

# Superdiffusive central limit theorem for a Brownian particle in a critically-correlated incompressible random drift

Scott Armstrong <sup>\*</sup>      Ahmed Bou-Rabee <sup>†</sup>      Tuomo Kuusi <sup>‡</sup>

April 1, 2024

## Abstract

We consider the long-time behavior of a diffusion process on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  advected by a stationary random vector field which is assumed to be divergence-free, dihedrally symmetric in law and have a log-correlated potential. A special case includes  $\nabla^\perp$  of the Gaussian free field in two dimensions. We show the variance of the diffusion process at a large time  $t$  behaves like  $2c_*t(\log t)^{1/2}$ , in a quenched sense and with a precisely determined, universal prefactor constant  $c_* > 0$ . We also prove a quenched invariance principle under this superdiffusive scaling. The proof is based on a rigorous renormalization group argument in which we inductively analyze coarse-grained diffusivities, scale-by-scale. Our analysis leads to sharp homogenization and large-scale regularity estimates on the infinitesimal generator, which are subsequently transferred into quantitative information on the process.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Coarse-graining estimates</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>A suboptimal lower bound on the renormalized diffusivities</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Homogenization on scales below the infrared cutoff</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>The Liouville theorem and large-scale regularity</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Coarse-graining and improved homogenization estimates</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Sharp asymptotics for the renormalized diffusivities</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Homogenization of the Dirichlet problem</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>The invariance principle</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>The log-correlated Gaussian field</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Nash-Aronson estimates</b>	<b>158</b>

<sup>\*</sup>Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University. [scotta@cims.nyu.edu](mailto:scotta@cims.nyu.edu).

<sup>†</sup>Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University. [ahmedmb@cims.nyu.edu](mailto:ahmedmb@cims.nyu.edu).

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Helsinki. [tuomo.kuusi@helsinki.fi](mailto:tuomo.kuusi@helsinki.fi).




Figure 1.1: A Brownian motion subject to a random incompressible drift.

## 1. Introduction

**1.1. Superdiffusive central limit theorem.** We consider the long-time behavior of a Brownian particle advected by a random, divergence-free velocity field in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . This is described by the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \mathbf{f}(X_t) dt + \sqrt{2\nu} dW_t, \\ X_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\nu \in (0, 1]$ <sup>1</sup> is a given positive parameter called the *molecular diffusivity*,  $\{W_t\}$  is a standard Brownian motion on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and the vector field  $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a stationary random field with law  $\mathbb{P}$ . We assume that the vector field  $\mathbf{f}$  is locally  $C^{1,1}$ , isotropic in law, and satisfies the incompressibility condition

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{f} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.2)$$

It is assumed to behave like a Gaussian field with Hurst parameter  $-1$ ; roughly,

$$\text{cov}[\mathbf{f}(x), \mathbf{f}(y)] \simeq |x - y|^{-2}, \quad \text{for } |x - y| \gg 1. \quad (1.3)$$

See Section 1.2 below for the precise assumptions on  $\mathbf{f}$ .

A special case of this setup is in two dimensions with  $\mathbf{f} = \nabla^\perp(H * \eta)$ , where  $H$  is a standard Gaussian free field (GFF) and  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$  is a smooth, radial bump function. This model was first

---

<sup>1</sup>The assumption that  $\nu \leq 1$  is made for convenience and without loss of generality. Indeed, if  $\nu > 1$ , we may rescale the equation and apply the result.

studied heuristically in the 1970s [FNS77, FFQ<sup>+</sup>85, KLY85, Fis84, AN84, BCGLD87, Fan98] and rigorously in the more recent works [TV12, CHST22, CMOW23].

It is well-known that advection by an incompressible vector field enhances the diffusivity of a Brownian particle. If the covariance (and thus the power spectrum) of  $\mathbf{f}$  decays very quickly, then the vector field will increase the effective diffusivity from  $\nu$  to some constant  $\nu_{\text{eff}} > \nu$ , and  $\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]$  will grow at the linear rate  $2\nu_{\text{eff}}t + o(t)$  for large times  $t$ ; here we denote by  $\mathbf{P}^{x_0}$  the law of the process (1.1) conditioned on  $\mathbf{f}$ , and by  $\mathbf{E}^{x_0}$  its corresponding expectation. Conversely, if the covariances of  $\mathbf{f}$  have slow decay, then the low frequencies of  $\mathbf{f}$  have larger amplitudes and the diffusivity enhancements may accumulate, as the particle sees more and more of these larger length scales. In this situation we expect *superdiffusivity*, that is,  $\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]$  should grow *superlinearly* in  $t$  for  $t \gg 1$ , due to the effect of diffusivity enhancements across an infinite range of length scales.

The decay rate in (1.3) is critical: it is situated exactly on the boundary between the diffusive regime (in which the right side of (1.3) is replaced by  $|x - y|^{-\xi}$  for  $\xi > 2$ ) and the expected superdiffusive regime ( $\xi < 2$ ). Predictions in [FNS77, FFQ<sup>+</sup>85, KLY85, Fis84, AN84, BCGLD87, Fan98], which were based on heuristic renormalization group arguments, are that we should see logarithmic-type superdiffusivity in the critical case of (1.3): more precisely,  $\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]$  is expected to grow at the rate of  $t(\log t)^{1/2}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .<sup>2</sup>

In this article we formalize these heuristic renormalization group arguments using methods from elliptic homogenization. In particular, we are able to sharply characterize the superdiffusivity of the process  $\{X_t\}$ . One of our main results is a *superdiffusive central limit theorem*: it states that, for large times  $t$ , the process  $\{X_t\}$  resembles a Brownian motion with diffusivity equal to  $2c_*\sqrt{\log t}$  for a deterministic and universal constant  $c_* > 0$  (*universal* in the sense that it is independent of the parameter  $\nu$ ).

**Theorem A** (Quenched superdiffusive invariance principle). *There exists a constant  $c_*(\mathbb{P}) > 0$  such that, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e. realization of the vector field  $\mathbf{f}$ ,*

$$|\log \varepsilon^2|^{-1/4} \varepsilon X_{t/\varepsilon^2} \Rightarrow \sqrt{2c_*} W_t \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\{W_t\}$  is a standard Brownian motion on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and the convergence in (1.4) is in law, with respect to the uniform topology on paths. Moreover, for each  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 4\delta)$ , there exists a constant  $C(\beta, \delta, c_*, \nu, d) \in (0, 1]$  such that, for every  $t \in [10, \infty)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2] - 2dc_*(\log t)^{1/2} \right| > C(\log t)^{1/4+\delta} \right] \leq C \exp(-C^{-1}(\log t)^\beta) \quad (1.5)$$

and, consequently, for every exponent  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , allowing  $C$  to depend also on  $p$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{t} [\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]] - 2dc_*(\log t)^{1/2} \right|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq C(\log t)^{1/4+\delta}. \quad (1.6)$$

The constant  $c_*$  in Theorem A is semi-explicit and can be computed in many cases of interest, as we will show. For instance, in the two-dimensional special case mentioned above, in which  $\mathbf{f}$  is  $\nabla^\perp$  of a mollified GFF, we have that  $c_* = \frac{1}{2\pi}$ .

A natural generalization of this two-dimensional example to  $d > 2$ , also covered by Theorem A, is to consider  $\mathbf{f} = \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{H} * \eta)$  where  $\mathbf{H}$  is an anti-symmetric matrix-valued random field,<sup>3</sup> the entries

<sup>2</sup>The dihedral symmetry assumption is crucial for this result; heuristic arguments give  $t(\log t)^{2/3}$  for certain non-isotropic models, see [TV12].

<sup>3</sup>We use the convention that the divergence of a matrix-valued function  $A = (A_{ij})$  is the vector field with  $j$ th coordinate given by  $(\nabla \cdot A)_j = \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i} A_{ij}$ .

of which are obtained from independent copies of the standard log-correlated Gaussian field (LGF) on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In this case, the constant  $c_*$  is given by the formula

$$c_* = \frac{(d-1)2^{1-d}}{\pi^{d/2}\Gamma(d/2)}. \quad (1.7)$$

Note that this example coincides with  $\nabla^\perp$  of the GFF in  $d = 2$ , since in two dimensions the LGF and the GFF coincide and anti-symmetric matrices have only one degree of freedom and therefore may be identified with scalars. In three dimensions, the divergence of an anti-symmetric matrix can be identified with  $\nabla^\perp$  of a vector field, and the  $\mathbf{f}$  above can be written in  $d = 3$  as  $\mathbf{f} = \nabla \times ((H_1, H_2, H_3) * \eta)$ , where the  $H_i$  are independent realizations of the  $3d$  LGF. This higher dimensional case was also analyzed heuristically in [BCGLD87] and in that paper the exact prefactor constant of  $c_*$ , coinciding with (1.7), was also predicted.

Prior to this paper, several authors [TV12, CHST22, CMOW23] have pursued rigorous results in the direction of Theorem A in the special case in which  $\nu = 1$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  is  $\nabla^\perp$  of a mollified GFF in two dimensions. The first rigorous result demonstrating (qualitative) superdiffusivity was obtained in [TV12], as well as (a time-averaged version of) the annealed estimate

$$C^{-1} \log \log t \leq \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]] \leq C \log t. \quad (1.8)$$

This bound was significantly improved in [CHST22], who obtained the predicted growth rate of  $t(\log t)^{1/2}$  up to double logarithmic corrections: precisely, they showed that, for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$C_\varepsilon^{-1} \frac{(\log t)^{1/2}}{(\log \log t)^{1+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]] \leq C_\varepsilon (\log t)^{1/2} (\log \log t)^{1+\varepsilon}. \quad (1.9)$$

The double logarithmic corrections were removed in [CMOW23], who obtained the estimate, for general  $\nu > 0$ ,

$$C_\nu^{-1} \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]]}{t(\log t)^{1/2}} \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]]}{t(\log t)^{1/2}} \leq C_\nu. \quad (1.10)$$

Annealed results in the superdiffusive regime in which the covariances of the field decay slower than exponent 2 were obtained in [KO02]. We refer to [T18] for further references and more on the history of the problem.

Theorem A improves on these works by obtaining the precise rate of superdiffusivity with nearly the next-order correction, by proving that the diffusion process  $\{X_t\}$  has a scaling limit which is a Brownian motion, and by treating all dimensions  $d \geq 2$ . Its statement also asserts that the asymptotic rate of superdiffusivity is independent of the molecular diffusivity  $\nu$ , a phenomenon characteristic of anomalous diffusion.

Furthermore, the estimates presented in Theorem A and throughout this paper are the first *quenched* statements about the behavior of the process. In fact, to our knowledge, Theorem A is the first result establishing even the qualitative superdiffusivity statement that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_t|^2}{t} = +\infty \right] > 0.$$

In contrast, the results in [TV12, CHST22, CMOW23] are *annealed*, which means that they are valid only after averaging over all realizations of the vector field  $\mathbf{f}$ . We emphasize that there is a substantial increase in difficulty when proving a quenched estimate rather than an annealed

one. In the problem we are considering, annealed estimates can often be obtained by relatively soft arguments, using ergodicity and stationarity. It appears, however, that quenched information requires a quantitative, scale-by-scale approach in which the random fluctuations of all quantities are carefully controlled.<sup>4</sup> The payoff is that a quenched analysis yields more precise estimates, even for annealed quantities.

It is certainly unusual to obtain convergence to a limit process under a scaling which is different from the one which leaves the limiting process invariant. Notably, a superdiffusive invariance principle, with the same  $\sqrt{\log}$ -scaling as the one encountered here, has been previously obtained for the periodic Lorentz gas [MT16, SV07].

The large-time behavior of the process  $X_t$  solving the SDE (1.1) has also been studied in the case  $\mathbf{f} = \nabla H$ , and the “unconstrained” case in which  $\mathbf{f}$  has both potential and solenoidal parts. In the potential case, the critical scaling for the covariance is the same as in (1.3)—so  $\mathbf{f}$  is essentially the gradient of the LGF mollified on the unit scale. This model was analyzed heuristically in [FFQ<sup>+</sup>85, KLY85, Fis84, BCGLD87], with the prediction of subdiffusive behavior due to trapping:  $t^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]] \simeq t^{-\nu}$  for some  $\nu < 1$ . The only rigorous result, to our knowledge, was proved in [BDG20], where it was shown that the exit time from a large ball of a two dimensional discrete version of this process has a subdiffusive scaling. For the unconstrained model, in which  $\mathbf{f}$  is a vector white noise mollified on the unit scale, the prediction in [FFQ<sup>+</sup>85, KLY85, Fis84, BCGLD87] depends on dimension: in  $d > 2$ , one expects a diffusive scaling, as well as in  $d = 2$  for weak disorder (when  $\mathbf{f}$  is also small). These predictions were rigorously confirmed in the case  $d > 2$  for weak disorder in [BK91, SZ06].

In the following two subsections, we introduce the precise assumptions and state our main results. In Section 1.4, we present an informal, heuristic argument for the superdiffusive scaling observed in Theorem A and, in Section 1.5, we give a detailed outline of the rigorous arguments we use in this paper to formalize these heuristics.

**1.2. Quantitative homogenization.** The diffusion process described by (1.1) is *Feller*, as we show in Appendix B. Feller processes are uniquely characterized by their infinitesimal generators (see [Kal02, Lemma 19.5]), and therefore any statement concerning a family of Feller processes can *in principle* be translated into an equivalent statement about their generators. For example, a sequence of Feller processes converges to a limit if and only if their corresponding generators converge: see [Kal02, Theorem 19.25] for the precise statement. This allows us to rephrase the invariance principle asserted in Theorem A as a statement about *homogenization* of elliptic partial differential operators.

The infinitesimal generator of the diffusion process described by (1.1) is the elliptic operator  $\mathfrak{L}$  given by

$$\mathfrak{L}u = \nu\Delta u + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla u. \tag{1.11}$$

We start by writing  $\mathfrak{L}$  as a purely second-order operator in divergence form,

$$\mathfrak{L}u = \nabla \cdot (\nu I_d + \mathbf{k})\nabla u,$$

where  $\mathbf{k}$  is the matrix potential or *stream matrix* for  $\mathbf{f}$ . That is,  $\mathbf{k}$  is an anti-symmetric  $d$ -by- $d$  matrix satisfying  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{k} = \mathbf{f}$ . In our setup, the matrix  $\mathbf{k}$  is a random field which is not stationary:

---

<sup>4</sup>The first arXiv version of [CMOW23] contains quenched estimates for infrared cutoffs of the vector field. However, these estimates are not shown to be valid on scales below that of the cutoff, and as such do not provide quenched information about the original process.

like the log-correlated Gaussian field, only its gradient is stationary. We define the matrix-valued random field  $\mathbf{a}(x)$  by

$$\mathbf{a}(x) = \nu I_d + \mathbf{k}(x), \quad (1.12)$$

so that we can simply write  $\mathfrak{L} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla$ . The first statement in Theorem A is a consequence of a stronger, more quantitative statement about the large-scale behavior of  $\mathfrak{L}$ , which is stated in Theorem B below.

If the stream matrix  $\mathbf{k}$  were a stationary function with finite second moment, then classical homogenization theory would immediately imply that  $\mathfrak{L}$  homogenizes in the large scale limit to a deterministic and constant-coefficient elliptic operator of the form  $\bar{\mathfrak{L}} = \nabla \cdot \bar{\mathbf{a}} \nabla$ . We would consequently obtain an invariance principle for the process  $\{X_t\}$  with diffusivity given by (twice) the symmetric part of  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$  and, in particular, we would observe the usual diffusive scaling  $\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2] \simeq t$ . It is because the stream matrix  $\mathbf{k}$  is *not* bounded that superdiffusivity is possible; however, this unboundedness brings the problem outside the realm of standard homogenization theory.

