepsilon,n} + \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon w_j^{\varepsilon,n} \mathbf{1}_{j=i} + \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_j^{\varepsilon,n} \mathbf{1}_{j=n}.$$

By Lemma 3.8,

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon w_n^{\varepsilon,n}\| \lesssim \sqrt{n} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_n^{\varepsilon,n}\| \leq n^{\frac{1}{2}-k} \|\mathcal{N}^k (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_n^{\varepsilon,n}\|.$$

At this point we apply the apriori estimate of Proposition 5.1, which implies that the right hand side of the previous formula is upper bounded by a constant dependent only on k , times

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}-k} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1}\| \lesssim n^{\frac{1}{2}-k} \|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_{i-1}\|,$$

where in the last step we applied again Lemma 3.8. Since f_{i-1} is smooth, the last norm is finite (and independent of n, ε) and therefore, taking $k > \frac{1}{2}$ and letting n tend to infinity, (4.13) follows.

The proof of (4.12) and (4.14) is more subtle but also much more interesting. Here, we give rather a heuristic approach, that allows to introduce the main tools that are used in the actual proof, and in Section 5.2.1 we explain how the rigorous proof (that can be found in full detail in [CGT24, Sections 2.3 and 2.4]) works.

Let us start by looking at the ΓL^2 -norm of $w^{\varepsilon,n}$. By definition,

$$w^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1}. \quad (5.42)$$

It is convenient to define

$$\begin{aligned} T_\pm^\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_\pm^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ T_{i,n}^\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ T_{i,n}^{\varepsilon,\pm} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{i,n} \mathcal{A}_\pm^\varepsilon P_{i,n} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

Now, *pretend* that the inverse that appears in the definition (5.42) can be expanded in power series as

$$\begin{aligned} (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1} &= (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(I - T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 0} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^j(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

The first is a rigorous identity but the second is only formal. Indeed, $\mathcal{A}_{i,n}^\varepsilon$ is *not* negligible with respect to \mathcal{L}_0 as an operator, uniformly in ε and n , not even when the vector $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the definition of the non-linearity has very small norm. In Section 5.2.1, we will explain how to derive an expansion which can be mathematically justified. Let us look first at the 0-th term in the expansion for $w^{\varepsilon,n}$, i.e.

$$(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} \quad (5.45)$$

and let us convince ourselves that this is small (as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$). The computation is analogous to that in (5.35) without $\mathcal{L}_0^{\mathfrak{w}} \mathcal{G}^\varepsilon$, and for any $\psi \in \Gamma L_j^2$ with generic j , we get

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi\|^2 \lesssim j! j^2 \sum_{k_{1:j}} |k_{1:j}|^2 |\hat{\psi}(k_{1:r})|^2 \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{|\ell| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} \frac{1}{(|\ell|^2 + |m|^2)^2}$$

where the constant implicit in the bound is independent of ε, ψ, m . The latter sum is finite in dimension $d = 3$, diverges like $|\log \varepsilon|$ in dimension $d = 4$ and as ε^{4-d} in dimension $d \geq 5$. Therefore,

$$\|(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi\|^2 \lesssim \|\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|^2 \times \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } d = 3, \\ \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon| & \text{if } d = 4, \\ \varepsilon^2 & \text{if } d \geq 5. \end{cases} \quad (5.46)$$

As a consequence of (5.46) applied with f_{i-1} in place of ψ , the norm of (5.45) converges to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 5.7 The inequality (5.46) should be compared with (3.28): while the norm of $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_\pm^\varepsilon \psi$ is at most of the order of $\|\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi\|$, that of $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \psi$ is negligible with respect to it.

Next, let us look at the j -th order term in the expansion for $w^{\varepsilon,n}$, with $j > 0$. This is given by

$$(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^j (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1}, \quad (5.47)$$

whose norm is

$$\langle (T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^j (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1}, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} (T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^j (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_{i-1} \rangle. \quad (5.48)$$

Proving that this norm tends to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is far less trivial than for $j = 0$ and it requires giving a more careful look at the action of the operators \mathcal{A}^ε and

$T_{i,n}^\varepsilon$. For definiteness, consider the case $i = 2$, so that $f_{i-1} = f_1 = \varphi$ belongs to the homogeneous Fock space ΓL_1^2 , and for simplicity assume that φ has a single Fourier mode, i.e. $\varphi = e_k$ for some fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^d$. That is, the Fourier transform $\hat{\varphi}$ is zero except when the momentum equals k , in which case it equals 1. In this case, $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi = \frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}}e_k$ and the scalar product in (5.48) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{|k|^2}{2} \langle (T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^j T_+^\varepsilon e_k, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} (T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^j T_+^\varepsilon e_k \rangle \quad (5.49)$$

with the notations (5.43).

To get a grip on (5.49), it is useful to introduce an intuitive representation in terms of paths. First of all, expand

$$(T_{i,n}^\varepsilon)^j T_+^\varepsilon = (T_{i,n}^{\varepsilon,+} + T_{i,n}^{\varepsilon,-})^j T_+^\varepsilon$$

into a sum of 2^j terms. Each such term is a product of $j + 1$ operators $T_{i,n}^{\varepsilon,\sigma}$, $\sigma \in \{-1, +1\}$, whose structure can be encoded via a ‘‘path’’ $p = (p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{j+1})$ with $j + 1$ steps, where by convention $p_0 = 1$ and $p_r - p_{r-1} = \pm 1$. These increments correspond to the signs σ of operators appearing in the product, read from right to left. For instance, for $j = 3$ the product $T_{i,n}^{\varepsilon,+} T_{i,n}^{\varepsilon,-} T_{i,n}^{\varepsilon,+} T_+^\varepsilon$ would correspond to the path $p = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) = (1, 2, 3, 2, 3)$ because $p_1 - p_0 = p_2 - p_1 = +1$, $p_3 - p_2 = -1$, $p_4 - p_3 = +1$.