Nevertheless, in this article we demonstrate that this superdiffusivity can be analyzed using *iterative quantitative homogenization*. We prove that, on length scales of order  $3^m$ , the operator  $\mathfrak{L}$  can be approximated (in the sense of homogenization, with estimates that are quenched) by the operator  $\bar{\mathfrak{L}}_m = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \Delta$ , where the *renormalized diffusivity*  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m > 0$  is close to  $(2c_* \log 3^m)^{1/2}$  for a special constant  $c_* > 0$ .

To prove this, we must directly confront the fact that the oscillation of the stream matrix necessarily diverges as a function of the length scale. This necessitates flexible analytic arguments which do not degenerate at each step: the conclusions we obtain at one scale must be just as strong as our assumption at the previous, smaller scale. This requires ideas and results from the quantitative homogenization theory developed for high contrast coefficient fields in our companion paper [AK24b].

We next introduce the general assumptions we work with throughout the paper. We take the stream matrix  $\mathbf{k}$ , not the vector field  $\mathbf{f}$ , as the given random field. We assume that it is given by the formal sum

$$\mathbf{k}(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{j}_n(x), \quad (1.13)$$

where  $\{\mathbf{j}_0, \mathbf{j}_1, \mathbf{j}_2, \dots\}$  is a sequence of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary random fields<sup>5</sup>, valued in the set  $\mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{d \times d}$  of anti-symmetric  $d$ -by- $d$  matrices with real entries, with law  $\mathbb{P}$  and corresponding expectation denoted by  $\mathbb{E}$ , satisfying the following assumptions:

- (J1) The field  $\mathbf{j}_n$  has range of dependence  $3^n \sqrt{d}$ .
- (J2) For each  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  with  $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ , the subcollections  $\{\mathbf{j}_n : n \in A\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{j}_n : n \in B\}$  are independent.
- (J3) Local regularity: with probability one,  $\mathbf{j}_n$  belongs to the space  $C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{d \times d})$  of anti-symmetric matrices with entries which belong to  $C^{1,1}(B_r)$  for every  $r > 0$ , and

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \|\mathbf{j}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} + \sqrt{d} 3^n \|\nabla \mathbf{j}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} + d 3^{2n} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{j}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} > t \right] \leq \exp(-t^2) \quad \forall t \in [1, \infty). \quad (1.14)$$

- (J4) Dihedral symmetry: the joint law of  $\{\mathbf{j}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is invariant under negation, reflections and permutations across the coordinate planes. That is, for every matrix  $R$  with exactly one  $\pm 1$

---

<sup>5</sup>The  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary assumption can be replaced by  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary with minimal notational changes.

in each row and column and 0s elsewhere, the law of the conjugated sequence  $\{R^t \mathbf{j}_n(R \cdot) R\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the same as that of  $\{\mathbf{j}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and the law of the sequence  $\{-\mathbf{j}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the same as that of  $\{\mathbf{j}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .<sup>6</sup>

(J5) Non-degeneracy: there exist constants  $c_*, \check{A} \in (0, \infty)$  such that, for every  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m$  and  $e \in \partial B_1$ ,

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \nabla \Delta^{-1} \left( \nabla \cdot \sum_{l=n+1}^m \mathbf{j}_l e \right) (0) \right|^2 \right] - c_*(\log 3)(m-n) \right| \leq \check{A}. \quad (1.15)$$

Throughout, we denote the law of  $\{\mathbf{j}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  by  $\mathbb{P}$  and the corresponding expectation by  $\mathbb{E}$ .

Strictly speaking, the sum on the right side of (1.13) is divergent. To be more precise, we should define instead

$$\mathbf{k}(x) - \mathbf{k}(y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{j}_n(x) - \mathbf{j}_n(y)), \quad (1.16)$$

which does converge and is stationary. Indeed, by (J3) and the Borel-Cantelli lemma,  $|\mathbf{j}_n(x) - \mathbf{j}_n(y)|$  is almost surely summable in  $n$ . Similarly,  $\nabla \mathbf{k}$  is a well-defined stationary field.

We introduce the divergence-free vector field

$$\mathbf{f}(x) := (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{k})(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_n)(x), \quad (1.17)$$

which is also unambiguously defined. Notice that the incompressibility condition  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{f} = 0$  is immediate from the assumed anti-symmetry of each  $\mathbf{j}_n$ .

As mentioned above, the main example we have in mind is of an anti-symmetric matrix with entries obtained from independent copies of a log-correlated Gaussian field (LGF), mollified on the unit scale. In dimensions  $d \geq 2$ , the LGF is the (generalized) Gaussian random field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  characterized by

$$\text{cov}[(h, \phi_1), (h, \phi_2)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\frac{d|B_1|}{(2\pi)^d} \log|x-y| \phi_1(x) \phi_2(y) dx dy, \quad (1.18)$$

where  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are compactly supported smooth functions with  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_2 = 0$ . In the two-dimensional case, this coincides with the Gaussian free field. That the LGF acts only on mean-zero test functions is a reflection of the fact that it is defined only modulo additive constants. For the reader's convenience, we give an explicit construction of the log-correlated Gaussian field in Appendix A, where we also check that the anti-symmetric matrix-valued field with entries which are obtained from independent copies of the log-correlated Gaussian field, mollified on the unit scale, satisfy the assumptions (J1)–(J5) above with  $c_*$  given by (1.7).<sup>7</sup>

The limit in (1.4) says that the rescaled process  $\{X_t^\varepsilon\}$ , defined for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  by

$$X_t^\varepsilon := \varepsilon X_{\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2(8c_*^2|\log \varepsilon|)^{1/2}}}, \quad (1.19)$$

<sup>6</sup>In even dimensions, the negation assumption is redundant.

<sup>7</sup>Conversely, the assumptions (J1) and (J3) imply that the correlations of  $\mathbf{k}$  are at most log-correlated, and the non-degeneracy condition (J5) can be seen as a weak, double-sided log-correlation bound. We work with these general assumptions to make it clear that we do not use Gaussianity, nor the precise covariance structure of the log-correlated Gaussian field. Furthermore, it will become clear from the proof of that the right side of (1.14) can be relaxed to allow for distributions with fatter tails, and the assumption (1.15) can be tailored to other situations with stronger or weaker correlations (resulting in faster or slower superdiffusivity).

converges in law, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , to a Brownian motion. The infinitesimal generator of (1.19) is the operator  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  of  $X_t^\varepsilon$  given by

$$\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2} \nabla \cdot (\nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}^\varepsilon) \nabla, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{k}^\varepsilon(x) := \mathbf{k}(x/\varepsilon). \quad (1.20)$$

Since the infinitesimal generator of Brownian motion is  $\frac{1}{2} \Delta$ , we should expect the limit in (9.2) to be equivalent to an appropriate statement concerning the convergence of  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  to  $\frac{1}{2} \Delta$ , in the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . The following is a quantitative version of such a statement with an essentially sharp bound on the error.

**Theorem B** (Quantitative homogenization). *Let  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1]$  with  $\beta + 2\alpha < 1$  and  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a smooth, bounded domain. There exists a random variable  $\mathcal{Z}$  and a constant  $C < \infty$ , each depending on  $(U, \beta, \alpha, c_*, \nu, d)$ , satisfying*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{Z} \geq \xi] \leq C \exp(-C^{-1}(\log \xi)^\beta), \quad \forall \xi \in [1, \infty), \quad (1.21)$$

such that, for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$  with  $\varepsilon^{-1} \geq \mathcal{Z}$  and functions  $f \in L^\infty(U)$  and  $g \in W^{1,\infty}(U)$  if we let  $u^\varepsilon, u_{\text{hom}} \in H^1(U)$  denote the solutions of the boundary value problems

$$\begin{cases} - (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2} \nabla \cdot (\nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}^\varepsilon) \nabla u^\varepsilon = f & \text{in } U, \\ u^\varepsilon = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} - \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = f & \text{in } U, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad (1.22)$$

then we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^\varepsilon - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + [\nabla u^\varepsilon - \nabla u_{\text{hom}}]_{H^{-1}(U)} + \left[ \frac{\nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}^\varepsilon - (\mathbf{k}^\varepsilon)_U}{(2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{1/2}} \nabla u^\varepsilon - \nabla u_{\text{hom}} \right]_{H^{-1}(U)} \\ \leq |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned} \quad (1.23)$$

We will show in Section 9 that Theorem B implies each of the assertions in Theorem A.

The estimate for the latter two quantities on the left side of (1.23) quantify the *weak convergence* in  $L^2(U)$ , as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , of the gradients and fluxes of the solutions  $u^\varepsilon$  to their homogenized limits.

The random variable  $\mathcal{Z}$  in Theorem B quantifies the lower bound on the scale separation ratio required for homogenization. Observe that the estimate (1.21) on  $\mathcal{Z}$  is very weak: it does not give any positive moments for  $\mathcal{Z}$ , since  $\beta < 1$ . This differs substantially from the typical case in quantitative homogenization theory, where one obtains very strong, exponential moments for minimal scales (see for instance [AK24a]). The very weak estimate we observe here is not an artifact of our proof, but is an intrinsic feature of the model. In fact, we expect that the stochastic integrability witnessed in (1.21) is essentially optimal.

We also expect that the scaling of the error in (1.23), namely  $|\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$ , is nearly sharp. To see this, observe first that no convergence rate better than  $|\log \varepsilon|^{-1}$  is possible, due to scaling (just compare the solutions of the first problem in (1.22) with  $\varepsilon$  and  $\varepsilon/2$ ). To see that  $|\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  should be sharp, observe that resampling the fields  $\mathbf{j}_k$  for  $k \geq |\log_3 \varepsilon| - 10$  will perturb the flux or the gradient of the solution  $u^\varepsilon$  by at least  $O(|\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ .

Theorem B is the first *iterative* homogenization result in the random setting. All previous results to our knowledge, either qualitative or quantitative, observe homogenization after essentially a finite scale separation. In contrast, the emergence of superdiffusivity is the result of an infinite cascade of enhancements of the diffusivity due to advection. The proof therefore requires quantitative



homogenization machinery to be invoked repeatedly across an infinite number of geometric scales (this is explained in more detail in Subsections 1.4 and 1.5 below). This kind of phenomenon is expected to occur in many problems in statistical physics, including field theory and turbulence, in which one observes the divergence of correlation length scales. Since such *critical phenomena* are notoriously difficult to analyze rigorously, we expect that the methods developed in this paper to prove Theorem B will be of wider interest beyond the particular problem considered here.

We also mention recent related works [AV23, BSW23] in which a multiscale, incompressible vector field is constructed by hand, using periodic ingredients, in such a way that the corresponding drift-diffusion equation can be analyzed by iterative quantitative homogenization. The solutions are shown to exhibit *anomalous diffusion*, which is a stronger form of superdiffusivity than the one observed here. The analysis in these papers rely on the periodic structure to obtain stronger quantitative homogenization estimates than what is available in the random setting. The tradeoff is that the vector fields in these explicit constructions are less generic, in a statistical sense, than the one considered here.

**1.3. Liouville theorems and large-scale regularity.** The behavior of a Markov process is inextricably linked to the properties of the  $\mathfrak{L}$ -harmonic functions associated to its infinitesimal generator  $\mathfrak{L}$ . Of particular importance are estimates on the regularity of  $\mathfrak{L}$ -harmonic functions. We next present statements giving large-scale  $C^{0,\gamma}$  and  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimates exhibiting the superdiffusive scaling, as well as associated Liouville-type classifications of  $\mathfrak{L}$ -harmonic functions with strictly sublinear and, respectively, subquadratic growth at infinity.

To see why some regularity estimate is necessary for the invariance principle, note that a quenched invariance principle requires pointwise homogenization in  $L^\infty$ . Since homogenization estimates are naturally obtained with  $L^2$  spatial integrability, an  $L^\infty$  estimate like the one in Theorem B is typically proved by combining an  $L^2$  estimate with some uniform equicontinuity of the sequence  $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ . Conversely, by [Kal02, Theorem 19.25], a quenched invariance principle actually implies equicontinuity. This kind of regularity estimate is not true deterministically and cannot be obtained by quoting classical elliptic theory since the equation for  $u^\varepsilon$  becomes highly singular and degenerate as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  (e.g., the De Giorgi-Nash estimates do not apply).

The importance of the regularity theory is not limited to its use as a technical tool to obtain Theorem A from Theorem B. In fact, the regularity theory presented here plays a central role in the paper, and without it we would be unable to prove even an  $L^2$  version of Theorem B, or to obtain the sharp asymptotic growth of the renormalized diffusivities. Indeed, it is the engine that allows us to formalize the heuristic renormalization group argument outlined below in Section 1.4.

The first regularity statement we present is a large-scale Hölder  $C^{0,\gamma}$ -type estimate, for  $\gamma < 1$ . It states that the oscillation of a solution in a ball decays at a rate consistent with Hölder continuity, as one decreases the radius of the ball from a large macroscopic scale down to a random minimal scale. This is paired with a Liouville-type result, which asserts that the only solutions which grow like  $O(|x|^\gamma)$  for  $\gamma < 1$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  are constants. The latter should be regarded as a soft, infinite-volume, qualitative version of the former.

Here and throughout the paper we denote volume-normalized integrals and  $L^p$  norms by

$$\int_U f(x) dx := \frac{1}{|U|} \int_U f(x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{\underline{L}^p(U)} := \left( \int_U |f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p}.$$

**Theorem C** (Large-scale  $C^{0,\gamma}$  estimate). *For each  $\gamma, \sigma \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $C(\gamma, \sigma, \nu, c_*, d) < \infty$  and a nonnegative random variable  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X} > t] \leq C \exp(-C^{-1}(\log t)^\sigma), \tag{1.24}$$

such that the following statements are valid.

1. Liouville theorem. Almost surely with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ , if  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfies

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-\gamma} \|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} = 0, \quad (1.25)$$

then  $u$  is constant.

2. Large-scale  $C^{0,\gamma}$  estimate. For every  $R \geq \mathcal{X}$ ,  $f \in L^\infty(B_R)$  and solution  $u \in H^1(B_R)$  of the equation

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f \quad \text{in } B_R, \quad (1.26)$$

we have, for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}, R/2]$ , the estimate

$$\|u - (u)_{B_r}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \left(\|u - (u)_{B_R}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)} + (\log R)^{-1/2} R^2 \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}\right). \quad (1.27)$$

The restriction  $\gamma < 1$  is sharp in the sense that the statement for  $\gamma = 1$  is false. Indeed, as explained below, a large-scale  $C^{0,1}$  estimate of this type would be inconsistent with superdiffusivity, and the best that one could hope for in our setting is a  $\sqrt[4]{\log}$ -Lipschitz type estimate (see Conjecture E below). This is in contrast to the case of uniformly elliptic homogenization, in which a large-scale  $C^{0,1}$  estimate is valid (cf. [AK24a, Theorem 1.21]). See the introduction of [AV23] for more discussion on the necessary trade-off between regularity of the solutions and the strength of superdiffusivity.

The factor  $(\log R)^{-1/2} R^2$  multiplying the norm of  $f$  in (1.27) differs from the usual factor of  $R^2$  found in elliptic estimates. The extra factor of  $(\log R)^{-1/2}$  reflects the superdiffusive scaling, and ensures that the rescaled equation in (1.22) will have uniform bounds in  $\varepsilon$ . As part of our analysis we will coarse-grain the Caccioppoli and Poincaré inequalities and obtain roughly that, for some random minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}$  and all solutions  $u$  of (1.26) on scales  $r \geq \mathcal{X}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - (u)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} &\lesssim \frac{r\nu^{1/2}}{(\log r)^{1/4}} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} + \frac{r^2}{(\log r)^{1/2}} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(B_r)}, \quad (\text{superdiffusive Poincaré}) \\ \frac{r\nu^{1/2}}{(\log r)^{1/4}} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} &\lesssim \|u - (u)_{B_{2r}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{2r})} + \frac{r^2}{(\log r)^{1/2}} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{2r})}. \quad (\text{superdiffusive Caccioppoli}) \end{aligned}$$

See Lemmas 8.6 and 9.7 for the precise statements. In particular, the bound (1.27) implies

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\gamma-1} \left(\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)} + (\log R)^{-1/4} R \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}\right), \quad (1.28)$$

where we have removed the logarithmic factors by slightly adjusting the parameter  $\gamma$ . This estimate does appear to have the usual elliptic scaling, but the superdiffusive scaling is hiding in these coarse-grained (“superdiffusive”) Caccioppoli and Poincaré inequalities.