Since we are applying such products to e_k that belongs to ΓL_1^2 , the effect of the projectors $P_{2,n}$ in the definition of $T_{2,n}^{\varepsilon,\pm}$ is to select only paths that never reach height 1 (except at its starting point) or height $n + 1$. Note that, necessarily, $p_1 = 2$, because the rightmost operator in the product is T_+^ε , and also $p_2 = 3$, otherwise one would have $p_2 = 1$. Call $\Pi_{j+1}^{(n)}$ the (finite) set of such paths of length $j + 1$ that reach neither height 1 (except at the starting point and possibly at the endpoint) nor $n + 1$, and call $\Pi_{j+1,a}^{(n)}$ the subsets of those paths in $\Pi_{j+1}^{(n)}$ that end at height a , i.e. such that $p_{j+1} = a$. Finally, for $p \in \Pi_{j+1}^{(n)}$, let

$$\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon = T_{p_{j+1}-p_j}^\varepsilon \cdots T_{p_2-p_1}^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon. \quad (5.50)$$

Plugging this (finite) expansion into (5.49), we can rewrite it as

$$\frac{|k|^2}{2} \sum_{2 \leq a \leq n} \sum_{p^{(1)}, p^{(2)} \in \Pi_{j+1,a}^{(n)}} \langle \mathcal{T}_{p^{(1)}}^\varepsilon e_k, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{p^{(2)}}^\varepsilon e_k \rangle. \quad (5.51)$$

The reason why both paths belong to $\Pi_{j+1,a}^{(n)}$ with the same value of a is that the scalar product would be zero otherwise, since $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon e_k \in \Gamma L_a^2$. Since the sum over paths is finite (for every given j), we are left with proving that each scalar product in the last expression individually tends to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For pedagogical reasons, let us look at a concrete example, with $j = 1$ and $p^{(1)} = p^{(2)} = p := (1, 2, 3)$, corresponding to $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon = T_+^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon$. That is, we look at the norm

$$\langle \mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon e_k, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon e_k \rangle = \langle T_+^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon e_k, (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} T_+^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon e_k \rangle. \quad (5.52)$$

Recalling how T_{\pm}^{ε} are defined in terms of $\mathcal{A}_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}$ and how $\mathcal{A}_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}$ act on each Fock subspace, the scalar product in (5.52) can be written as a multiple Fourier sums. Let us work this out step by step. First of all, recalling that $\varphi = e_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(T_{+}^{\varepsilon}\varphi)(k_{1:2}) &= -\sqrt{\frac{2}{|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2}} \frac{\iota\lambda_{\varepsilon}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \mathfrak{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2) \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^{\varepsilon} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{|k|} \hat{\varphi}(k_1 + k_2) \\ &= C_1 \lambda_{\varepsilon} \frac{\mathfrak{w} \cdot k}{|k| |k_{1:2}|} \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{k_1 + k_2 = k}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

with $C_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\iota/(2\pi)^{d/2}$. In the first equality, the first square root comes from the leftmost $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in the definition of T_{+}^{ε} , while the ratio $\sqrt{2}/|k|$ from the rightmost one, and in the second equality we used the fact that for our choice of φ , $\hat{\varphi}(m) = \mathbb{1}_{m=k}$. When we apply T_{+}^{ε} for a second time we get something more complicated, because the output belongs to ΓL_3^2 , so that there are three possible choices of (i, j) in the formula (3.23) for $\mathcal{A}_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}$. Namely, the reader can easily check that

$$\mathcal{F}(T_{+}^{\varepsilon}T_{+}^{\varepsilon}\varphi)(k_{1:3}) = C_2 \lambda_{\varepsilon}^2 \frac{\mathfrak{w} \cdot k}{|k|} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = k}}{|k_{1:3}|} [(\text{I}) + (\text{II}) + (\text{III})], \quad (5.54)$$

where $C_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2}{3}(C_1)^2$ and

$$(\text{I}) = \frac{\mathfrak{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2)}{|k_1 + k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2} \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{J}_{k_1 + k_2, k_3}^{\varepsilon},$$

while the term denoted (II) (resp. (III)) is defined like (I), except that (k_1, k_2, k_3) is replaced by (k_1, k_3, k_2) (resp. by (k_2, k_3, k_1)). Note in particular the indicator function that imposes that the total sum of the momenta is k . This is a general fact, that holds for every choice of path p , and is a consequence of translation invariance (in law) of the Burgers equation (see (3.24) for how it translates to the generator). The occurrence of the prefactor $(\mathfrak{w} \cdot k)/|k|$ is also general and is due to the action of the rightmost $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ (that produces $1/|k|$ when acting on e_k) and of the term $\mathfrak{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2)$ from the rightmost $\mathcal{A}_{+}^{\varepsilon}$, since at the first application one has $k_1 + k_2 = k$ by conservation of momentum. See also the left drawing in Fig. 1.

At last we can compute the norm in (5.52). When squaring, we obtain both ‘‘direct terms’’ like (I)², or ‘‘cross terms’’ like (I)×(II), see again Fig. 1 for a schematic illustration. By symmetry, all direct terms give the same result, as do all cross terms. Altogether, the contribution of the direct terms is

$$3C_2^2 \lambda_{\varepsilon}^4 \left(\frac{\mathfrak{w} \cdot k}{|k|} \right)^2 \sum_{k_{1:3}} \mathbb{1}_{k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = k} \frac{(\mathfrak{w} \cdot (k_1 + k_2))^2 \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{J}_{k_1 + k_2, k_3}^{\varepsilon}}{|k_{1:3}|^4 (|k_1 + k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2)^2}. \quad (5.55)$$

The contribution from the cross terms is similar, and actually for the present purposes we can simply bound it above by (5.55), using Cauchy-Schwarz.




Figure 1: *Left drawing*: a schematic representation of term (I) in $(T_+^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon e_k)(k_{1:3})$. The drawing should be read from right to left: each branching corresponds to the application of $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ (or equivalently T_+^ε), the labels next to the lines denote the Fourier variable (momentum) and at each branching, the sum of outgoing momenta equals the incoming momentum. *Center and right drawings*: a schematic representation of the direct term (I)² and of the cross term (I)×(II).

Let us make a few comments about (5.55). The sum on $k_{1:3}$ runs over $(\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\})^3$, but because of the indicator function, it is actually only on k_1, k_2 . Secondly, the terms $\mathbb{J}_{\cdot, \cdot}^\varepsilon$ restrict summed momenta to be at most of order ε^{-1} . Finally, observe that $\lambda_\varepsilon^4 = \varepsilon^{2d-4}$. Therefore, we can rewrite the sum (including the prefactor λ_ε^4) in the more evocative form

$$\varepsilon^2 \times \varepsilon^{2d} \sum_{k_1, k_2} \mathbb{J}_{\varepsilon k_1, \varepsilon k_2}^1 \mathbb{J}_{\varepsilon(k_1+k_2), \varepsilon(k-k_1-k_2)}^1 \times \quad (5.56)$$

$$\times \frac{(\mathfrak{w} \cdot (\varepsilon k_1 + \varepsilon k_2))^2}{(|\varepsilon k_1|^2 + |\varepsilon k_2|^2 + |\varepsilon(k-k_1-k_2)|^2)^2} \frac{1}{(|\varepsilon(k_1+k_2)|^2 + |\varepsilon(k-k_1-k_2)|^2)^2}.$$