The estimate (1.27) in Theorem C is not strong enough to imply an estimate on the actual (pointwise) Hölder seminorm of a solution. While we do not know if such an estimate is true, we suspect not. Pointwise bounds are typically obtained from large-scale regularity estimates by covering the domains with balls of the form  $B_{\mathcal{X}(y)}(y)$ , where  $\mathcal{X}(y)$  is the minimal scale for the environment centered at  $y$ , and then applying local estimates (such as Schauder or De Giorgi-Nash) in each of these balls. Carrying this out requires an estimate of the maximum of the  $\mathcal{X}(y)$ ’s, which is typically obtained by a union bound. The difficulty in our setting is that the stochastic integrability of the minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}$  in (1.24) is very weak: since  $\sigma < 1$ , we have no positive moment

bounds on  $\mathcal{X}$ , only stretched exponential moments for  $\log \mathcal{X}$ . This restricts our ability to make use of union bounds.

What we can derive from Theorem C, which suffices for the pointwise  $L^\infty$  estimate in Theorem B, and thus the invariance principle, is a Hölder estimate down to a certain mesoscopic scale which implies uniform equicontinuity for sequences of solutions  $u^\varepsilon$  of (1.22). As explained in more detail below—see the discussion leading to (1.58)—a solution  $u^\varepsilon$  of the first problem in (1.22) satisfies, for all  $s > 0$  and  $V$  with  $\bar{V} \subseteq U$  and small  $\varepsilon > 0$  (smaller than a random  $\varepsilon_0$ ),

$$\|u^\varepsilon * \eta_{|\log \varepsilon|^{-s}}\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(V)} \leq C(\|g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(U)}),$$

where the constant  $C$  depends on the subdomain  $V$  in addition to  $(U, \alpha, c_*, \nu, d)$  and  $\{\eta_r\}_{r>0}$  is the standard mollifier. We do not possess continuity estimates on the solutions  $u^\varepsilon$  on scales smaller than a power of  $|\log \varepsilon|^{-1}$ , and we in fact expect the solution to have wild, “intermittent” behavior on such scales which can be highly localized in space (and will be localized in the regions corresponding to large values of the random variable  $\mathcal{X}$  in Theorem C).

Our next main result is a large-scale  $C^{1,\gamma}$  regularity estimate, which can be considered as a next-order analogue of Theorem C. We denote, for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , the linear subspace of  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  consisting of functions which grow like  $o(|x|^{1+\gamma})$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  by

$$\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-(1+\gamma)} \|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} < \infty \right\}. \quad (1.29)$$

The next theorem asserts that the vector space  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  has dimension  $1 + d$ , the same as the dimension of affine functions; and, secondly, that an arbitrary element of  $\mathcal{A}(B_R)$  with  $R$  large can be approximated by an element of  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , on all smaller balls down to a random minimal scale, with the same precision as observed in the approximation of a harmonic function by an affine function.

**Theorem D** (Large-scale  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate). *Let  $\gamma, \sigma \in (0, 1)$  and  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sigma)$ . There exists a constant  $C(\alpha, \gamma, \sigma, \nu, c_*, d) < \infty$  and a nonnegative random variable  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X} > t] \leq C \exp(-C^{-1}(\log t)^\sigma) \quad (1.30)$$

such that the following statements are valid.

1. Liouville theorem. *Almost surely with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ , the space  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  has dimension  $1 + d$  and does not depend on  $\gamma$ .*
2. Flatness at every scale. *For every  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sigma)$ ,  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $r \geq \mathcal{X}$ , we have*

$$\inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\phi - \ell_e - (\phi)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C(\log r)^{-\alpha} \|\phi\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}. \quad (1.31)$$

3. Large-scale  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate. *For each  $R \in [\mathcal{X}, \infty)$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}(B_R)$ , there exists  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that*

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla \phi\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}, \quad \forall r \in [\mathcal{X}, R). \quad (1.32)$$

In light of the first statement of theorem, we henceforth drop the  $\gamma$  and denote  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

In the case of stationary uniformly elliptic equations, a large-scale  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate similar to the statement of Theorem D is valid (see [GNO20] or [AK24a, Theorem 1.21]) and plays a central role

in the theory of quantitative homogenization. In that case, the space  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  consists of solutions which can be written as an affine function plus a stationary corrector which is strictly sublinear at infinity. In particular, each of these solutions grows like a particular affine function and has a gradient which is stationary; unlike in our setting, the “flatness at every scale” assertion (1.31) is valid with a slope  $e$  that is independent of the scale  $r$ . Consequently there exists a canonical linear isomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , that is, the isomorphism respects stationarity.

The space  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  in our setting has very different behavior. The vector  $e$  attaining the infimum in (1.31) cannot be selected independently of the scale  $r$ . That is, while the elements of  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  will indeed be flat at every scale as (1.31) asserts, they will have different slopes at different scales. As a consequence, the individual elements of  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  do not have stationary gradients and there is no canonical (stationary) isomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

Indeed, if  $e_r[\phi] \in \mathbb{R}^d$  attains the infimum in (1.31), then we should expect  $e_r[\phi]$  to be related to the energy of  $\phi$  in  $B_r$  and the effective diffusivity  $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r$  at scale  $r$  by

$$\nu \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(B_r)}^2 \approx \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r |e_r[\phi]|^2, \quad (1.33)$$

up to a small error, we will in fact prove (1.33) (see (5.13) and (5.69)). Meanwhile, the main results in the present work assert that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r \approx (2c_* \log r)^{1/2}$ . Now, if  $\nabla \phi$  was a stationary field with bounded second moment, then  $e_r[\phi]$  would converge as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  to the expectation of  $\nabla \phi(0)$ , by the ergodic theorem, and the left side of (1.33) would also be independent of  $r$  in expectation. This is clearly inconsistent with  $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r \simeq (\log r)^{1/2}$ .

This reasoning suggests that the size of the “slope” of an element  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  in a ball  $B_r$  should scale with the radius  $r$  like  $|e_r[\phi]| \simeq \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/4} \simeq (2c_* \log r)^{-1/4}$ , leading us to the following conjecture.

**Conjecture E.** *For every element  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the energy density  $\nu |\nabla \phi|^2$  is a stationary field. Moreover, if  $e_r[\phi] \in \mathbb{R}^d$  attains the infimum in (1.31), then*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|e_r[\phi]|}{(2c_* \log r)^{-1/4}} = \mathbb{E}[\nu |\nabla \phi|^2]^{1/2}. \quad (1.34)$$

If Conjecture E is true, then it is immediate from (1.31) that every nonconstant element  $\phi$  of  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  grows like  $|x|(\log |x|)^{-1/4}$ . Combining this with the first statement of Theorem D, we would deduce that the equation has no solutions which grow at least linearly but at most like  $O(|x|^{1+\gamma})$  for  $\gamma < 1$ . It can also be combined with the third statement of Theorem D to obtain a large-scale  $\sqrt[4]{\log}$ -Lipschitz estimate, which would evidently be the sharp estimate (in view of the second statement of the conjecture).

We offer a second but related conjecture about the scaling limit of the vector space  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

**Conjecture F.** *Given  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|e| = 1$  and  $r \geq \mathcal{X}$ , let  $\phi_{e,r}$  denote the unique element of  $\mathcal{A}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying  $e_r[\phi_{e,r}] = e$ . Then we have that the vector field*

$$(2c_* \log r)^{1/2} (\nabla \phi_{e,r} - e)(r \cdot)$$

*converges in law (with respect to the topology of distributions), jointly with respect to  $e$ , to the random field  $\nabla \Delta^{-1}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{k}e)$ , with additive constant chosen so that its average vanishes in  $B_1$ .*

**1.4. Heuristic arguments for the superdiffusive scaling.** The logarithmic divergence of the diffusivity in Theorems A and B is a result of an accumulation of smaller enhancements of diffusivity due to advection, iterated across many length scales. We formalize this by tracking the change in the effective diffusivity between successive scales, as a function of the scale. This subsection contains an informal description of this strategy and a more detailed outline appears in Section 1.5 below.

The vector field  $\mathbf{f}$  in (1.17) is the sum of vector fields  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_n$ , each of which has size  $3^{-n}$  and inverse frequencies (wavelengths) of order  $3^n$ . It follows that, for times  $t \ll 3^{2n}$ , the vector field  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_n$  has a small relative effect on the position  $X_t$  of the particle. As time grows, the particle “sees” more and more of the terms  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_n$ . Each such term enhances the effective diffusivity of the particle, which should thus be viewed as a function of the scale.

This story can be told in the language of homogenization, in terms of the infinitesimal generator of the diffusion process, which is

$$\mathfrak{L} = \nabla \cdot (\nu I_d + \mathbf{k}) \nabla. \quad (1.35)$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , on length scales much smaller than  $3^n$ , the matrix  $\mathbf{j}_n$  is nearly a constant, by (1.14). Since adding a constant anti-symmetric matrix to the divergence in  $\mathfrak{L}$  leaves  $\mathfrak{L}$  unchanged, we deduce that

$$\mathfrak{L} \approx \nabla \cdot \left( \nu I_d + \sum_{k=0}^n \mathbf{j}_k \right) \nabla =: \mathfrak{L}_n \quad \text{on length scales smaller than } 3^n. \quad (1.36)$$

The operator  $\mathfrak{L}_n$  is called the *infrared cutoff* of  $\mathfrak{L}$  on scale  $3^n$ , and it has range of dependence of order  $3^n$ , by assumption (J1). By classical homogenization theory, the operator  $\mathfrak{L}_n$  is close to a constant-coefficient, deterministic operator  $\bar{\mathfrak{L}}_n$  on length scales much larger than  $3^n$ :

$$\mathfrak{L}_n \approx \bar{\mathfrak{L}}_n =: \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \Delta \quad \text{on length scales larger than } 3^n. \quad (1.37)$$

The dihedral symmetry assumption (J4) ensures that  $\bar{\mathfrak{L}}_n$  is a multiple of the Laplacian, and we define the constant  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n > 0$  to be this multiple. It is natural to expect that coarse-graining on a smaller scale to (approximately) commute with taking an infrared cutoff on a larger scale. Indeed, adding a constant anti-symmetric matrix commutes with homogenization, and the larger scale matrices are approximately constant on smaller scales. This leads to the ansatz

$$\mathfrak{L} \approx \nabla \cdot \left( \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n I_d + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{j}_k \right) \nabla \quad \text{on length scales larger than } 3^n. \quad (1.38)$$

In effect, the oscillations in the vector field on scales smaller than  $3^n$  have been integrated out, *becoming part of the diffusion matrix*, which has increased its value from  $\nu$  to  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$ . This process can be iterated, resulting in a *reverse cascade of homogenization*. Quantifying the increase in diffusivity between successive scales leads to an approximate recurrence relation for  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$  which allows us to compute, to leading order, its growth rate.

This heuristic is not new. It is a renormalization group argument that is present in some form in the papers [FNS77, FFQ<sup>+</sup>85, KLY85, Fis84, AN84, BCGLD87, Fan98], with [Fan98] being the closest to our discussion here. It is also similar to the heuristics presented in [CMOW23] and in [AV23], which considers a different but related problem.

There are however several difficulties in passing from (1.36) and (1.37) to the conclusion (1.38), stemming from a *lack of scale separation* and a *large ellipticity contrast* in the diffusion matrices.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup>These difficulties can, to a certain extent, be circumvented if one is after *annealed* as opposed to *quenched* estimates. Our discussion here is oriented toward the latter.

An assumption of scale separation was implicit in passing from (1.36) & (1.37) to (1.38). Indeed, this implication relies on the “macroscopic” part of the vector field, represented by  $\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{j}_k$ , not affecting the homogenization of the “microscopic” scales, i.e., the range of dependence of  $\mathfrak{L}_n$ . However, this is clearly a tenuous assumption, since  $\mathbf{j}_{n+1}$  is active on scale  $3^{n+1}$ , which is only a factor of three more than the microscopic scale.

This difficulty is compounded by the large ellipticity contrast of the operator  $\mathfrak{L}_n$ : the ratio of its ellipticity constants in a cube of size  $3^n$  is typically of order  $\nu^{-2}n^2$ .

This is where we crucially rely on the high contrast quantitative homogenization theory developed in [AK24b]. The results in [AK24b] assert that the critical length scale of homogenization is at most  $\exp(C(\log \Theta)^3)$  times the correlation length scale of the coefficients, where  $\Theta$  is the ellipticity ratio of the field. In our setting, this says that  $\mathfrak{L}_n$  should homogenize by at most length scale  $3^{n+C(\log n)^3}$ . We can therefore update (1.37) to the more precise claim that, for some  $q < \infty$ ,

$$\mathfrak{L}_n \approx \bar{\mathfrak{L}}_n =: \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \Delta \quad \text{on length scales larger than } 3^{n+C(\log n)^q}. \quad (1.39)$$

The problem of scale separation will be fixed by arguing that the error due to the overlapping scales near  $3^n$  is much smaller than the size of  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$ . Indeed, if we can show that  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  at a sufficiently fast rate, then we can neglect the contribution of  $\mathbf{j}_k$  for  $k$  in a large interval and make a small relative error. Using this idea, we will eventually show that the homogenization approximation in (1.39) is actually valid on scales *below*  $3^n$ :

$$\mathfrak{L}_n \approx \bar{\mathfrak{L}}_n =: \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \Delta \quad \text{on length scales larger than } 3^{n-n^\delta}, \text{ for every } \delta \in (0, 1/2). \quad (1.40)$$

This requires a lower bound on  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$  of  $n^{1/2}(\log n)^{-\xi}$  for some exponent  $\xi < \infty$ , which is achieved by a crude and less precise version of the argument which is to follow.

To obtain the recurrence relation, we use (1.40) to obtain roughly that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathfrak{L}}_{n+k} &\approx \mathfrak{L}_{n+k} \approx \nabla \cdot \left( \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \text{I}_d + (\mathbf{j}_{n+1} + \cdots + \mathbf{j}_{n+k}) \right) \nabla \\ &= \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \nabla \cdot \left( \text{I}_d + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1} (\mathbf{j}_{n+1} + \cdots + \mathbf{j}_{n+k}) \right) \nabla. \end{aligned} \quad (1.41)$$

Since  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \gtrsim n^{1/2}(\log n)^{-\xi}$ , for fixed  $k \ll n^\delta$  for  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$  and large enough  $n$  we have

$$\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1} (\mathbf{j}_{n+1} + \cdots + \mathbf{j}_{n+k}) \lesssim k^{1/2} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1} \simeq k^{1/2} n^{-1/2} (\log n)^\xi \ll n^{-\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (1.42)$$

The operator on the right side of (1.41) can therefore be analyzed by perturbative arguments which yield an asymptotic expansion of its homogenized matrix. Indeed, in Section 7.3 we show that if  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  is a small anti-symmetric matrix-valued random field satisfying the dihedral symmetry assumption, then

$$\nabla \cdot (\text{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}) \nabla \quad \text{homogenizes to} \quad \bar{\mathfrak{s}} \Delta, \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{\mathfrak{s}} = 1 + \mathbb{E}[|\nabla \Delta^{-1} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta} e_1|^2(0)] + O(\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^4).$$

The assumption **(J5)** tells us that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[|\nabla \Delta^{-1} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta} e_1|^2(0)] - kc_* \log 3 \right| \leq \check{A}, \quad \text{where} \quad \boldsymbol{\delta} = \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1} (\mathbf{j}_{n+1} + \cdots + \mathbf{j}_{n+k}).$$

We deduce that, for  $k \ll n^\delta$  with  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ ,

$$\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+k} = \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n (1 + k(c_* \log 3) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-2}) + O(\check{A} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1}). \quad (1.43)$$

A simple analysis of this recurrence gives that

$$\frac{\bar{s}_n}{\sqrt{2c_* \log 3^n}} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.44)$$

To obtain this precise growth rate, we need to make  $k$ , the number of scales in our recurrence step, large enough that the increment in the recurrence (1.43) dominates the error on the right side. By quantifying this idea we are able to obtain a convergence rate for this limit, which is stated below in Theorem 7.1.

With the sharp asymptotics of  $\bar{s}_n$ , we can return to (1.36) and (1.40) to conclude that

$$\mathfrak{L} \approx \sqrt{2c_* \log 3^n} \Delta \quad \text{on length scales between } 3^{n-n^\delta} \text{ and } 3^n.$$

This tells us that the original process  $\{X_t\}$  behaves, on length scales between  $3^{n-n^\delta}$  and  $3^n$ , like a Brownian motion with covariance  $\sqrt{8c_* \log 3^n}$ . In other words, the rescaled process  $X_t^\varepsilon$  defined in (1.19) should be close to a Brownian motion.

**1.5. An outline of the rigorous proof.** In this subsection we explain how the informal heuristics above are formalized and give a detailed overview of the structure of the proofs of Theorems A and B. Rather than attempt to directly iterate homogenization of the operators  $\mathfrak{L}_n$  defined in (1.36), we instead analyze the asymptotics of certain (quenched) quantities which we regard as representing the effective diffusion matrix at different length scales. We call these quantities the *coarse-grained diffusion matrices* of the diffusion matrix  $\nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}$ . They are the same objects central to the theory of quantitative homogenization, having been first introduced in that context (see [AK24a, Chapter 5] and the references therein).

As recalled in Section 2, below, we define, for each cube  $\square \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and coefficient field  $\mathbf{a}(x)$ , a dual pair of symmetric matrices  $\mathbf{s}(\square)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(\square)$ , and another matrix  $\mathbf{k}(\square)$ . We think of  $\mathbf{s}(\square)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(\square)$  as representing two competing notions of the “symmetric part of the effective diffusion matrix in  $\square$ ” and  $\mathbf{k}(\square)$  as representing the anti-symmetric part. The two symmetric matrices are ordered: they satisfy  $\mathbf{s}_*(\square) \leq \mathbf{s}(\square)$ , and the error in certain “coarse-graining estimates” will become small when the difference  $\mathbf{s}(\square) - \mathbf{s}_*(\square)$  is small. We therefore regard  $[\mathbf{s}_*(\square) + \mathbf{k}(\square), \mathbf{s}(\square) + \mathbf{k}(\square)]$  as a confidence interval for the effective diffusion matrix.<sup>9</sup> There are also *annealed* versions of these quantities defined below, which we denote by  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}(\square)$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_*(\square)$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{k}}(\square)$ . As we will see in (2.71) below, in our context we have, by symmetry, that  $\bar{\mathbf{k}}(\square) = 0$ .

The coarse grained diffusion matrices can be thought of as the coefficients of the corresponding elliptic operator in a wavelet-type expansion. They organize and compress the information in the full elliptic operator into discrete multiscale representatives. Indeed, quantitative estimates on the coarse-grained matrices can be translated into estimates on the solutions. For instance, we will deduce Theorem B as a consequence of the quantitative convergence of the coarse-grained matrices, which roughly states that, for the coefficient field  $\mathbf{a}(x) = \nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}(x)$ , we have that, for every  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$|\mathbf{s}(\square_m) - (2c_*(\log 3)m)^{1/2} \mathbf{I}_d| + |\mathbf{s}_*(\square_m) - (2c_*(\log 3)m)^{1/2} \mathbf{I}_d| + |\mathbf{k}(\square_m) - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}| \lesssim m^\alpha. \quad (1.45)$$

Here and throughout the paper,  $\square_m$  denotes the axis-aligned cube centered at the origin with side length  $3^m$  defined by

$$\square_m := \left( -\frac{1}{2}3^m, \frac{1}{2}3^m \right)^d.$$

<sup>9</sup>These coarse-grained diffusion matrices are related to, but different from, the quantity that Fannjiang proposes to analyze in [Fan98] which he calls *box diffusivity*. In fact, his quantity lies in the interval  $[\mathbf{s}_*(U), \mathbf{s}(U)]$ .




Figure 1.2: Outline of the proof.

As discussed above, the field  $\nu\mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}(x)$  is only defined modulo a constant anti-symmetric matrix. The coarse-grained matrices inherit this property, and in fact the matrices  $\mathbf{s}(U)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$  do not depend on the choice of the anti-symmetric matrix, while the matrix  $\mathbf{k}(U)$  commutes with it. The expressions on the left side of (1.45) are therefore unambiguously defined.

The quantitative bound (1.45) is a very precise estimate which will not be proved until the end of Section 7. The rest of this discussion is an outline of its proof, illustrated in Figure 1.2, which we organize into six main steps.

It is natural to work with infrared cutoffs of the field  $\mathbf{k}(\cdot)$  and  $\mathbf{a}(\cdot)$ , which are defined at scale  $3^L$  with  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  by

$$\mathbf{k}_L(x) := \sum_{n=0}^L \mathbf{j}_n(x), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{a}_L(x) := \nu\mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}_L(x). \quad (1.46)$$

We let  $\mathbf{s}_L(\square)$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square)$  and  $\mathbf{k}_L(\square)$  be the associated coarse-grained matrices. As mentioned in the informal heuristics section above (see the discussion below (1.37)), the infrared cutoff and coarse-graining operations nearly commute with each other, provided that the scale of the cutoff is larger than that of the coarse-graining—this follows from the fact that the coarse-grained matrices commute with the addition of a constant anti-symmetric matrix and depend continuously on the field. Using this we infer that the coarse-grained matrices of the original field (without cutoff) inherit decorrelation properties from those of the cutoff fields (which by definition have finite range dependence). The precise version of this estimate appears in Lemma 2.9, and we refer to this as the *localization* property of the coarse-grained matrices. This localization property is important because it says that the coarse-grained matrices have much better decorrelations than the logarithmic ones of the coefficient field, allowing us to obtain quantitative homogenization estimates.

The relative error in the localization estimate involves the ratio of the size of the terms that are removed, multiplied by the coarse-grained matrix  $\mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(\square)$ . This is the term which appeared above in (1.42) and, as discussed there, to estimate it effectively we need a lower bound on  $\mathbf{s}_*(\square)$ , which is very close to  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square)$  if the size of  $\square$  is smaller than  $3^L$ .



*Step one:* A suboptimal lower bound for  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square)$ . In Section 3, we prove a quenched lower bound for  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)$  which states roughly that, for every  $L, m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $L \geq m \gtrsim 1$ ,

$$\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m) \lesssim m^{-1/2}(\log m)^7 \mathbf{I}_d. \quad (1.47)$$

The precise version of (1.47) is stated in Proposition 3.1. This estimate is a suboptimal lower bound on the diffusivity which, like the annealed estimate (1.9), exhibits a rate of superdiffusivity which is optimal up to a correction which is doubly logarithmic in the length scale.

The proof of (1.47) relies on special properties of the matrix quantity  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square)$ . The argument would not work if we attempted to substitute  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square)$  with other notions of “diffusivity”, including  $\mathbf{s}_L(\square)$ .

The first step in the proof is to observe that (1.47) can be reduced to an *annealed* estimate, using the localization of  $\mathbf{s}_*$  and another key property of  $\mathbf{s}_*^{-1}$ , namely *subadditivity*, which says that  $\mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(\square_m)$  can be upper bounded by the sample mean of the  $\mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(z + \square_n)$ ’s over the partition of  $\square_m$  of subcubes of size  $3^n$ . Due to the localization property, the sample mean will exhibit stochastic cancellations and, as a result, we deduce strong one-sided control of the fluctuations of  $\mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(\square_m)$ .

It therefore suffices to prove an annealed version of (1.47), which states that

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m) \lesssim m^{-1/2}(\log m)^{13/2}, \quad (1.48)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)]$  denotes the mean of  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)$ . Note that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)$  is a scalar matrix by the dihedral symmetry assumption, and so by abusing notation slightly we allow  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)$  to also denote a scalar.

To prove (1.48), we fix  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  and find a large sequence of successive length scales  $[m - 2h, m]$  of length  $2h \ll L$ , with  $0 < L - m \lesssim \log L$ , such that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_k)$  does not change much (in ratio) as we vary the parameter  $k \in [m - 2h, m]$ . Since the subadditivity of  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}$  implies that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_k)$  is monotone nonincreasing in  $k$  and bounded from above by  $\nu^{-1}$ , such a scale  $m$  can be found using a simple pigeonhole argument.

After identifying this range of good scales  $[m - 2h, m]$ , we attempt to obtain quantitative homogenization estimates within it. That is, we start from scale  $m - 2h$  and show that homogenization has occurred before we reach scale  $m$ . The fact that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_k)$  is essentially constant across this range of scales ensures that its subadditivity is nearly *additivity*, and this provides us with additional decorrelation on these scales, which is notably below the scale of the infrared cutoff. Consequently, the fluctuations of the coarse-grained matrices  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_k)$  are relatively small, and so these matrices are close to the same deterministic scalar matrix, namely  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)$ .

This allows us to commute the influence of the larger scale  $\mathbf{j}_k$ ’s with the coarse-graining, giving us a rigorous version of (1.41) on this limited range of scales. We are therefore able to lower bound  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)$  by the expected diffusivity enhancement due to these waves  $\mathbf{j}_k$  on the operator  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)\Delta$ . This (roughly) yields the bound

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m) \gtrsim \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)h. \quad (1.49)$$

The actual bound will have additional logarithmic factors, see (3.53). Since  $h$  can be taken to be nearly the size of  $m$ , we obtain, up to these logarithmic factors,

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^2(\square_m) \gtrsim m.$$

This results in the bound (1.48), and the choice of  $m$  can be removed by using the monotonicity of  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)$  in  $m$ , due to the subadditivity of  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}$ .

Implementing this argument requires the application of quantitative homogenization estimates for high contrast coefficient fields established in [AK24b] to the infrared cutoff field  $\mathbf{a}_L$ . This is because the argument above does not really give the bound (1.49) directly, it actually gives instead

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_m) \gtrsim \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)h. \quad (1.50)$$

The estimates in [AK24b] state that the relative homogenization error becomes small after approximately  $O(\log^3 m)$  many geometric scales. This tells us that, if we impose the constraint  $h \gtrsim \log^3 m$  on the width of the interval of scales, then we can ensure that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_m) \leq 2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)$ . We then obtain (1.49) from (1.50). The constraint  $h \gtrsim \log^3 m$  is responsible for the additional logarithmic factors mentioned above.

*Step two: Quantitative homogenization on scales below the infrared cutoff.* With a lower bound for  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}$  in hand, we turn our attention to the problem of lack of scale separation in Section 4 with the goal of formalizing the vague statement (1.40). That is, we want to prove that, across a range of scales strictly smaller than  $L$ , the operator  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_L \nabla$  is close to  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L \Delta$ , where  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)$ .

The precise statement formalizing the closeness of the operators  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_L \nabla$  to  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L \Delta$  is presented in Proposition 4.1. It says roughly that the coarse-grained matrices satisfy

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} |\mathbf{s}_L(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m| + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m| + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} |\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m)| \lesssim m^{-1/4+\delta}. \quad (1.51)$$

This statement does not take the form of a traditional homogenization estimate, in which solutions corresponding to the two operators are compared to one another. We can certainly obtain such a statement as a *consequence*, and we will do so, but it is much more efficient to encode information about the operator  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_L \nabla$  in the coarse-grained matrices themselves. The exponent  $1/4$  appearing in (1.51) is not optimal, and will be improved later.

Since, for each fixed  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ , the field  $\mathbf{a}_L$  has a finite range of dependence, the quantitative homogenization results of [AK24b] are applicable (see in particular [AK24b, Proposition 1.4]). However, since the range of dependence of  $\mathbf{a}_L$  is of order  $3^L$ , these results will give us homogenization only on scales *larger* than  $3^L$ . On the other hand, we learn from the localization estimates in Section 2.5 that the operator  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_L \nabla$  is a very good approximation of  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla$  on scales a bit smaller than  $3^L$ . It is therefore on length scales strictly below the infrared cutoff that quantitative homogenization estimates would be most useful. Indeed, the main interest in an estimate like (1.51) is when the scale parameter  $m$  is the range  $L - C \log L < m < L$ .

The main difficulty in proving homogenization estimates below the scale of the infrared cutoff is due to the lack of good quantitative ergodicity of  $\mathbf{a}_L$  on these scales. On scales below  $L$ , the field  $\mathbf{a}_L$  has essentially the same logarithmic correlations as the field without cutoff. The strategy is to use the lower bound for  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}$  in Proposition 3.1 and the special structure of the coarse-grained coefficients to argue that, notwithstanding the lack of correlation decay of  $\mathbf{a}_L$ , the coarse-grained matrices still possess sufficient correlation decay on scales larger than  $3^{L-o(L)}$ . In other words, *coarse-graining reveals a hidden decorrelation structure*. This will allow us to apply the results of [AK24b] to obtain the desired homogenization estimates, since these results are applicable under such weak mixing conditions.

*Step three: Large-scale regularity theory.* A bootstrap technique that is present in many works in quantitative homogenization is to use a weak or suboptimal homogenization estimate to gain an improvement of regularity, which is then used to obtain stronger (and often optimal) homogenization estimates. This idea is crucial to the present work, as explained in the next step.

In Section 5, we prove a conditional “black box” statement which asserts that any quenched homogenization estimate, like the one in Proposition 4.1, yields, deterministically, a corresponding statement about large-scale regularity. Since the estimate given in Proposition 4.1 is suboptimal, this black box gives us a version of Theorem D with a slightly weaker exponent  $\alpha$ . The exponent  $\alpha$  will be improved by reusing the black box, once the exponent in (1.51) has been improved from almost  $1/4$  to almost  $1/2$ —this is accomplished in Step four. We also prove a weaker version of Theorem C (see the last statement of Proposition 5.7), which requires  $f = 0$  and has  $L^2$  spatial integrability instead of  $L^\infty$  in (1.27).

The overall strategy for obtaining regularity statements from homogenization estimates is reviewed in [AKM19, Chapter 3]. Briefly, the idea is to approximate an arbitrary solution by harmonic functions at each scale, and thereby deduce that the solution enjoys the same oscillation decay estimates as harmonic functions do, up to the homogenization error. These estimates can then be iterated if the homogenization error is sufficiently small. To obtain Hölder  $C^{0,\gamma}$ -type estimates, the iteration can be closed if the homogenization error is a small enough constant, which is ensured by the assumption in the black box statement.

The  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate is the critical one for the bootstrap argument in the paper. It is more involved than the Hölder estimate, and it differs substantially from the usual argument in uniformly elliptic homogenization theory. There one uses the homogenization estimates to obtain bounds on the flatness of corrected affines on all sufficiently large scales. Then, working with a modified notion of excess<sup>10</sup> in which affines are replaced by corrected affines, we obtain excess decay estimates for general solutions from those of harmonic functions, once again up to the homogenization error. These can then be iterated to give the desired  $C^{1,\gamma}$ -type bound.

Unlike the case of uniformly elliptic equations, infinite-volume corrected affines do not exist in our setting. They do however exist in finite volume, and the main additional difficulty in the proof is to show that these finite-volume corrected affines are compatible with each other across different scales. In other words, we need to show that each of the finite-volume correctors is close to an affine at every scale, with the slope of the affine depending on the scale. This estimate, which we call *flatness at every scale*, is proved as part of an induction argument which proves a finite-volume version of the  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate. This finite-volume estimate then implies the Liouville theorem which allows us to upgrade the finite-volume  $C^{1,\gamma}$  statement to an infinite-volume one.