As ε tends to zero, the sum (including the factor ε^{2d}) is a Riemann sum approximation and the whole expression approximately equals

$$\varepsilon^2 \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} dq dp \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon \leq |p|, |q|, |p+q| \leq 1} \frac{(\mathfrak{w} \cdot (p+q))^2}{(|q|^2 + |p|^2 + |p+q|^2)^2} \times \frac{1}{4|p+q|^4}, \quad (5.57)$$

where the indicator function comes from the fact that, for instance, $\mathbb{J}_{\varepsilon k_1, \varepsilon k_2}^1 = \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon$ imposes $0 \leq |k_1|, |k_2|, |k_1+k_2| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}$. To analyse this integral, it is convenient to make a dyadic scale decomposition into regions where $2^{-a-1} \leq |p| \leq 2^{-a}$, $2^{-b-1} \leq |p+q| \leq 2^{-b}$ with $0 \leq a, b \lesssim |\log_2 \varepsilon|$. In each such region $D_{a,b}$ the integrand is approximately constant, and the integral restricted to $D_{a,b}$ is of order

$$\frac{2^{-d(a+b)}}{2^{-2b} 2^{-4 \min(a,b)}},$$

where the numerator estimates the size of $D_{a,b}$ and the denominator estimates the integral (we used the obvious bound $|\mathfrak{w} \cdot (p+q)| \lesssim |p+q|$). The sum over $a, b \lesssim |\log_2 \varepsilon|$ is bounded uniformly in ε for $d > 3$ and it is of order $|\log \varepsilon|$ for $d = 3$. In either case, the expression (5.57) tends to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We emphasize that the presence of the inverse $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1}$ in (5.52) is crucial: otherwise, the exponent 4 in (5.55) would be 2 and the prefactor ε^2 in (5.56) would not be there.

The argument just given proves that one particular term in the sum (5.51), corresponding to a specific j and a specific choice of $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}$, converges to zero as desired. In principle, to prove the convergence (4.12), one might try to treat the generic term in the same way and prove that each individually converges to zero. As the reader can easily imagine, however, expressions like (5.54) and the corresponding integrals become unmanageable as soon as j grows. This problem is solved in a systematic way in [CGT24, Lemma 2.19], where the generalisation of formula (5.54) to the case of a generic path $p \in \Pi_{j+1,a}^{(n)}$ is derived via an inductive procedure, the induction being with respect to the length of the path p . Without writing here the full result, let us point out its main features. If $p \in \Pi_{j+1,a}^{(n)}$, then $\mathcal{F}_p^\varepsilon e_k \in \Gamma L_a^2$. The expression for $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}_p^\varepsilon e_k)(k_{1:a})$ has several points in common with (5.54):

1. it is proportional to $\lambda_\varepsilon^{j+1}$ (because the product $\mathcal{F}_p^\varepsilon$ contains $j+1$ operators, each bringing a factor λ_ε),
2. it is proportional to $(\mathfrak{w} \cdot k)/|k|$ (coming from the rightmost T_+^ε), to $1/|k_{1:a}|$ (coming from the leftmost $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$) and to $\mathbb{1}_{k_1+\dots+k_a=k}$ (from translation invariance),
3. it contains the sum over r ‘‘momenta’’ in \mathbb{Z}_0^d , where r is the number of operators T_-^ε that appear in $\mathcal{F}_p^\varepsilon$ (in the example (5.54), $r=0$). The sums come from that over ℓ, m that appears in the definition (3.23) of $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$.
4. just as (5.54) involves the sum of the three terms (I), (II), (III) coming from the three possible choices of $1 \leq i < j < 3$ from the application of $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ to a function in ΓL_2^2 , the general formula involves a large but finite sum of terms, each coming from a choice of $1 \leq i < j \leq n+1$ or $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ from the repeated applications of $\mathcal{A}_\pm^\varepsilon$, see (3.18). Each term is a product of indicator functions $\mathbb{J}_{\cdot,\cdot}^\varepsilon$, multiplied by a ratio of two homogeneous polynomials of $k_{1:a}$. The polynomials in the numerator originates from the $\mathfrak{w} \cdot (\ell + m)$ or $\mathfrak{w} \cdot (k_i + k_j)$ in (3.23), while those in the denominator come from the $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ involved in the definition of T_\pm^ε .

A simple power counting based on the degree of homogeneity of the polynomials mentioned in item 4 above then shows that the scalar product in (5.51) is in the form a product between ε^2 and the Riemann sum approximation of an integral of $j+1$ variables in \mathbb{R}^d , where the integrand is a linear combination of ratios of homogeneous polynomials whose variables are constrained to be of norm at most 1. It would be extremely laborious to analyse by hand the convergence of such integrals, as we did for the simple case of (5.57) above. The way out devised in [CGT24] is based on the following observations. First, as noted above, there is an extra $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1}$, in the sense that even without it the scalar product in (5.49) would be bounded. Second, the main contribution to the norm of T_\pm^ε comes from momenta whose size diverges with ε (see the informal discussion after Lemma 3.5 or the precise formulation of [CGT24,

Lemma 2.15]), i.e. the Fourier modes ℓ, m produced by $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$ (or those annihilated by $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$) need to be such that $|\ell|, |m| \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. As a consequence, we can (formally) bound the extra $(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \lesssim \varepsilon^{2\gamma}$, which vanishes, and be left with something which is $O(1)$ (see [CGT24, Lemma 2.16] for the details).

Let us now turn to (the heuristics of) the proof of (4.14). Again, we consider $i = 2$ and the special case $f_1 = \varphi = e_k$ (the function φ is the single Fourier mode k). At the end of this section, we will comment on the case $i = 3$, which is *not* a simple extension of $i = 2$ and requires some new ideas. Again we choose $w^{\varepsilon, n}$ as in (5.40) and our goal is to prove that, in the double limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ first and $n \rightarrow \infty$ afterwards,

$$(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_2^{\varepsilon, n} \approx (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D} f_1 = -D_{\text{SHE}} \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2}{\sqrt{2}|k|} e_k \quad (5.58)$$

for a suitable constant $D_{\text{SHE}} > 0$. Let us start by rewriting the l.h.s. of (5.58) as

$$\begin{aligned} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_2^{\varepsilon, n} &= (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}_{2,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \varphi \\ &= (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (I - T_{2,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon \varphi \\ &= \frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}} P_1 T_-^\varepsilon (I - T_{2,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1} T_+^\varepsilon \varphi, \end{aligned}$$

with P_1 the projection on ΓL_1^2 . Again, let us proceed heuristically and expand the inverse in power series:

$$\begin{aligned} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_2^{\varepsilon, n} &= \frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}} P_1 T_-^\varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (T_{2,n}^\varepsilon)^j T_+^\varepsilon \varphi \\ &= \frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_1 T_-^\varepsilon (T_{2,n}^{\varepsilon,+} + T_{2,n}^{\varepsilon,-})^j T_+^\varepsilon \varphi \quad (5.59) \\ &= \frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{p \in \Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}} \mathcal{J}_p^\varepsilon \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

where, in the last step, we expanded the power $(T_{2,n}^{\varepsilon,+} + T_{2,n}^{\varepsilon,-})^j$ and used the fact that, due to the presence of the projector P_1 , each resulting paths p belongs to $\Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}$, i.e. p has to end at height 1. Note that the first (resp. last) step of the path is necessarily upward (resp. downward), due to the rightmost T_+^ε (resp. to the leftmost T_-^ε).