*Step four: Improved coarse-graining estimates.* The homogenization error obtained in Step 2 is *larger* than the diffusivity enhancement we expect to observe in the recurrence relation (1.43). This is not surprising, because we obtained the homogenization result by using the localization estimate, which essentially discards the wavelengths responsible for the enhancement. In order to prove the recurrence, we must sharpen the homogenization estimates so that the heuristic in (1.41) can be formalized.

The homogenization error is captured by the sizes of the differences  $|(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(\square)|$  as well as  $|\mathbf{k}(\square) - \bar{\mathbf{k}}|$  and  $|\mathbf{s}_*(\square) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}|$ . However, the real bottleneck which limits the convergence rate is the first difference  $|(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(\square)|$ , which represents the size of the “confidence interval” for the coarse-graining operation in  $\square$ . We call this the *coarse-graining error*, and it is distinct from the other two errors, whose sum we call the *fluctuation error*, which measures how close the coarse-grained matrices are to  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ .

The coarse-graining error is usually much smaller than the fluctuation error, in fact it is typically the square of the latter. The role of the coarse-graining error is fundamental in our approach as

---

<sup>10</sup>The *excess* of a given function  $u$  is usually defined as  $E(u, r) := \inf_{\ell} \|u - \ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}$ , where the infimum is over all affines  $\ell$ . It measures the relative distance between a given function and the nearest affine.

it is the basis of the rigorous renormalization group argument. We define, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the *coarse-grained coefficient field*  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n$  at length scale  $3^n$  by

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n(x) := \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{a}_*(z + \square_n) \mathbf{1}_{z + \square_n}(x). \quad (1.52)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_*(\square) := (\mathbf{s}_* - \mathbf{k}^t)(\square)$ . In fact, if we take a solution  $u$  of the equation and mollify it on scale  $r > 3^n$  by considering  $u * \eta_r$ , then  $u * \eta_r$  will be a solution of the coarse-grained equation

$$-\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_n \nabla (u * \eta_r) = \nabla \cdot (\text{Error}),$$

where the divergence-form error on the right side is controlled—explicitly and deterministically—by the coarse-graining error. Therefore, if the coarse-graining error can be made small, we can *literally* coarse-grain the equation by replacing  $\mathbf{a}(\cdot)$  by  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n(\cdot)$ . This brings us very close to formalizing the informal heuristics in Section 1.4, as we will explain in the next step below.

The goal of Section 6 is to improve the coarse-graining error, so that it is much smaller than the fluctuation error. The proof follows a renormalization argument which is presented in the uniformly elliptic case in [AK24a, Section 6.2]. The idea is quite simple: the coarse-grained matrices characterize an exact relation between the gradients and fluxes of certain solutions, and the large-scale  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate says that the gradients of arbitrary solutions are close to a certain  $d$  dimensional family of solutions. This *finite dimensionalizes* the problem and restricts the pair  $\mathbf{s}(\square)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(\square)$  to be closer to each other. This argument appears in Lemma 6.3, which is then post-processed into a statement about weak norms of fluxes, presented in Proposition 6.6.

As a result of this analysis, we improve the homogenization error estimate stated roughly in (1.51) to the (still roughly stated) estimate

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} |\mathbf{s}_L(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m| + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m| + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} |\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m)| \lesssim m^{-1/2+\delta}, \quad (1.53)$$

with the coarse-graining error improved to

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} |\mathbf{s}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)| \leq m^{-1+\delta}. \quad (1.54)$$

These estimates, which are optimal up to the small  $\delta > 0$ , are stated in Proposition 6.2. They also allow us to deduce the full statement of Theorem D from the black box regularity statement proved in Section 5.

*Step five: The approximate recurrence relation and sharp superdiffusivity.* The main goal of Section 7 is to obtain the approximate recurrence relation informally stated in (1.43). The estimate, which is stated precisely in Proposition 7.2, is roughly

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m+h} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - c_*(\log 3) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} h| \lesssim m^{-1/2+\delta}, \quad (1.55)$$

where  $h \in \mathbb{N}$  is constrained to lie in the interval  $h \in [m^\delta, m^{-\delta} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m]$  and  $\delta > 0$  is arbitrary. Upon iteration of (1.55) we obtain a quantitative version of (1.44), which says that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (2c_*(\log 3)m)^{1/2}| \lesssim m^\delta.$$

See Theorem 7.1 for the precise statement. The proof of (1.55) is broken into two steps, which are stated in Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4 and which are the focus of Subsections 7.2 and 7.3, respectively.

Lemma 7.3 says that the homogenized matrix for  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_m + (\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)$  is almost the same as the homogenized matrix for  $\mathbf{a}_{m+h}$ . The estimate is roughly that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m+h} - \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_m + (\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)]| \lesssim C m^{-1/2+\delta}, \quad (1.56)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{d}]$  denotes the homogenized matrix for a (stationary random) elliptic coefficient field  $\mathbf{d}(\cdot)$ . This formalizes (1.41) and says that *the renormalization flow is indeed (almost) a semigroup!* The proof of this estimate is based on the improved fluctuation and coarse-graining inequalities (1.53) and (1.54) obtained in the previous step, in the (stronger) form of weak norm estimates on the fluxes (Proposition 6.6).

Lemma 7.4 asserts roughly that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_m + (\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)] - (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m + c_*(\log 3)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}h)| \lesssim m^{-1/2+\delta}. \quad (1.57)$$

Observe that the combination of (1.56) and (1.57) imply (1.55). To prove (1.57), we first show that, in the computation of  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_m + (\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)]$ , the coarse-grained field  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_m$  has small fluctuations and therefore can be replaced by  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \mathbf{I}_d$ , up to a negligible error. Thus

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_m + (\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)] \approx \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m (\mathbf{I}_d + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m))] = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)].$$

By the assumption on  $h$  we have that the anti-symmetric field  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)$  is much smaller than  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}$  and thus can be treated as a perturbation of the identity. This perturbative problem is quite simple and straightforward to analyze, as we can compare the correctors  $\phi_e$ , which solve the problem

$$-\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta})(e + \nabla \phi_e) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

to a solution of a problem with the Laplacian,

$$-\Delta \chi_e = \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\delta} e) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

To see that  $\nabla \phi_e$  should be close to  $\nabla \chi_e$ , we observe that the two equations coincide asides from the extra term  $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta} \nabla \phi_e$ , which turns out to be small,  $|\boldsymbol{\delta} \nabla \phi_e| \simeq |\boldsymbol{\delta}|^2$ . Since the homogenized matrix is the mean of the energy of the corrector, we deduce that

$$e \cdot \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}]e = |e|^2 + \langle |\nabla \phi_e|^2 \rangle \approx |e|^2 + \langle |\nabla \chi_e|^2 \rangle.$$

Meanwhile, our assumption **(J5)** controls exactly the term appearing on the right,

$$\langle |\nabla \chi_e|^2 \rangle \simeq c_*(\log 3)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-2}|e|^2 h,$$

and so, combining the above yields  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_{m+h} - \mathbf{k}_m)] \approx \mathbf{I}_d + c_*(\log 3)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-2}h$ . A careful quantification of this argument gives us (1.57).

*Step six: Pointwise homogenization estimates.* The main purpose of Section 8 is to upgrade the homogenization estimates from  $L^2$  to  $L^\infty$ . This will allow us to complete the proof of Theorem B. Note that such an upgrade of spatial regularity is also needed in the next step to prove the invariance principle, Theorem A.

A common way to obtain pointwise homogenization estimates from  $L^2$  bounds is to obtain uniform bounds in a stronger space—such as  $C^{0,\gamma}$ —and then interpolate  $L^\infty$  between  $L^2$  and  $C^{0,\gamma}$ . In the case of uniformly elliptic equations, one can directly apply the De Giorgi-Nash Hölder estimate.

The argument is not so simple in our case, since the equation is not uniformly elliptic. We apply the large-scale regularity estimates to obtain a bound on the  $L^2$  oscillation of the solution  $u^\varepsilon$  in every ball larger than  $|\log \varepsilon|^{-q}$  for any exponent  $q < \infty$ . We take such a large mesoscopic scale because, in order to have such a regularity estimate, we need to cover the domain by a grid

of balls  $B_{r/2}(x_i)$  which have radii  $r \geq \varepsilon \mathcal{X}(x_i/\varepsilon)$ , where  $\mathcal{X}(z)$  is the minimal scale for the large-scale regularity estimates centered at the point  $z$ . These estimates are similar to Theorem C, but have  $L^2$  type spatial integrability rather than  $L^\infty$ . We use a union bound and a bound on  $\mathcal{X}$  similar to (1.24) to estimate the probability, for a given  $r$ , that such a covering is possible. The stochastic integrability of (1.24) is however very weak. There will be  $r^{-d}$  many balls, so for the union to yield something useful, we require that  $r^{-d} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X} > \varepsilon^{-1}r] \ll 1$ . This is only possible if  $r \gg \exp(-(c \log \varepsilon)^\sigma)$  for  $\sigma < 1$ . Taking then  $r_\varepsilon := |\log \varepsilon|^{-q}$  is clearly fine, but we cannot take it to be as small as  $\varepsilon^{0.999}$ .

The result of this argument is an estimate of the form

$$[u^\varepsilon * \eta_{r_\varepsilon}]_{C^{0,\gamma}} \lesssim 1, \quad (1.58)$$

where  $\{\eta_r\}_{r>0}$  is the standard mollifier. In fact, we have (1.58) for  $\gamma = 1$  for such  $r_\varepsilon$ , as we will prove in Proposition 8.7, which states roughly that, in every ball  $B_r(x_i)$  with  $r \in [r_\varepsilon, 1]$ ,

$$\|u^\varepsilon - (u^\varepsilon)_{B_r(x_i)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r(x_i))} \lesssim r.$$

We then use the De Giorgi-Nash  $L^\infty$ - $L^2$  estimate with explicit prefactor constant depending on the ellipticity ratio<sup>11</sup> to take care of the smaller scales. Since the ellipticity of our equation is at most of order  $\nu^{-1} |\log \varepsilon|^2$  (by another union bound), we obtain

$$\|u^\varepsilon - (u^\varepsilon)_{B_{r/2}(x_i)}\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_i))} \lesssim (\nu^{-1} |\log \varepsilon|^2)^{\frac{d}{4}} \|u^\varepsilon - (u^\varepsilon)_{B_r(x_i)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r(x_i))}.$$

When combined with the previous display, we obtain, in light of the choice of  $r$ , that

$$\|u^\varepsilon * \eta_{r_\varepsilon} - u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (\nu^{-1} |\log \varepsilon|^2)^{\frac{d}{4}} r \leq \nu^{-\frac{d}{4}} |\log \varepsilon|^{-q+\frac{d}{2}} \lesssim |\log \varepsilon|^{-1000}. \quad (1.59)$$

after taking  $q > \frac{d}{2} + 1000$ . The combination of (1.58) and (1.59) gives us the uniform equicontinuity of  $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  and allows us to upgrade the homogenization estimates from  $L^2$  to  $L^\infty$  and complete the proofs of Theorem B and C.

*Step seven: Consequences for the diffusion process  $\{X_t\}$ .* It is a basic fact that convergence of a sequence of Feller processes is equivalent to convergence of the corresponding infinitesimal generators: see for instance [Kal02, Theorem 19.25]. More precisely, if  $X_t^\varepsilon$  is a sequence of Feller processes with infinitesimal generators  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  and  $X_t$  is a Feller process with generator  $\mathfrak{L}$ ,

$$X_t^\varepsilon \Rightarrow X_t \iff \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}$$

where we say that  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}$  if, for every  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  there exists a sequence  $u^\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$u^\varepsilon \rightarrow u \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}u,$$

with respect to the local uniform topology. In our setting, the latter statement can be deduced from Theorem B. Specifically, we let  $u^\varepsilon$  be the solution of the problem

$$\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = \mathfrak{L}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

and obtain convergence of  $u^\varepsilon$  to  $u$  by approximation via the Dirichlet problem with zero boundary conditions on a very large domain and applying Theorem B.

---

<sup>11</sup>The optimal constant for the  $L^\infty$ - $L^2$  estimate is known to be  $C\Lambda^{\frac{d-1}{4}}$ , where  $\Lambda$  is ellipticity and  $C$  depends only on  $d$ . This was proved recently by Bella and Schäffner [BS21]. We do not require such a precise estimate, and any of the standard proofs of De Giorgi-Nash bounds, upon tracking the dependence of the constants, yield  $C\Lambda^{\frac{d}{4}}$ . We will use the latter estimate, since the precise exponent does not matter to us.

The remaining step needed in the proof of the first part of Theorem A is to verify that  $\{X_t^\varepsilon\}$  is Feller. This is, however, an immediate corollary of the generalized Nash-Aronson type upper bound established in the appendix (see Corollary B.3).

To prove the convergence of the diffusivity  $t^{-1}\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|]^2$  stated in the second part of Theorem A, we use Theorem B to find a solution  $u^\varepsilon$  of the equation

$$\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = 1$$

which is very close to the quadratic function  $Q(x) = \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2$ . This allows us to compute, making a small error due to the difference  $\|u^\varepsilon - Q\|_{L^\infty}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2d}\partial_t\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t^\varepsilon|^2] = \partial_t\mathbf{E}^0[Q(X_t^\varepsilon)] \approx \partial_t\mathbf{E}^0[u^\varepsilon(X_t^\varepsilon)] = \mathbf{E}^0[\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon(X_t^\varepsilon)] = 1.$$

Therefore, after integration, we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{2d}\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t^\varepsilon|^2] \approx t.$$

After rescaling this bound, using (1.19), we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t^\varepsilon|^2] \approx 2dc_*(\log t)^{1/2}.$$

To make the above argument precise, we must work in a bounded domain. We do so by defining  $u^\varepsilon$  to be the solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = -1 & \text{in } B_1, \\ u^\varepsilon = Q & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.60)$$

and using a stopping time  $T_{B_1}^\varepsilon$ , the first exit time of the process  $\{X_t^\varepsilon\}$  from the domain  $B_1$ :

$$\partial_t\mathbf{E}^0[u^\varepsilon(X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)] = \mathbf{E}^0[\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon(X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}_{\{T_{B_1}^\varepsilon > t\}}] = \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon > t].$$

The previous computation can then be repeated as long as the first exit time  $T_{B_1}^\varepsilon$  is larger than  $t$  with high probability, and we should expect this to hold for times  $t \ll 1$ . Upon undoing the scaling, we obtain the estimates (1.5) and (1.6) stated in Theorem A for all times  $t$ .

The bulk of Section 9 is devoted to this exit time estimate. This is obtained by repackaging the homogenization bounds for the Dirichlet problem into estimates on the resolvent which then in turn give bounds on the parabolic initial-boundary value problem. Repeatedly iterating the parabolic bounds allows us to deduce that the probability that  $X_t^\varepsilon$  exits  $B_1$  before time  $(\log t)^{-\delta}$  is extremely small (see (9.23)).

**1.6. Notation.** The Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  is denoted by  $|\cdot|$ . We sometimes write  $r \wedge s := \min\{r, s\}$  and  $r \vee s := \max\{r, s\}$ . The Hölder conjugate exponent of an exponent  $p \in [1, \infty]$  is denoted by  $p'$ , where  $p' := p(p-1)^{-1}$  if  $p \neq \infty$  and  $p' = 1$  otherwise. We let  $\ell_e(x) = e \cdot x$  denote the linear function with slope  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The distance between subsets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted by  $\text{dist}(A, B) := \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} |x - y|$ . The set of  $m$ -by- $n$  matrices with real entries is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ . If  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , then  $B^t$  is the transpose of  $B$ . The  $n$ -by- $n$  identity matrix is written  $I_n$ . The symmetric and anti-symmetric  $n$ -by- $n$  matrices are denoted respectively by  $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{n \times n}$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{n \times n}$ . We denote the Loewner ordering on  $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{n \times n}$  by  $\leq$ ; that is, if  $A, B \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{n \times n}$  then  $A \leq B$  means that  $B - A$  has nonnegative eigenvalues. Unless otherwise indicated, the norm we use for  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , denoted by  $|A|$ ,

is the square root of the largest eigenvalue of  $A^t A$ . The Lebesgue measure of a (measurable) subset  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted by  $|U|$ . If  $V$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of codimension 1, such as the boundary  $\partial U$  of a nice domain  $U$ , then  $|V|$  refers instead to the  $d - 1$  dimensional Hausdorff measure of  $V$ . We denote volume-normalized integrals and  $L^p$  norms for  $p \in [1, \infty)$  by

$$(f)_U := \int_U f(x) dx := \frac{1}{|U|} \int_U f(x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{\underline{L}^p(U)} := \left( \int_U |f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p}.$$

We also put a slash through the sum symbol  $\sum$  to denote the average of a finite sequence. We denote by  $|A|$  the cardinality of a finite set  $A$  and, for every  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\sum_{a \in A} f(a) := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{a \in A} f(a).$$

We denote indicator functions—both for events and for subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ —using the symbol  $\mathbf{1}$ .

The function spaces we use include the standard Hölder spaces  $C^{k,\alpha}(U)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  and a domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , as well as Sobolev spaces, which are denoted by  $W^{s,p}(U)$  for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $p \in [1, \infty]$ . The fractional Sobolev spaces are defined in [AKM19, Appendix B], and we use the notation from this appendix (which we do not repeat here). For most of the paper, we use the classical space  $W^{1,p}(U)$ ; in the case  $p = 2$  this is denoted by  $H^1(U)$ . The norm is defined by

$$\|f\|_{W^{1,p}(U)} := \left( \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(U)}^p + \|f\|_{L^p(U)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

If  $|U| < \infty$ , then the volume-normalized norm  $\|f\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(U)}$  is defined by

$$\|f\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(U)} := \left( \|\nabla f\|_{\underline{L}^p(U)}^p + |U|^{-\frac{2}{d}} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^p(U)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The negative, dual seminorms are defined by

$$[f]_{\underline{W}^{-1,p'}(U)} := \sup \left\{ \int_U f(x)g(x) dx : g \in C_c^\infty(U), [g]_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(U)} \leq 1 \right\}$$

and

$$[f]_{\widehat{\underline{W}}^{-1,p'}(U)} := \sup \left\{ \int_U f(x)g(x) dx : [g]_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(U)} \leq 1, (g)_U = 0 \right\}.$$

If  $p = p' = 2$ , then we write  $H^{-1}$  in place of  $W^{-1,p}$ . We let  $W_0^{1,p}(U)$  denote the closure of  $C_c^\infty(U)$  in  $W^{1,p}(U)$  with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$ . If  $X(U)$  is a function space defined for every domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , then  $X_{\text{loc}}(U)$  denotes the set of functions on  $U$  which belong to  $X(U \cap B_R)$  for every  $R \in [1, \infty)$ . We let  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denote the space of continuous functions  $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u(x) = 0$ , and  $C_c^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denotes the subspace of  $C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with compact support in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

We keep track of the stochastic integrability of our random variables with the  $\mathcal{O}_\Psi(\cdot)$  notation defined in Section 2.3. Throughout, for  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$  we denote  $\Gamma_\sigma(t) := \exp(t^\sigma)$  as defined in (2.38). The bold symbol  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is used to denote the gamma function  $\mathbf{\Gamma}(s) := \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} \exp(-t) dt$ .

## 2. Coarse-graining estimates

In this section we introduce the main objects in our approach to renormalization, namely the coarse-grained coefficient fields. These quantities are not new, and have been used extensively in



the theory of quantitative homogenization (see [AKM19, AK24a] and the references therein for the historical background).

In a very recent paper [AK24b], two of the authors developed a formalization of the renormalization group in the context of elliptic homogenization, with an analysis based on these coarse-grained coefficients. In particular, in that paper we measure ellipticity in a negative regularity space, and this allows for the renormalization of the ellipticity ratio. Concretely, for solutions on large scales, we are able to make use of elliptic estimates on a coarse-grained level—we can use the renormalized diffusion matrices rather than the microscopic diffusivity. The analysis in the present paper makes critical use of this idea.

We begin our discussion in the next subsection by introducing the reader to the coarse-grained matrices for very general coefficient fields, specializing to the setting of Theorem B later in the section.

There are many equivalent ways of defining and of thinking about coarse-grained fields, and they have many interesting algebraic properties. These are presented in a complete and self-contained way in [AK24a, AK24b]. To avoid repetition, here we will summarize the properties that are needed while referring to those papers for many of the proofs.

**2.1. Definition of the coarse-grained matrices.** Consider a general coefficient field  $\mathbf{a} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and write the symmetric and anti-symmetric parts of  $\mathbf{a}$ , respectively, as

$$\mathbf{s} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}^t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{k} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}^t),$$

where  $\mathbf{a}^t$  denotes the transpose of  $\mathbf{a}$ . Although the coarse-grained matrices can be defined for more general coefficient fields (see [AK24b]), in this paper we work under the assumption that  $\mathbf{a}(\cdot)$  is qualitatively uniformly elliptic on bounded subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . This means that  $\mathbf{s}$  is valued in the set of positive matrices and  $\mathbf{s}^{-1}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{k} \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Associated to the field  $\mathbf{a}$  is another field  $\mathbf{A}$  which is valued in the set  $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2d \times 2d}$  of  $2d$ -by- $2d$  symmetric matrices and given by

$$\mathbf{A}(x) := \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}^{-1} \mathbf{k})(x) & -(\mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}^{-1})(x) \\ -(\mathbf{s}^{-1} \mathbf{k})(x) & \mathbf{s}^{-1}(x) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

The field  $\mathbf{A}$  arises naturally in the variational formulation of the equation  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = 0$ , and the variational perspective is helpful in gaining an intuition for coarse-graining.

For each such  $\mathbf{a}(\cdot)$  and every bounded Lipschitz domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , we define three matrices which we denote by  $\mathbf{s}(U)$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$  and  $\mathbf{k}(U)$ . The matrices  $\mathbf{s}(U)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$  are symmetric, and we think of them as representing, respectively, upper and lower bounds for the symmetric part of the coarse-grained matrix. We always have the order  $\mathbf{s}(U) \geq \mathbf{s}_*(U)$ , and we think of the gap between  $\mathbf{s}(U)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$  as representing “uncertainty” in the coarse-graining procedure. The matrix  $\mathbf{k}(U)$  is not necessary anti-symmetric, but its symmetric part is bounded by the size of  $(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(U)$  and therefore small if coarse-graining is working well.

We also arrange these three matrices in a pair of  $2d$ -by- $2d$  matrices which we denote by

$$\mathbf{A}(U) := \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{k})(U) & -(\mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1})(U) \\ -(\mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{k})(U) & \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{A}_*(U) = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{s}_* + \mathbf{k} \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{k}^t)(U) & (\mathbf{k} \mathbf{s}_*^{-1})(U) \\ (\mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{k}^t)(U) & \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.2)$$

We consider these matrices to be a coarse-graining of the field  $\mathbf{A}$ . We have that  $\mathbf{A}_*(U) \leq \mathbf{A}(U)$  and the difference  $\mathbf{A}(U) - \mathbf{A}_*(U)$  is proportional to  $(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(U)$ , once again representing the uncertainty

or error in the coarse-graining. We will often need to refer to the top left  $d$ -by- $d$  block of  $\mathbf{A}(U)$ , so we denote this matrix by

$$\mathbf{b}(U) := (\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{k})(U). \quad (2.3)$$

The matrices  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  and  $\mathbf{A}_*(U)$  evidently contain the same information as the triple  $(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_*, \mathbf{k})(U)$ . It is however helpful to have both perspectives in mind. The matrices  $(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_*, \mathbf{k})(U)$  are often more intuitive, but on the other hand several important algebraic properties are best written in terms of  $\mathbf{A}(U)$ . For instance, as shown below,  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  is subadditive, while  $\mathbf{s}(U)$  and  $\mathbf{k}(U)$  are not.

There are several equivalent ways to define these coarse-grained matrices. The first way is to define  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  by the variational formula

$$\frac{1}{2}P \cdot \mathbf{A}(U)P = \inf \left\{ \int_U \frac{1}{2}(X + P) \cdot \mathbf{A}(X + P) : X \in L^2_{\text{pot},0}(U) \times L^2_{\text{sol},0}(U) \right\}, \quad P \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $L^2_{\text{pot},0}(U)$  and  $L^2_{\text{sol},0}(U)$  respectively denote the set of potential (gradient) and solenoidal (divergence-free) vector fields which vanish on the boundary  $\partial U$ ; that is,

$$L^2_{\text{pot},0}(U) := \{\nabla u : u \in H^1_0(U)\}, \quad L^2_{\text{sol},0}(U) := \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in L^2(U; \mathbb{R}^d) : \forall \phi \in H^1(U), \int_U \mathbf{g} \cdot \nabla \phi = 0 \right\}.$$

The right side of (2.4) is clearly quadratic in  $P$ , and therefore there exists a symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  such that the equality in (2.4) holds, and this defines  $\mathbf{A}(U)$ . Having defined  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  in this way, we can define the matrices  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$ ,  $\mathbf{k}(U)$  and  $\mathbf{s}(U)$ —in that order—by giving names to the various block entries of  $\mathbf{A}(U)$ .

An alternative way to define the coarse-grained matrices is to define, for each  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , another variational quantity  $J(U, p, q)$  by

$$J(U, p, q) := \sup_{u \in \mathcal{A}(U)} \int_U \left( -\frac{1}{2} \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla u - p \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u + q \cdot \nabla u \right), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}(U)$  denotes the set of solutions to the equation  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = 0$  in  $U$ ; that is,

$$\mathcal{A}(U) := \{u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(U) : \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = 0 \text{ in } U\}.$$

We also define the analogue of this quantity for the adjoint equation by

$$J^*(U, p, q) := \sup_{u \in \mathcal{A}^*(U)} \int_U \left( -\frac{1}{2} \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla u - p \cdot \mathbf{a}^t \nabla u + q \cdot \nabla u \right) \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^*(U) := \{u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(U) : -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}^t \nabla u = 0 \text{ in } U\}$$

denotes the set of solutions to the adjoint equation in the domain  $U$ . The supremums in the variational problems on the right sides of (2.5) and (2.6) are achieved, and the maximizers belong to  $H^1(U)$  and are unique up to additive constants. Throughout the paper we denote them by  $v(\cdot, U, p, q)$  and  $v^*(\cdot, U, p, q)$ , respectively.

Having defined  $J(U, p, q)$ , we can then define  $\mathbf{s}(U)$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_*(U) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}_{\text{sym}}$  and  $\mathbf{k}(U) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  in a such a way that

$$J(U, p, q) = \frac{1}{2}p \cdot \mathbf{s}(U)p + \frac{1}{2}(q + \mathbf{k}(U)p) \cdot \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U)(q + \mathbf{k}(U)p) - p \cdot q. \quad (2.7)$$

It turns out that, by duality arguments, it can be shown that (see [AK24a, Lemma 5.4])

$$J^*(U, p, q) = \frac{1}{2}p \cdot \mathbf{s}(U)p + \frac{1}{2}(q - \mathbf{k}(U)p) \cdot \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U)(q - \mathbf{k}(U)p) - p \cdot q. \quad (2.8)$$

If we then define  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  by (2.2), then the above identities become

$$J(U, p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -p \\ q \end{pmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{A}(U) \begin{pmatrix} -p \\ q \end{pmatrix} - p \cdot q \quad \text{and} \quad J^*(U, p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{A}(U) \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} - p \cdot q. \quad (2.9)$$

This implies that

$$\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{A}(U) \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} = J(U, p, -q) + J^*(U, p, q) \quad (2.10)$$

These two definitions of the coarse-grained matrices given above are equivalent. A proof of this purely algebraic fact can be found for instance in [AK24a, Section 5].

The quadratic form  $(p, q) \mapsto J(U, p, q)$  is therefore yet another way to represent the coarse-grained matrices. Its usefulness is due to the variational form (2.5), from which we can quickly derive many important properties, as we will see in the next subsection.

While the coarse-grained matrices clearly depend on the underlying coefficient field  $\mathbf{a}(\cdot)$ , we usually suppress this dependence from the notation. However, in this paper we need to consider several different coefficient fields (for instance infrared cutoffs of  $\mathbf{a}$  in the context of Theorem B, as well as renormalized coefficient fields) and so it is necessary to make this dependence explicit in some cases, which we do by writing  $\mathbf{s}(U; \mathbf{a})$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_*(U; \mathbf{a})$ ,  $\mathbf{k}(U; \mathbf{a})$ ,  $\mathbf{A}(U; \mathbf{a})$ ,  $J(U, p, q; \mathbf{a})$  and so forth.

One property of the coarse-grained matrices which is very important for the analysis in this paper is the *commutativity of coarse-graining with the addition of constant anti-symmetric matrices*. We first observe that the set of solutions  $\mathcal{A}(U)$  of the equation does not change if we add a constant anti-symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{k}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  to the field  $\mathbf{a}$ , since  $\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{k}_0)\nabla u = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}\nabla u$ . That is,  $\mathcal{A}(U; \mathbf{a}) = \mathcal{A}(U; \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{k}_0)$ . Indeed, we may even consider that the field  $\mathbf{a}$  is only defined modulo the addition of an anti-symmetric matrix. This invariance is inherited by the coarse-grained matrices. Indeed, using this and (2.5) we see immediately that

$$J(U, p, q; \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{k}_0) = J(U, p, q - \mathbf{k}_0 p; \mathbf{a}).$$

In terms of the matrices, we have

$$\mathbf{s}(U; \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{k}_0) = \mathbf{s}(U; \mathbf{a}), \quad \mathbf{s}_*(U; \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{k}_0) = \mathbf{s}_*(U; \mathbf{a}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{k}(U; \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{k}_0) = \mathbf{k}(U; \mathbf{a}) + \mathbf{k}_0, \quad (2.11)$$

and

$$\mathbf{A}(U; \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{k}_0) = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{s} + (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_0)^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_0))(U) & -((\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_0)^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1})(U) \\ -(\mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_0))(U) & \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{k}_0}^t \mathbf{A}(U; \mathbf{a}) \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{k}_0}, \quad (2.12)$$

where we define the matrix  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}$  as

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & 0 \\ \mathbf{h} & \mathbf{I}_d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.13)$$

In other words, adding a constant anti-symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{k}_0$  does not change  $\mathbf{s}(U)$  or  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$ , and it merely adds  $\mathbf{k}_0$  to  $\mathbf{k}(U)$ .

We combine  $J$  and  $J^*$  into a single quantity by defining

$$\mathbf{J} \left( U, \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} q^* \\ p^* \end{pmatrix} \right) := \frac{1}{2} J(U, p - p^*, q^* - q) + \frac{1}{2} J^*(U, p^* + p, q^* + q). \quad (2.14)$$

**2.2. Basic properties of the coarse-grained matrices.** We list here (without proof) some of the important properties of the coarse-grained matrices. Proofs can be found in [AK24a] or [AK24b].