What we would like to see is that for each path $p \in \Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}$,

$$\frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}} \mathcal{J}_p^\varepsilon \varphi \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} -D(p) \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2}{\sqrt{2}|k|} e_k \quad (5.60)$$

for some $D(p)$, so that (morally) the constant D_{SHE} in (5.58) would be given by

$$D_{\text{SHE}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \sum_{p \in \Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}} D(p).$$

For concreteness, let us look at a concrete example, namely take $p = (1, 2, 1)$, that belongs to $\Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}$ with $j = 0$, corresponding to $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon = T_-^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon$. (It would probably be more convincing for the reader if we worked out an example with $j > 0$, but $\Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}$ is empty unless j is even and for $j = 2$, $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon$ involves the product of four operators $T_\varepsilon^\varepsilon$, leading to a cumbersome and unreadable expression for $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon e_k$.) Let us then write down the explicit expression for $(T_-^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon e_k)(k')$. To do this, we start from (5.53) and we apply T_-^ε , with the result

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}} \mathcal{F}(T_-^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon e_k)(k') &= -\frac{|k|}{\sqrt{2}} C_3 \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)(\mathbf{w} \cdot k')}{|k| |k'|} \sum_{\ell+m=k'} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{|\ell|^2 + |m|^2} \mathbb{1}_{\ell+m=k} \\ &= -C_3 \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2}{\sqrt{2}|k|} \mathbb{1}_{k=k'} \sum_{\ell+m=k} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{|\ell|^2 + |m|^2} \end{aligned} \quad (5.61)$$

with $C_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -4(C_1)^2 > 0$ and C_1 as in (5.53). Next, note that

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell+m=k} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{|\ell|^2 + |m|^2} = \varepsilon^d \sum_{\ell+m=k} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 |\ell|^2 + \varepsilon_2 |m|^2} = \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{0 < |x|, |x-\varepsilon k| \leq 1}}{|x|^2 + |\varepsilon k - x|^2} :$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the latter sum converges to the integral

$$I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{|x| \leq 1}}{2|x|^2} dx > 0 \quad (5.62)$$

which is both finite (because $d \geq 3$) and independent of k . Since the function $k' \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{k'=k}$ is exactly the kernel of $\varphi = e_k$, we have proven that (for this particular choice of path p) (5.60) holds, with $D(p) = I \times C_3 > 0$. Obviously, for generic path p there is no simple way of writing down explicitly the kernel of $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon e_k$. However, using the recursive expression mentioned above (see [CGT24, Lemma 2.19]), it is not difficult to convince oneself that indeed each of these kernels is proportional to $(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2 \mathbb{1}_{k'=k}$ times a Riemann sum, whose summand is a finite linear combination of ratios of polynomials. Next, an a priori estimate of ‘‘uniform summability’’ type, on the operators on the operators T_\pm^ε , (or rather on a modified version of them, called $T_\pm^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ there, see [CGT24, Lemma 2.14]) allow to prove that indeed the sums converge to the corresponding integrals, and that these are finite. The integrals are independent of k since, before the limit ε is taken, k appears in the sums only in the combination $\varepsilon \times k$. We refer to [CGT24, Lemma 2.20] for all details.

Finally, we want to explain why formula (4.14) holds also for $i = 3$, i.e. when the function $f_{i-1} = f_2$ belongs to the second Wiener chaos ΓL_2^2 . Recall that for the proof of Theorem 4.5 we want to take f_2 of the form $f_2 = [\varphi \otimes \psi]_{sym} = [\varphi \otimes \psi + \psi \otimes \varphi]/2$ for some smooth test functions φ, ψ . For simplicity, consider here the case $\varphi = \psi = e_k$, so that Fourier transform of f_2 (as function of two momenta k_1, k_2) is just $\mathbb{1}_{k_1,2=(k,k)}$.

What we need to prove is that, in the limit where $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ first and then $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_3^{\varepsilon,n} \approx (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D} f_2 = -\frac{1}{|k|} D_{\text{SHE}}(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2 e_k \otimes e_k, \quad (5.63)$$

where \approx means that the difference of the two expressions should have small ΓL^2 -norm as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We emphasise that there are two non-trivial points here. First, D_{SHE} should not just be “a constant”, but *the same* constant as in (5.58). Secondly, by translation invariance, it is clear that the right hand side of (5.63) should be a linear combination of $[e_m \otimes e_\ell]_{\text{sym}}$, with $\ell + m = 2k$. What (5.63) is saying is much stronger: not only the total momentum, but (at least in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) the two individual momenta are conserved!

To see why this happens, let us proceed exactly as in the case $i = 2$ but, this time, take, according to (5.40),

$$w^{\varepsilon,n} = (-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}_{3,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon f_2.$$

Now, a formal power series expansion of $(-\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathcal{A}_{3,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1}$ leads to (the reader is invited to check!)

$$\begin{aligned} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon w_3^{\varepsilon,n}(k_{1:2}) &= |k| P_2 T_-^\varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (T_{2,n}^\varepsilon)^j T_+^\varepsilon [e_k \otimes e_k](k_{1:2}) \\ &= |k| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{p \in \Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}} \mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon [e_k \otimes e_k](k_{1:2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, like in (5.59), the paths p end at height 1: however, since $[e_k \otimes e_k] \in \Gamma L_2^2$, the right-hand side is correctly an element of ΓL_2^2 . Let us choose the same $p = (1, 2, 1)$ and $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon = T_-^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon$ as above, and let us see whether, indeed,

$$|k| \mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon [e_k \otimes e_k] \approx -\frac{1}{|k|} D(p) (\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2 [e_k \otimes e_k], \quad (5.64)$$

with the same $D(p) = I \times C_3$. This is a bit laborious but very instructive. First of all, using the definition of $\mathcal{A}_+^\varepsilon$, note that

$$|k| \mathcal{F}(T_+^\varepsilon e_k \otimes e_k)(k_{1:3}) = C_1 \frac{\lambda_\varepsilon \sqrt{2}}{3 |k_{1:3}|} (\mathbf{w} \cdot k) [(I') + (II') + (III')] \quad (5.65)$$

where $(I') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{J}_{k_1, k_2}^\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{k_1+k_2=k_3=k}$, while (II') (resp. (III')) is defined like (I') , except that (k_1, k_2, k_3) is replaced by (k_1, k_3, k_2) (resp. (k_2, k_3, k_1)), and the constant C_1 is the same as in (5.53). See Fig. 2 for a schematic representation of (I') – (III') .

Next, we apply T_-^ε . Because it acts on a function in ΓL_3^2 , in the definition (3.23) of $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$, we have two possible choices for j , i.e. $j = 1$ or 2 . Therefore $|k| \mathcal{F}(T_-^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon [e_k \otimes e_k])(k_{1:2})$ is the sum of six terms: two of them are referred to as “the diagonal diagrams” and the other four as the “off-diagonal diagrams”. The term “diagram” is chosen because of the analogy with Feynman diagrams arising in perturbative analysis of field theories. See Fig. 3 for an explanation of this nomenclature.




Figure 2: A schematic representation of the terms (I), (II), (III). When T_+^ε acts on $e_k \otimes e_k$, the first momentum k is split into two momenta k_i, k_j with three possible choices for $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$. By conservation of momentum, $k_i + k_j = k$, and the third outgoing momentum also equals k .

Taking carefully into account the prefactors in the definitions of $\mathfrak{A}_\pm^\varepsilon$, the reader can check that the sum of the two diagonal diagrams in $|k| T_-^\varepsilon T_+^\varepsilon [e_k \otimes e_k](k_{1:2})$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \times (C_1)^2 \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)(\mathbf{w} \cdot k_1)}{|k_{1:2}|} 2\sqrt{2}\lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell+m=k_1} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{|\ell|^2 + |m|^2 + |k|^2} \mathbb{1}_{\ell+m=k_2=k} \\ &= -C_3 \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)^2}{|k|} \mathbb{1}_{k_1=k_2=k} \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell+m=k} \mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon \frac{1}{|\ell|^2 + |m|^2 + |k|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

with C_3 the same constant as in (5.61), and the factor 2 at the beginning of the first line comes from the fact that there are 2 diagonal diagrams. Finally, note that $\mathbb{1}_{k_1=k_2=k} = \mathcal{F}([e_k \otimes e_k])(k_{1:2})$ and that the sum, including the prefactor λ_ε^2 , converges as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to the same finite integral I as in (5.62). In other words, the diagonal diagrams in $|k| \mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon [e_k \otimes e_k](k_{1:2})$ are non-zero only if $k_{1:2} = (k, k)$, in which case they tend exactly to the r.h.s. of (5.64) computed at $k_{1:2} = (k, k)$.

Hopefully, the contribution of the off-diagonal diagrams to $|k| \mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon [e_k \otimes e_k](k_{1:2})$ is negligible in the limit. Let us compute them. Applying again the definition of T_-^ε one sees that, for instance, the diagram in the middle of Fig. 3 is proportional to

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^2 \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)(\mathbf{w} \cdot k_1)}{|k_{1:2}|} \sum_{\ell+m=k_1} \frac{\mathbb{J}_{\ell,m}^\varepsilon}{|\ell|^2 + |m|^2 + |k_2|^2} \mathbb{1}_{\ell+k_2=m=k}.$$

Note that, because of the indicator functions, the whole expression is zero unless $k_1 + k_2 = 2k$ and the only possible value of ℓ is $k_1 - k = k - k_2$. Therefore, the previous sum is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot k)(\mathbf{w} \cdot k_1)}{\sqrt{|k_1|^2 + |2k - k_1|^2}} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{|k_1| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}}}{|k - k_1|^2 + |k|^2 + |2k - k_1|^2} \mathbb{1}_{k_1+k_2=2k} \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^{d-2} |k| \frac{\mathbb{1}_{0 < |k_1| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}}}{|k_1|^2} \mathbb{1}_{k_1+k_2=2k}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: A schematic, graphical, representation of the three contributions that are obtained by applying T_-^ε (with the choice $j = 1$ in the definition (3.23) of $\mathcal{A}_-^\varepsilon$) to the three terms (I'), (II'), (III') defining $T_+^\varepsilon[e_k \otimes e_k]$. The left-most drawing corresponds to a diagonal diagram (a similar one is obtained with the choice $j = 2$) while the second and third are two of the four off-diagonal diagrams (again, the remaining two are obtained with the choice $j = 2$). As the drawing indicates, in diagonal diagrams the action of T_-^ε merges exactly the two momenta that have been generated by the application of T_+^ε , which splits one incoming momentum k . In off-diagonal diagrams, instead, one of the two merged momenta has not been modified by the action of T_+^ε . Note that because of momentum conservation, in the two off-diagonal diagrams, ℓ is forced to be equal to $k_1 - k = k - k_2$ (recall that $k_1 + k_2 = 2k$ also because of momentum conservation), while in the diagonal one ℓ is free and will be summed over.

The last expression, as a function of $k_{1,2}$, has an L^2 norm that vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, for every dimension $d \geq 3$. More precisely, the squared norm vanishes as ε^d for $d \geq 5$, as $\varepsilon^4 |\log \varepsilon|$ for $d = 4$ and as ε^2 for $d = 3$, which implies that (5.64) holds.

We emphasise that (see Fig. 3) what distinguishes graphically a diagonal from an off-diagonal diagram are the following two properties, namely the graph associated to a diagonal diagram (i) is disconnected and (ii) it has a line flowing from one of the two incoming to one of the two outgoing momenta, without undergoing any branching or merging. A systematic analysis of $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon[e_k \otimes e_k]$, and more generally of $\mathcal{T}_p^\varepsilon f_2$, for general path $p \in \Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}$ and $f_2 \in \Gamma L_2^2$, shows that the only diagrams that contribute as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ are those that satisfy properties (i)-(ii) (see [CGT24, Lemma 2.17]). See also Fig. 4 for a pictorial example.

5.2.1 Avoiding the power series expansion

The argument sketched in the previous section has an obvious weak point: the power series expansion (5.44) is not justified. In fact, what (3.29) says is that the norm of T_σ^ε , when acting on ΓL_j^2 , is bounded by a constant C times \sqrt{j} . Following the proof of (3.29) one easily sees that the constant C can be (artificially) made small choosing the vector \mathfrak{w} that defines the nonlinearity to have a small norm. However, the factor \sqrt{j} grows with the chaos label, so that the operator $T_{2,n}^\varepsilon$ cannot be expected to be bounded in norm by anything better than \sqrt{n} . Hence, the power series expansion of $(I - T_{2,n}^\varepsilon)^{-1}$ around $T_{2,n}^\varepsilon = 0$ has no chance of converging.




Figure 4: A schematic representation of three diagrams arising in the expression of $\mathcal{T}_p^\epsilon[e_k \otimes e_k]$ for paths belonging to $\Pi_{j+2,1}^{(n)}$, $j = 2$. The left-most one satisfies properties (i)-(ii) and it gives a non-vanishing contribution as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The two others do not, either because they are not disconnected, or because both connected components involve branching and merging.