The coarse-grained matrices are bounded by integrals of the field itself: for every bounded Lipschitz domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have that

$$\left( \int_U \mathbf{s}^{-1}(x) dx \right)^{-1} \leq \mathbf{s}_*(U) \leq \mathbf{s}(U) \leq (\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{k})(U) \leq \int_U (\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}^{-1} \mathbf{k})(x) dx. \quad (2.15)$$

and, more generally,

$$\left( \int_U \mathbf{A}^{-1}(x) dx \right)^{-1} \leq \mathbf{A}_*(U) \leq \mathbf{A}(U) \leq \int_U \mathbf{A}(x) dx. \quad (2.16)$$

A more general form of the last inequality in (2.16) is the subadditivity of  $\mathbf{A}(U)$ , which states that, for every partition  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^N$  of  $U$  (up to a Lebesgue null set) we have that

$$\mathbf{A}(U) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|U_i|}{|U|} \mathbf{A}(U_i). \quad (2.17)$$

Equivalently, the quantity  $J(U, p, q)$  is subadditive. By Young's inequality, if  $\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2$  are symmetric matrices and  $\mathbf{k}$  is another matrix, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_1 + \mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{k} & -\mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_2 \\ -\mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{k} & \mathbf{s}_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_1 + 2\mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{k} & 0 \\ 0 & 2\mathbf{s}_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.18)$$

We will use this to upper bound matrices like  $\mathbf{A}(x)$  and  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  by a block diagonal matrix.

The first variation for the optimization problem (2.5) asserts that, for every  $w \in \mathcal{A}(U)$ ,

$$q \cdot \int_U \nabla w - p \cdot \int_U \mathbf{a} \nabla w = \int_U \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q). \quad (2.19)$$

The second variation says that, for every  $w \in \mathcal{A}(U)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} J(U, p, q) - \int_U \left( -\frac{1}{2} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla w - p \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla w + q \cdot \nabla w \right) \\ = \int_U \frac{1}{2} (\nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q) - \nabla w) \cdot \mathbf{s} (\nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q) - \nabla w). \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

It follows that  $J$  can be written as the energy of the maximizer: for every  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$J(U, p, q) = \int_U \frac{1}{2} \nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q) \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q). \quad (2.21)$$

Similarly, we have that

$$J(U, p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \left( q \cdot \int_U \nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q) - p \cdot \int_U \mathbf{a} \nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q) \right). \quad (2.22)$$

By summing (2.7) and (2.8), we obtain the identity

$$\begin{aligned} J(U, p, q - h) + J^*(U, p, q + h) &= p \cdot (\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(U)p + (q - \mathbf{s}_*(U)p) \cdot \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U)(q - \mathbf{s}_*(U)p) \\ &\quad + (h - \mathbf{k}(U)p) \cdot \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U)(h - \mathbf{k}(U)p). \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

In particular,

$$J(U, e, (\mathbf{s}_* - \mathbf{k})(U)e) + J^*(U, e, (\mathbf{s}_* + \mathbf{k})(U)e) = e \cdot (\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(U)e. \quad (2.24)$$

By [AK24a, Remark 5.7], we have that the symmetric part of  $\mathbf{k}$  is controlled by the gap between  $s(U)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$ :

$$(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}^t)(U) \leq (\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(U) \quad \text{and} \quad -(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}^t)(U) \leq (\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(U). \quad (2.25)$$

The quantity  $J$  allows us to relate the spatial averages of gradients and fluxes of arbitrary solutions: by (2.19), we have that, for every  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $w \in \mathcal{A}(U)$ ,

$$\left| \int_U (p \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla w - q \cdot \nabla w) \right| = \left| \int_U \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla v(\cdot, U, p, q) \right| \leq (2J(U, p, q))^{1/2} \left( \int_U \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla w \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.26)$$

By taking  $q = (\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{k})(U)p$ , using (2.24) and then taking the maximum over  $|p| = 1$ , we obtain, for every  $w \in \mathcal{A}(U)$ ,

$$\left| \int_U \mathbf{a} \nabla w - (\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{k}^t)(U) \int_U \nabla w \right| \leq 2^{1/2} |\mathbf{s}(U) - \mathbf{s}_*(U)|^{1/2} \left( \int_U \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla w \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.27)$$

The coarse-grained matrix  $\mathbf{s}_*(U)$  gives a lower bound for the spatial average of the gradient of an arbitrary solution in terms of its energy:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_U \nabla u \right) \cdot \mathbf{s}_*(U) \left( \int_U \nabla u \right) \leq \int_U \frac{1}{2} \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla u, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{A}(U). \quad (2.28)$$

Similarly, the coarse-grained matrix  $\mathbf{b}(U)$  gives a lower bound for the spatial average of the flux of an arbitrary solution in terms of its energy:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_U \mathbf{a} \nabla u \right) \cdot \mathbf{b}^{-1}(U) \left( \int_U \mathbf{a} \nabla u \right) \leq \int_U \frac{1}{2} \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla u, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{A}(U). \quad (2.29)$$

For  $e, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and a bounded Lipschitz domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  denote by  $v(\cdot, U, e, q)$  the maximizing solution in (2.5). The spatial averages of the gradient and flux can be written explicitly in terms of the coarse-grained matrices: by [AK24a, (5.16)], we have

$$\begin{cases} \int_U \nabla v(\cdot, U, e, q) = -p + \mathbf{s}_*^{-1}(U)(q + \mathbf{k}(U)e) \\ \int_U \mathbf{a} \nabla v(\cdot, U, e, q) = (\mathbf{I}_d - \mathbf{k}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1})(U)q - \mathbf{b}(U)e. \end{cases} \quad (2.30)$$

We also denote

$$v(\cdot, U, e) := v(\cdot, U, 0, \mathbf{s}_*(U)e), \quad (2.31)$$

so that by (2.30) we have that

$$\begin{pmatrix} (\nabla v(\cdot, U, e))_U \\ (\mathbf{a} \nabla v(\cdot, U, e))_U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e \\ (\mathbf{s}_*(U) - \mathbf{k}^t(U))e \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.32)$$

By (2.21), the energy can be expressed as

$$\int_U \frac{1}{2} \nabla v(\cdot, U, e) \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla v(\cdot, U, e) = J(U, 0, \mathbf{s}_*e) = \frac{1}{2} e \cdot \mathbf{s}_*(U)e. \quad (2.33)$$

It is clear that the map  $e \mapsto \nabla v(\cdot, U, e)$  is linear. We also define

$$\mathbf{a}_*(U) := \mathbf{s}_*(U) - \mathbf{k}^t(U).$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we introduce the coarse-grained coefficient field  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n$  defined by

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n := \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{a}_*(z + \square_n) \mathbf{1}_{z + \square_n}. \quad (2.34)$$

**2.3. Orlicz notation for tail bounds.** Throughout the paper we track tail bounds of random variables as follows: for  $A > 0$  and an increasing function  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  satisfying

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{t}{\Psi(t)} dt < \infty, \quad (2.35)$$

and a random variable  $X$ , we write

$$X \leq \mathcal{O}_\Psi(A) \quad (2.36)$$

to mean

$$\mathbb{P}[X > tA] \leq \frac{1}{\Psi(t)}, \quad \forall t \in [1, \infty). \quad (2.37)$$

As we will see just below, this induces a particularly useful algebra which allows us to essentially multiply and add the right sides of (2.36). More generally, we write

$$X \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Psi_1}(A_1) + \dots + \mathcal{O}_{\Psi_n}(A_n)$$

to mean that

$$X \leq X_1 + \dots + X_n, \quad \text{where } X_i \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Psi_i}(A_i), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Although we introduce this notation for a general increasing function  $\Psi$  satisfying (2.35), for most of this paper we will use  $\Psi = \Gamma_\sigma$ , where for  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$\Gamma_\sigma(t) := \exp(t^\sigma). \quad (2.38)$$

This describes random variables with stretched exponential tails. The important case  $\sigma = 2$  specifies Gaussian tails and (1.14) can be rewritten as

$$\|\mathbf{j}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n e)} + 3^n \|\nabla \mathbf{j}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} + 3^{2n} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{j}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(1). \quad (2.39)$$

We recall some basic properties and refer to [AK24b, Appendix C] and [AKM19, Appendix A] for an in depth discussion.

**Lemma 2.1** (Generalized triangle inequality). *There exists a universal constant  $C < \infty$  such that, for every  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$  and sequence  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  of random variables,*

$$X_k \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(a_k) \quad \implies \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} X_k \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma} \left( (1 + C\sigma^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma < 1\}}) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} a_k \right) \quad (2.40)$$

*Proof.* The inequality for  $\sigma \geq 1$  is proved in [AKM19, Lemma A.4]. The proof of that lemma also gives the statement for  $0 < \sigma < 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2** (Multiplication property). *For every  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in (0, \infty)$  if  $X_1, X_2$  are positive random variables, then*

$$X_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma_1}}(A_1) \quad \text{and} \quad X_2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma_2}}(A_2) \quad \implies \quad X_1 X_2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\frac{\sigma_1 \sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}}}(A_1 A_2). \quad (2.41)$$

*In particular, for every  $\sigma, p, K \in (0, \infty)$  and positive random variable  $X$ ,*

$$X \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(K) \quad \iff \quad X^p \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma/p}}(K^p). \quad (2.42)$$

*Proof.* This is [AKM19, Lemma A.3].  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3** (Maximum of  $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}$  random variables). *Suppose that  $\sigma, A > 0$  and  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  is a sequence of random variables satisfying  $X_i = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(A)$  for  $N \geq 2$ . Then*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_i = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}((3 \log N)^{1/\sigma} A). \quad (2.43)$$

*Proof.* For every  $t \geq 1$  we use a union bound to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_i > A(3 \log N)^{1/\sigma} t\right] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{P}[X_i > A(3 \log N)^{1/\sigma} t] \\ &\leq N \exp(-3t^\sigma \log N) \leq \exp(-t^\sigma(3 \log N - \log N)) \leq \exp(-t^\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used  $2 \log N \geq 1$ .  $\square$

The indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_E$  of an event  $E$  with  $0 < \mathbb{P}[E] < 1$  satisfies, for every  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$\mathbf{1}_E \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(|\log \mathbb{P}[E]|^{-1/\sigma}). \quad (2.44)$$

This is immediate from the definition of (2.36) in (2.37).

**Lemma 2.4.** *For every  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$  and random variable  $X$  satisfying  $X = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(\sigma)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|X|^k] \leq \sigma^k (1 + \Gamma(k/2 + 1)), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.45)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(NX) - 1] \leq 3 \max\{\sigma N \exp(\sigma N), \sigma^2 N^2 \exp(\sigma^2 N^2)\}. \quad (2.46)$$

*Proof.* To obtain (2.45), we assume  $\sigma = 1$  without loss of generality and straightforwardly compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|X|^k] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[|X|^k > t] dt \leq 1 + \int_1^\infty \mathbb{P}[|X| > t] k t^{k-1} dt \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \int_1^\infty k t^{k-2} \exp(-t^2) 2t dt \leq 1 + \Gamma(k/2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

We next use (2.45) to estimate

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(NX)] - 1 = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{N^k}{k!} \mathbb{E}[|X|^k] \leq \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\sigma^k N^k}{k!} + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\sigma^k N^k \Gamma(k/2 + 1)}{k!}.$$

The first term on the right side is bounded from above by  $\sigma N \exp(\sigma N)$  and the second term is bounded using the identity

$$\Gamma(k + 1/2) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(2k)!}{4^k k!}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\sigma^k N^k \Gamma(k/2 + 1)}{k!} &= \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{(\sigma N)^{2k} \Gamma(k + 1)}{(2k)!} + \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(\sigma N)^{2k+1} \Gamma((k + 1) + 1/2)}{(2k + 1)!} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{(\sigma N)^{2k}}{k!} \frac{(k!)^2}{(2k)!} + \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(\sigma N)^{2k+1}}{k!} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(2k + 2)}{4^{k+1}} \\ &\leq (\exp(\sigma^2 N^2) - 1) + \sigma N \exp(\sigma^2 N^2) \\ &\leq \sigma^2 N^2 \exp(\sigma^2 N^2) + \sigma N \exp(\sigma^2 N^2). \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we note that

$$\sigma N \exp(\sigma N) + \sigma^2 N^2 \exp(\sigma^2 N^2) + \sigma N \exp(\sigma^2 N^2) \leq 3 \max\{\sigma N \exp(\sigma N), \sigma^2 N^2 \exp(\sigma^2 N^2)\}.$$

This completes the proof of (2.46).  $\square$

We will use the following concentration inequality for sums of centered, independent random variables with stretched exponential tails. For a proof, see [AK24b, Lemma C.2 & Corollary C.4].

**Proposition 2.5** (Concentration for  $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}$ ). *There exists a universal constant  $C < \infty$  such that, for every  $\sigma \in (0, 2]$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and finite sequence  $X_1, \dots, X_m$  of independent random variables satisfying*

$$X_k = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[X_k] = 0, \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad (2.47)$$

we have the estimate

$$\sum_{k=1}^m X_k = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma} \left( \left( (C\sigma^{-1})^{1/\sigma} + C |\log(\sigma - 1)|^{1/\sigma} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma > 1\}} \right) m^{1/2} \right). \quad (2.48)$$

We often apply Proposition 2.5 in the case of sequences which have a finite range of dependence. For instance, we may have random variables  $\{X_z\}_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m}$  for some  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m$ , which have the property that  $X_z$  and  $X_{z'}$  are independent provided that the corresponding subcubes do not touch: that is, if  $\text{dist}(z + \square_n, z' + \square_n) \neq 0$ . In this case, we can simply break into  $3^d$  many subcollections which are independent:

$$\sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} X_z = \sum_{y \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{n+1}} \sum_{z \in 3^{n+1} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} X_{y+z}$$

We then apply (2.48) to each of the inner sums: assuming  $X_z = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(1)$ , we have

$$\sum_{z \in 3^{n+1} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} X_{y+z} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma} \left( \left( (C\sigma^{-1})^{1/\sigma} + C |\log(\sigma - 1)|^{1/\sigma} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma > 1\}} \right) 3^{\frac{d}{2}(m-n-1)} \right).$$

Summing over  $y \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{n+1}$  and using the triangle inequality then yields

$$\sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} X_z = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma} (C_\sigma 3^{\frac{d}{2}(m-n)}).$$

**2.4. Infrared cutoffs.** We now move from the general setting considered above to the particular setting of Theorem B, that is,  $\mathbf{a} := \nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}$  with  $\mathbf{k}$  given in (1.13) with the assumptions (J1)–(J5) in force.

We let  $\mathbf{a}_m$  and  $\mathbf{k}_m$  be the infrared cutoffs defined in (1.46), and we define also

$$\mathbf{A}_m(x) := \begin{pmatrix} (\nu \mathbf{I}_d + \nu^{-1} \mathbf{k}_m^t \mathbf{k}_m)(x) & -\nu^{-1} \mathbf{k}_m^t(x) \\ -\nu^{-1} \mathbf{k}_m(x) & \nu^{-1} \mathbf{I}_d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.49)$$

The divergence-free vector field  $\mathbf{f}_m$  is defined by

$$\mathbf{f}_m := -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{k}_m.$$



By **(J1)**, the fields  $\mathbf{a}_m$ ,  $\mathbf{k}_m$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_m$  and  $\mathbf{f}_m$  are  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary and have range of dependence  $\sqrt{d}3^m$ . The assumption **(J3)** implies that, for a constant  $C(d) < \infty$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}_m\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} \leq \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2} \left( \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} 3^{-n} \right) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(3^{-m}) \quad (2.50)$$

and, indeed, for every  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m$ ,

$$\|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n)\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(3^{-n}). \quad (2.51)$$

In the following lemma we record some more basic estimates on  $\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n$  in  $L^p$  and  $W^{-1,p}$  norms.