Let us present the way to avoid it that we learned from [GP]. We will specialise to the case of (4.12), since the argument for (4.14) works similarly (see the proof of [CGT24, Proposition 2.12] for the details). The key point is to note that, while $T_{2,n}^\epsilon$ is not small, it is antisymmetric, so that, in particular, its spectrum is purely imaginary. As a consequence, the inverse $(I - T_{2,n}^\epsilon)^{-1}$ is well-defined and can be expressed as

$$(I - T_{2,n}^\epsilon)^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-s} e^{sT_{2,n}^\epsilon} ds \quad (5.66)$$

and the integral converges since the exponential is bounded by 1 thanks to the mentioned purely imaginary nature of the spectrum of $T_{2,n}^\epsilon$. Therefore, the L^2 norm of $w^{\epsilon,n}$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \|w^{\epsilon,n}\|^2 &= -\frac{|k|^2}{2} \langle e_k, T_-^\epsilon (I + T_{2,n}^\epsilon)^{-1} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} (I - T_{2,n}^\epsilon)^{-1} T_+^\epsilon e_k \rangle \quad (5.67) \\ &= -\frac{|k|^2}{2} \langle e_k, T_-^\epsilon \int_0^\infty e^{-s} e^{-sT_{2,n}^\epsilon} ds (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{-r} e^{+rT_{2,n}^\epsilon} dr T_+^\epsilon e_k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since the exponentials are bounded by 1, we can apply Fubini's theorem to exchange integration with the scalar product and, dominated convergence, to exchange it with the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, thus obtaining

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w^{\epsilon,n}\|^2 = -\frac{|k|^2}{2} \int_0^\infty ds dr e^{-r-s} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle e_k, T_-^\epsilon e^{-sT_{2,n}^\epsilon} (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} e^{+rT_{2,n}^\epsilon} T_+^\epsilon e_k \rangle. \quad (5.68)$$

At this point, since $T_{2,n}^\epsilon$ is bounded (for fixed n , thanks to Lemma 3.8), we can expand the exponentials in power series and exchange limit and summation

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w^{\epsilon,n}\|^2 &= -\frac{|k|^2}{2} \int_0^\infty ds dr e^{-r-s} \times \\ &\quad \times \sum_{a \geq 0, b \geq 0} \frac{(-s)^a r^b}{a! b!} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle e_k, T_-^\epsilon (T_{2,n}^\epsilon)^a (-\mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} (T_{2,n}^\epsilon)^b T_+^\epsilon e_k \rangle \end{aligned}$$

(this is allowed for fixed values of r and s ; note, however, that we *cannot exchange the order of summation and integration at this point!*). Now we are in a situation similar to that where we got after the non-rigorous step (5.44), except that this time all expansions and exchanges of limits are justified. Hence, we reduced the problem to the analysis of a scalar product which has the form of that in (5.49) and we can proceed as we did in the previous section.

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to Fondazione CIME (Centro Internazionale Matematico Estivo) and to Francesco Caravenna, Rongfeng Sun and Nikos Zygouras for organizing the Summer school “Statistical Mechanics and Stochastic PDEs”. We would also like to thank Dirk Erhard, Massimiliano Gubinelli and Levi Haunschmid-Sibitz for their contributions to the articles these lecture notes are based on, and Quentin Mouillard for enlightening discussions, in particular about the heuristics of Section 4.3.

G. C. gratefully acknowledges financial support via the UKRI FL fellowship “Large-scale universal behaviour of Random Interfaces and Stochastic Operators” MR/W008246/1. F. T. was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P35428-N.

References

- [APP83] D. J. AMIT, G. PARISI, and L. PELITI. Asymptotic behavior of the “true” self-avoiding walk. *Physical review B* **27**, no. 3, (1983), 1635.
- [BB17] A. BORODIN and A. BUFETOV. An irreversible local Markov chain that preserves the six vertex model on a torus. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **53**, no. 1, (2017), 451–463. doi:10.1214/15-AIHP722.
- [BC14] A. BORODIN and I. CORWIN. Macdonald processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **158**, no. 1-2, (2014), 225–400. doi:10.1007/s00440-013-0482-3.
- [BF14] A. BORODIN and P. L. FERRARI. Anisotropic growth of random surfaces in $2 + 1$ dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **325**, no. 2, (2014), 603–684. doi:10.1007/s00220-013-1823-x.
- [BG97] L. BERTINI and G. GIACOMIN. Stochastic Burgers and KPZ equations from particle systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **183**, no. 3, (1997), 571–607. doi:10.1007/s002200050044.
- [CC18] G. CANNIZZARO and K. CHOUK. Multidimensional SDEs with singular drift and universal construction of the polymer measure with white noise potential. *Ann. Probab.* **46**, no. 3, (2018), 1710–1763. doi:10.1214/17-AOP1213.
- [CCM20] F. COMETS, C. COSCO, and C. MUKHERJEE. Renormalizing the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation in $d \geq 3$ in weak disorder. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **179**, (2020), 713–728.
- [CD20] S. CHATTERJEE and A. DUNLAP. Constructing a solution of the $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional KPZ equation. *The Annals of Probability* **48**, no. 2, (2020), 1014 – 1055. doi:10.1214/19-AOP1382.

- [CES21] G. CANNIZZARO, D. ERHARD, and P. SCHÖNBAUER. 2D anisotropic KPZ at stationarity: scaling, tightness and nontriviality. *Ann. Probab.* **49**, no. 1, (2021), 122–156. doi:10.1214/20-AOP1446.
- [CET23a] G. CANNIZZARO, D. ERHARD, and F. TONINELLI. The stationary AKPZ equation: logarithmic superdiffusivity. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **76**, no. 11, (2023), 3044–3103. doi:10.1002/cpa.22108.
- [CET23b] G. CANNIZZARO, D. ERHARD, and F. TONINELLI. Weak coupling limit of the Anisotropic KPZ equation. *Duke Math. Journal* **172(16)**, (2023), 3013–3104. doi:https://doi.org/10.1215/00127094-2022-0094.
- [CG24] G. CANNIZZARO and H. GILES. An invariance principle for the 2d self-repelling brownian polymer (2024). arXiv:2403.06730.
- [CGT24] G. CANNIZZARO, M. GUBINELLI, and F. TONINELLI. Gaussian fluctuations for the stochastic Burgers equation in dimension $d \geq 2$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **405**, no. 89(2024). doi:10.1007/s00220-024-04966-z.
- [CHST22] G. CANNIZZARO, L. HAUNSMID-SIBITZ, and F. TONINELLI. $\sqrt{\log t}$ -superdiffusivity for a Brownian particle in the curl of the 2D GFF. *Annals of Probability* **50**, no. 6, (2022), 2475 – 2498. doi:10.1214/22-AOP1589.
- [CK23] G. CANNIZZARO and J. KIEDROWSKI. Stationary stochastic navier–stokes on the plane at and above criticality. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations* (2023). doi:10.1007/s40072-022-00283-5.
- [CKnt] G. CANNIZZARO and T. KLOSE. Hairer-Quastel universality result for the critical stationary stochastic Burgers equation (preprint).
- [CLO01] C.-C. CHANG, C. LANDIM, and S. OLLA. Equilibrium fluctuations of asymmetric simple exclusion processes in dimension $d \geq 3$. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **119**, no. 3, (2001), 381–409. doi:10.1007/PL00008764.
- [CMOW23] G. CHATZIGEORGIOU, P. MORFE, F. OTTO, and L. WANG. The gaussian free-field as a stream function: asymptotics of effective diffusivity in infra-red cut-off (2023). arXiv:2212.14244.
- [CNN20] C. COSCO, S. NAKAJIMA, and M. NAKASHIMA. Law of large numbers and fluctuations in the sub-critical and L^2 regions for SHE and KPZ equation in dimension $d \geq 3$. *arXiv e-prints* (2020). arXiv:2005.12689.
- [CSZ20] F. CARAVENNA, R. SUN, and N. ZYGOURAS. The two-dimensional KPZ equation in the entire subcritical regime. *Ann. Probab.* **48**, no. 3, (2020), 1086–1127. doi:10.1214/19-AOP1383.
- [CSZ23] F. CARAVENNA, R. SUN, and N. ZYGOURAS. The critical 2d Stochastic Heat Flow. *Inventiones mathematicae* (2023). doi:10.1007/s00222-023-01184-7.
- [CTar] S. CHHITA and F. L. TONINELLI. The domino shuffling algorithm and Anisotropic KPZ stochastic growth. *Annales Henri Lebesgue (to appear)* arXiv:1906.07231. arXiv:1906.07231.
- [DD16] F. DELARUE and R. DIEL. Rough paths and 1d SDE with a time dependent distributional drift: application to polymers. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **165**, no. 1-2, (2016), 1–63. doi:10.1007/s00440-015-0626-8.
- [DG22] A. DUNLAP and Y. GU. A forward-backward SDE from the 2D nonlinear stochastic heat equation. *Ann. Probab.* **50**, no. 3, (2022), 1204–1253. doi:10.1214/21-aop1563.

- [DGHSnt] D. DE GASPARI and L. HAUNSCMID-SIBITZ. $(\log t)^{2/3}$ -superdiffusivity for the 2d stochastic Burgers equation (preprint).
- [DGP17] J. DIEHL, M. GUBINELLI, and N. PERKOWSKI. The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation as scaling limit of weakly asymmetric interacting Brownian motions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **354**, no. 2, (2017), 549–589. doi:10.1007/s00220-017-2918-6.
- [DGRZ21] A. DUNLAP, Y. GU, L. RYZHIK, and O. ZEITOUNI. The Random Heat Equation in Dimensions Three and Higher: The Homogenization Viewpoint. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **242**, no. 2, (2021), 827–873. doi:10.1007/s00205-021-01694-9.
- [DPD02] G. DA PRATO and A. DEBUSSCHE. Two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations driven by a space-time white noise. *J. Funct. Anal.* **196**, no. 1, (2002), 180–210.
- [DPD03] G. DA PRATO and A. DEBUSSCHE. Ergodicity for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* **82**, no. 8, (2003), 877–947.
- [Ech82] P. ECHEVERRÍA. A criterion for invariant measures of markov processes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* **61**, no. 1, (1982), 1–16. doi:10.1007/BF00537221.
- [EK86] S. N. ETHIER and T. G. KURTZ. *Markov processes*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1986. Characterization and convergence. doi:10.1002/9780470316658.
- [EMY94] R. ESPOSITO, R. MARRA, and H. T. YAU. Diffusive limit of asymmetric simple exclusion. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **06**, no. 05a, (1994), 1233–1267. doi:10.1142/S0129055X94000444.
- [FG95] F. FLANDOLI and D. GATAREK. Martingale and stationary solutions for stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **102**, no. 3, (1995), 367–391.
- [FR08] F. FLANDOLI and M. ROMITO. Markov selections for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **140**, no. 3-4, (2008), 407–458.
- [FT90] B. M. FORREST and L.-H. TANG. Surface roughening in a hypercube-stacking model. *Physical review letters* **64**, no. 12, (1990), 1405.
- [GIP15] M. GUBINELLI, P. IMKELLER, and N. PERKOWSKI. Paracontrolled distributions and singular PDEs. *Forum Math. Pi* **3**, (2015), e6, 75. doi:10.1017/fmp.2015.2.
- [GJ13] M. GUBINELLI and M. JARA. Regularization by noise and stochastic Burgers equations. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.* **1**, no. 2, (2013), 325–350. doi:10.1007/s40072-013-0011-5.
- [GJ14] P. GONCALVES and M. JARA. Nonlinear fluctuations of weakly asymmetric interacting particle systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **212**, no. 2, (2014), 597–644. doi:10.1007/s00205-013-0693-x.
- [GP] L. GRÄFNER and N. PERKOWSKI. *private communication*.
- [GP15] M. GUBINELLI and N. PERKOWSKI. *Lectures on singular stochastic PDEs*, vol. 29 of *Ensaio Matemáticos [Mathematical Surveys]*. Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática, Rio de Janeiro, 2015.

- [GP17] M. GUBINELLI and N. PERKOWSKI. KPZ reloaded. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **349**, no. 1, (2017), 165–269. doi:10.1007/s00220-016-2788-3.
- [GP18] M. GUBINELLI and N. PERKOWSKI. Energy solutions of KPZ are unique. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **31**, no. 2, (2018), 427–471. doi:10.1090/jams/889.
- [GP20] M. GUBINELLI and N. PERKOWSKI. The infinitesimal generator of the stochastic Burgers equation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **178**, (2020), 1067–1124.
- [GRZ18a] Y. GU, L. RYZHIK, and O. ZEITOUNI. The Edwards-Wilkinson limit of the random heat equation in dimensions three and higher. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **363**, no. 2, (2018), 351–388. doi:10.1007/s00220-018-3202-0.
- [GRZ18b] Y. GU, L. RYZHIK, and O. ZEITOUNI. The Edwards–Wilkinson Limit of the Random Heat Equation in Dimensions Three and Higher. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **363**, no. 2, (2018), 351–388. doi:10.1007/s00220-018-3202-0.
- [GT20] M. GUBINELLI and M. TURRA. Hyperviscous stochastic Navier–Stokes equations with white noise invariant measure. *Stochastics and Dynamics* **20**, no. 6, (2020), 2040005. arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219493720400055. doi:10.1142/S0219493720400055.
- [Gu20] Y. GU. Gaussian fluctuations from the 2D KPZ equation. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.* **8**, no. 1, (2020), 150–185. doi:10.1007/s40072-019-00144-8.
- [Gub19] M. GUBINELLI. *Lectures on Energy Solutions for the Stationary KPZ Equation*, 11–74. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-29545-5_2.
- [Hai13] M. HAIRER. Solving the KPZ equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **178**, no. 2, (2013), 559–664. doi:10.4007/annals.2013.178.2.4.
- [Hai14] M. HAIRER. A theory of regularity structures. *Invent. Math.* **198**, no. 2, (2014), 269–504. doi:10.1007/s00222-014-0505-4.
- [HMo6] M. HAIRER and J. C. MATTINGLY. Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **164**, no. 3, (2006), 993–1032.
- [HTV12] I. HORVÁTH, B. TÓTH, and B. VETŐ. Diffusive limits for “true”(or myopic) self-avoiding random walks and self-repellent brownian polymers in $d \geq 3$. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **153**, no. 3, (2012), 691–726.
- [HZZ23] M. HOFMANOVÁ, R. ZHU, and X. ZHU. Global existence and non-uniqueness for 3D Navier-Stokes equations with space-time white noise. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **247**, no. 3, (2023), Paper No. 46, 70. doi:10.1007/s00205-023-01872-x.
- [Jan97] S. JANSON. *Gaussian Hilbert spaces*, vol. 129 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511526169.
- [Kal21] O. KALLENBERG. *Foundations of Modern Probability*, vol. 99 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-61871-1.

- [KLO12] T. KOMOROWSKI, C. LANDIM, and S. OLLA. *Fluctuations in Markov processes*, vol. 345 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012. Time symmetry and martingale approximation. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-29880-6.
- [KPZ86] M. KARDAR, G. PARISI, and Y. ZHANG. Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces. *Physical Review Letters* **56**, no. 9, (1986), 889–892.
- [Kup14] A. KUPIAINEN. Renormalization group and stochastic PDEs. *Annales Henri Poincaré* **17**, (2014), 497–535. doi:10.1007/s00023-015-0408-y.
- [Ler20] V. LEROUVILLOIS. Hydrodynamic limit of a (2+1)-dimensional crystal growth model in the Anisotropic KPZ class. *Electron. J. Probab.* **25**, (2020), paper n. 76, 1–35.
- [LOY04] C. LANDIM, S. OLLA, and H. YAU. Diffusive behaviour of the equilibrium fluctuations in the asymmetric exclusion processes. *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.* **39**, (2004), 307–324. doi:10.2969/aspm/03910307.
- [LQSY04] C. LANDIM, J. QUASTEL, M. SALMHOFER, and H.-T. YAU. Superdiffusivity of asymmetric exclusion process in dimensions one and two. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **244**, no. 3, (2004), 455–481. doi:10.1007/s00220-003-1020-4.
- [LY97] C. LANDIM and H. YAU. Fluctuation-dissipation equation of asymmetric simple exclusion processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **108**, no. 3, (1997), 321–356. doi:10.1007/s004400050112.
- [LZ22] D. LYGKONIS and N. ZYGOURAS. Edwards–Wilkinson fluctuations for the directed polymer in the full L^2 -regime for dimensions $d \geq 3$. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré (B): Prob. Stat.* **58(1)**, (2022), 65–104.
- [Mit83] I. MITOMA. Tightness of probabilities on $C([0, 1]; \mathcal{S}')$ and $D([0, 1]; \mathcal{S}')$. *Ann. Probab.* **11**, no. 4, (1983), 989–999.
- [MR04] R. MIKULEVICIUS and B. L. ROZOVSKII. Stochastic Navier–Stokes Equations for Turbulent Flows. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **35**, no. 5, (2004), 1250–1310.
- [MU18] J. MAGNEN and J. UNTERBERGER. The Scaling Limit of the KPZ Equation in Space Dimension 3 and Higher. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **171**, no. 4, (2018), 543–598. doi:10.1007/s10955-018-2014-0.
- [MW17] J.-C. MOURRAT and H. WEBER. Convergence of the two-dimensional dynamic Ising-Kac model to Φ_2^4 . *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **70**, no. 4, (2017), 717–812. doi:10.1002/cpa.21655.
- [Nua06] D. NUALART. *The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics*. Springer, 2006.
- [PS97] M. PRÄHOFER and H. SPOHN. An exactly solved model of three-dimensional surface growth in the anisotropic KPZ regime. *J. Statist. Phys.* **88**, no. 5-6, (1997), 999–1012. doi:10.1007/BF02732423.
- [QS23] J. QUASTEL and S. SARKAR. Convergence of exclusion processes and the kpz equation to the kpz fixed point. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **36**, no. 1, (2023), 251–289. doi:10.1090/jams/999.
- [RZZ14] M. RÖCKNER, R. ZHU, and X. ZHU. Local existence and non-explosion of solutions for stochastic fractional partial differential equations driven by multiplicative noise. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **124**, no. 5, (2014), 1974–2002.

- [Spo12] H. SPOHN. *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [SVY00] S. SETHURAMAN, S. R. S. VARADHAN, and H.-T. YAU. Diffusive limit of a tagged particle in asymmetric simple exclusion processes. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **53**, no. 8, (2000), 972–1006. doi:10.1002/1097-0312(200008)53:8(972::AID-CPA2)3.0.CO;2-#.
- [Ton18] F. TONINELLI. (2 + 1)-dimensional interface dynamics: mixing time, hydrodynamic limit and anisotropic KPZ growth. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. III. Invited lectures*, 2733–2758. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018.
- [TV12] B. TÓTH and B. VALKÓ. Superdiffusive bounds on self-repellent Brownian polymers and diffusion in the curl of the Gaussian free field in $d = 2$. *J. Stat. Phys.* **147**, no. 1, (2012), 113–131. doi:10.1007/s10955-012-0462-5.
- [vBKS85] H. VAN BEIJEREN, R. KUTNER, and H. SPOHN. Excess noise for driven diffusive systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, no. 18, (1985), 2026–2029. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.54.2026.
- [Vir20] B. VIRAG. The heat and the landscape I (2020). arXiv:2008.07241.
- [WAG71] T. E. WAINWRIGHT, B. J. ALDER, and D. M. GASS. Decay of time correlations in two dimensions. *Phys. Rev. A* **4**, (1971), 233–237. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.4.233.
- [Wol91] E. WOLF, DIETRICH. Kinetic roughening of vicinal surfaces. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, (1991), 1783–1786.
- [Yau04] H.-T. YAU. $(\log t)^{2/3}$ law of the two dimensional asymmetric simple exclusion process. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **159**, no. 1, (2004), 377–405. doi:10.4007/annals.2004.159.377.
- [ZZ15] R. ZHU and X. ZHU. Three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations driven by space-time white noise. *J. Differential Equations* **259**, no. 9, (2015), 4443–4508.