**Lemma 2.6** (Estimates on  $\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n$ ). *Let  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $l, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m \leq l$ ,*

$$\|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(\square_l)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Cp^{1/2}3^m), \quad (2.52)$$

$$\|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_l)} \leq C(m-n)^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Cp^{1/2}(m-n)^{1/2}3^{-\frac{d}{2}(l-m)}), \quad (2.53)$$

$$\|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_l)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m-n)^{1/2}(l-n)^{1/2}). \quad (2.54)$$

Moreover, for every  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$ , there exists a random variable  $\mathcal{K}_\sigma$  with

$$\log \mathcal{K}_\sigma \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\sigma}}(C(C\delta^{-1}\sigma^{-1})^{1/\sigma}) \quad (2.55)$$

such that, for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^m \geq \mathcal{K}_\sigma$ ,

$$m^{-1}\|\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} + 3^m\|\nabla\mathbf{k} - \nabla\mathbf{k}_m\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} + 3^{-m/4}[\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}]_{\underline{H}^{-1/4}(\square_m)} \leq \delta m^\sigma \quad (2.56)$$

and for every  $A, B \geq 1$  and  $m - [A \log(Bm)] \leq n \leq m$  and  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m$

$$|(\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}| \leq (A \log(Bm))\delta m^\sigma. \quad (2.57)$$

Also, for  $\mathcal{K}_\sigma$  satisfying (2.55), we have, for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbf{k}(x) - \mathbf{k}(0)|^2 \leq C(\log(\mathcal{K}_\sigma^2 + |x|^2))^{2(1+\sigma)}. \quad (2.58)$$

*Proof.* The dihedral symmetry assumption **(J4)** and the  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationarity of  $\mathbf{j}_n$  imply that, for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{j}_n(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{j}_n(0)] = 0.$$

The independence and tail assumptions, **(J1)** and **(J3)** respectively, therefore yield, for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$|(\mathbf{j}_k)_{y+\square_h}| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C3^{-\frac{d}{2}(h-k) \vee 0}). \quad (2.59)$$

Applying the multiscale Poincaré inequality (see [AK24b, Proposition A.1]) and using (2.42) and the concentration inequality in Proposition 2.5 with  $\sigma = 2/p$ , for every  $l \geq k$ ,

$$3^{-l}\|\mathbf{j}_k\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(\square_l)} \leq C \sum_{h=-\infty}^l 3^{h-l} \left( \sum_{y \in 3^h \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_l} |(\mathbf{j}_k)_{y+\square_h}|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Cp^{1/2}3^{k-l}(1 + (l-k)\mathbf{1}_{\{d=2\}})). \quad (2.60)$$

The bound (2.52) now follows from the triangle inequality and Lemma 2.1:

$$3^{-l} \|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(\square_l)} \leq \sum_{k=n}^m 3^{-l} \|\mathbf{j}_k\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(\square_l)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Cp^{1/2}3^{m-l}).$$

Turning to the proof of (2.53) and (2.54), we use the independence of different  $\mathbf{j}_k$  and the tail assumptions ((J2) and (J3), respectively) to obtain the existence of  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m$ ,

$$|(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n)(0)| = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m-n)^{1/2}). \quad (2.61)$$

Using (J3), we obtain, for every  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} \leq \sqrt{d}3^n \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n)\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} + |(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n)(0)| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m-n)^{1/2}). \quad (2.62)$$

By the assumption of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationarity, we obtain, for every  $l \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m$ ,

$$\int_{\square_l} |(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n)(x)|^p dx \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/p}}(C^p(m-n)^{p/2}). \quad (2.63)$$

Using the finite range of dependence assumption (J1) and Proposition 2.5, we can improve the previous bound on scales larger than  $3^m$ : for every  $l, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m \leq l$ ,

$$\int_{\square_l} |(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n)(x)|^p dx \leq C(m-n)^{p/2} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/p}}((Cp)^{p/2}(m-n)^{p/2}3^{-\frac{d}{2}(l-m)}). \quad (2.64)$$

This yields (2.53). To obtain (2.54) we return to (2.62) and make a union bound: for every  $t \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left[\|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{L^\infty(\square_l)} > C(m-n)^{1/2}(l-n)^{1/2}t\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_l} \|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{L^\infty(z + \square_n)} > C(m-n)^{1/2}(l-n)^{1/2}t\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_l} \mathbb{P}\left[\|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_n\|_{L^\infty(z + \square_n)} > C(m-n)^{1/2}(l-n)^{1/2}t\right] \\ &\leq 3^{d(l-n)} \exp(-Ct^2(l-n)) \leq \exp(-t^2), \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $C$  is large enough. This implies (2.54).

Turning to the proof of (2.56) and (2.57), for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote  $h := \lceil A \log(Bm) \rceil$  and define

$$\begin{aligned} X_m &:= m^{-1} \|\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} + 3^m \|\nabla \mathbf{k} - \nabla \mathbf{k}_m\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} + 3^{-m/4} [\mathbf{k}_m]_{\hat{H}^{-1/4}(\square_m)} \\ &\quad + h^{-1} \max_{n \in [m-h, m] \cap \mathbb{N}} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{k})_{z + \square_n} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.65)$$

We claim that

$$X_m \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C). \quad (2.66)$$

The first two terms on the right side of (2.65) are bounded by  $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C)$  using (2.54) and (2.51). For the third term, we claim that for every  $(z + \square_n) \subseteq \square_m$ , we have

$$|(\mathbf{k})_{z + \square_n} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m-n)^{1/2}). \quad (2.67)$$

Indeed, by (2.59) and (2.43) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}| \\
& \leq |(\mathbf{k}_n)_{z+\square_n}| + |(\mathbf{k}_m)_{\square_m}| + |(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_n)_{z+\square_n} - (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_m)_{\square_m}| \\
& \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C) + |(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_n)(z) - (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_n)_{z+\square_n}| + |(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_m)(z) - (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_m)_{\square_m}| + |\mathbf{k}_m(z) - \mathbf{k}_n(z)| \\
& \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m-n)^{1/2}) + |(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_n)(z) - (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_n)_{z+\square_n}| + |(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_m)(z) - (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_m)_{\square_m}| \\
& \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m-n)^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used (2.51). Consequently,

$$3^{-m/4}[\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}]_{\hat{H}^{-1/4}(\square_m)} \leq C \sum_{n=-\infty}^m 3^{-\frac{1}{4}(m-n)} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C).$$

Also by (2.67) and (2.43) we have

$$\max_{n \in [m-h, m] \cap \mathbb{N}} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch). \quad (2.68)$$

This completes the proof of (2.66).

For each  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$  we define  $\mathcal{K}_\sigma := \sup\{3^{m+1} : m \in \mathbb{N}, X_m > \delta m^\sigma\}$ . Set also  $N_\sigma := \lceil (C\sigma^{-1}\delta^{-1})^{1/\sigma} \rceil$ . By a union bound and (2.66) together with (2.68) and a straightforward computation, we deduce that, if the constant  $C$  in the definition of  $N_\sigma$  is a large enough universal constant, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\log \mathcal{K}_\sigma > (\log 3)N_\sigma m\right] \leq \sum_{n=\lfloor N_\sigma^\sigma m \rfloor}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[X_n > \delta n^\sigma] \leq \sum_{n=\lfloor N_\sigma^\sigma m \rfloor}^{\infty} \exp(-cn^{2\sigma}) \leq \exp(-cm^{2\sigma}).$$

This completes the proof of (2.56) and (2.57).

Finally, (2.58) is a direct consequence of (2.56). The proof is complete.  $\square$

We denote the coarse-grained matrices for the infrared cutoff  $\mathbf{a}_m$  with the subscript  $m$ ; that is,

$$\mathbf{s}_m(U) := \mathbf{s}(U; \mathbf{a}_m), \quad \mathbf{s}_{m,*}(U) := \mathbf{s}_*(U; \mathbf{a}_m), \quad \mathbf{k}_m(U) := \mathbf{k}(U; \mathbf{a}_m), \quad \mathbf{A}_m(U) := \mathbf{A}(U; \mathbf{a}_m)$$

as well as  $J_m(U, \cdot) := J(U, \cdot; \mathbf{a}_m)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_m(U) := \mathcal{A}(U; \mathbf{a}_m)$  and so forth. We also denote the infrared cutoff coarse-grained coefficient fields  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n}$  by

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} := \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z + \square_n) \mathbf{1}_{z+\square_n}. \quad (2.69)$$

Associated to these coarse-grained matrices are *annealed* matrices  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m(U)$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m(U)$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}(U)$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{k}}_m(U)$ . These are defined by

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m(U) := \begin{pmatrix} (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m + \bar{\mathbf{k}}_m^t \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{k}}_m)(U) & -(\bar{\mathbf{k}}_m^t \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}^{-1})(U) \\ -(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{k}}_m)(U) & \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}^{-1}(U) \end{pmatrix} := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_m(U)]. \quad (2.70)$$

In fact, using that  $\mathbf{a}_m$  has the same law as  $\mathbf{a}_m^t$ , and that

$$\mathbf{k}(U; \mathbf{a}^t) = -\mathbf{k}(U; \mathbf{a}),$$

which is immediate from (2.7) and (2.8), we deduce that  $\mathbf{k}_m(U)$  has the same law as  $-\mathbf{k}_m(U)$ . In particular,  $\bar{\mathbf{k}}_m(U) = 0$ , which allows us to rewrite the matrix in (2.70) as

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m(U) := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m(U) & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}^{-1}(U) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.71)$$

The dihedral symmetry assumption **(J4)** also implies that each of the diagonal blocks of  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m(\square_n)$  is a scalar matrix.

By subadditivity, the matrices  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m(\square_n)$  are monotone nonincreasing in  $n$ . We also define the deterministic matrices  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m$  as the infinite-volume limits of these:

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} \end{pmatrix} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_m(\square_n)]. \quad (2.72)$$

The fact that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}^{-1}(U)$  converges to  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}$  is a consequence of qualitative homogenization for the field  $\nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}_m$  (see [AK24b, Proposition D.1 & Theorem 3.1]).

We also define, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathbf{E}_m := \begin{pmatrix} (\nu + 2C_{(2.53)}\nu^{-1}m)\mathbf{I}_d & 0 \\ 0 & 2C_{(2.53)}\nu^{-1}\mathbf{I}_d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.73)$$

**Lemma 2.7** (Ellipticity bounds for  $\mathbf{A}_m$ ). *For every  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$|\mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_m(\square_n) \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2}| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{A}}_m \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \leq \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{A}}_m(\square_n) \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \leq 1. \quad (2.74)$$

Moreover, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a constant  $C(\gamma, d) < \infty$  and a random minimal scale  $\mathcal{S}_{m,\gamma}$  satisfying

$$\mathcal{S}_{m,\gamma} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\gamma}(C3^m) \quad (2.75)$$

such that, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$3^n \geq \mathcal{S}_{m,\gamma} \implies 3^{-\gamma(n-l)} \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_m(z + \square_l) \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \leq 2\mathbf{I}_{2d}, \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{Z} \cap (-\infty, n], \quad z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n. \quad (2.76)$$

*Proof.* Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using (2.18), we compute, for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_m(z + \square_l) &\leq \int_{z+\square_l} \mathbf{A}_m(x) dx \leq \int_{z+\square_l} \begin{pmatrix} \nu \mathbf{I}_d + 2\nu^{-1} \mathbf{k}_m^t(x) \mathbf{k}_m(x) & 0 \\ 0 & 2\nu^{-1} \mathbf{I}_d \end{pmatrix} dx \\ &\leq \begin{pmatrix} (\nu + 2\nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{k}_m\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_l)}^2) \mathbf{I}_d & 0 \\ 0 & 2\nu^{-1} \mathbf{I}_d \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that

$$\mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_m(z + \square_l) \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \leq \max \left\{ 1, (Cm)^{-1} \|\mathbf{k}_m\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_l)}^2 \right\} \mathbf{I}_{2d}.$$

By (2.53) and (2.54), we have that, for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$(Cm)^{-1} \|\mathbf{k}_m\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_l)}^2 \leq 1 + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C3^{-(\frac{d}{2}(l-m) \vee 0)}). \quad (2.77)$$

Combining the previous two displays yields (2.74).

We also deduce from (2.77) that, for every  $t \geq 1$ ,  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq \max\{m, l\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ (Cm)^{-1} \|\mathbf{k}_m\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_l)}^2 > 2t3^{\gamma(n-l)} \right] \leq \exp \left( -ct3^{\gamma(n-l) + \frac{d}{2}(l-m) \vee 0} \right).$$

By a union bound and stationarity, for every  $t \geq 1$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left[\exists l \in \mathbb{Z} \cap (-\infty, n], \exists z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n, \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_m(z + \square_l) \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} \not\leq 2t3^{\gamma(n-l)} \mathbf{I}_{2d}\right] \\
& \leq \sum_{l=-\infty}^n \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} \mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_m(z + \square_l) \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} \not\leq 2t3^{\gamma(n-l)} \mathbf{I}_{2d}\right] \\
& \leq \sum_{l=-\infty}^n 3^{d(n-l)} \mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_m(\square_l) \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} \not\leq 2t3^{\gamma(n-l)} \mathbf{I}_{2d}\right] \\
& \leq \sum_{l=-\infty}^n 3^{d(n-l)} \exp(-ct3^{\gamma(n-l)} + \frac{d}{2}(l-m) \vee 0) \\
& \leq \exp\left(\frac{C|\log \gamma|}{\gamma}\right) \exp(-c3^{\gamma(n-m)}).
\end{aligned}$$

We next define

$$\mathcal{S}_{m,\gamma} := \sup \left\{ 3^n : n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [m, \infty) \text{ and there exists } l \in \mathbb{Z} \cap (-\infty, n], z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n, \right. \\
\left. \text{such that } \mathbf{E}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_m(z + \square_l) \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} \not\leq 2t3^{\gamma(n-l)} \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{S}_{m,\gamma}$  satisfies the conclusion of the lemma.  $\square$

**2.5. Localization.** We observe in this section that the matrix  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}$  defined in (2.13) and the infrared cutoffs of the previous section can be used to estimate the cost of localizing, that is lowering the infrared cutoff of the coarse-grained matrices. Localization will be used below in arguments requiring us to use independence to observe stochastic cancellations.

**Lemma 2.8.** *We have*

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}_1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}_2} = \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2}, \quad \forall \mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}. \quad (2.78)$$

For every  $\ell, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,

$$\mathbf{A}_\ell(U) = \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{k}_\ell(U)}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_\ell(U) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}(U) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{k}_\ell(U)} \quad (2.79)$$

and

$$\left| \mathbf{A}_\ell^{-1}(U) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}^t \mathbf{A}_\ell(U) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \leq 2|\mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}(U) \mathbf{h}| + |\mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}(U) \mathbf{h}|^2. \quad (2.80)$$

*Proof.* The first two identities are immediate. To see (2.80), suppress  $\ell$  and  $U$  from the notation and compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}^t \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| &= \left| \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_* \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}}^t \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}^t \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{k}}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_* \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right) \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{k}} \right| \\
&= \left| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_* \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \\
&= \left| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{h} & \mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \\ \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{h} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| \\
&= \left| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}^{-1/2} \mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{s}_*^{-1/2} & \mathbf{s}^{-1/2} \mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{s}_*^{-1/2} \\ \mathbf{s}_*^{-1/2} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{s}_*^{-1/2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq 2|\mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{h}| + |\mathbf{s}_*^{-1} \mathbf{h}|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last estimate follows by the fact that  $\mathbf{s}_* \leq \mathbf{s}$ .  $\square$

We next compare the coarse-grained matrices corresponding to two different infrared cutoffs.

**Lemma 2.9** (Localization). *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $m, n, L \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \leq m \leq L$  and Lipschitz domain  $U \subseteq \square_n$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2}(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_m)U}^t \mathbf{A}_L(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_m)U} \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2}(U) - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{d}3^n \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} + d3^{2n} \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.81)$$

Consequently,

$$|\mathbf{s}_m(U) \mathbf{s}_L^{-1}(U) - \mathbf{I}_d| + |\mathbf{s}_{m,*}(U) \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(U) - \mathbf{I}_d| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(3^{1-(m-n)}) \quad (2.82)$$

and

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U)(\mathbf{k}_L(U) - \mathbf{k}_m(U) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_m)U) \mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2}(U)| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(3^{1-\frac{1}{2}(m-n)}). \quad (2.83)$$

*Proof.* We begin with the proof of (2.81). We start from the pointwise identity, which is immediate from (2.49):

$$\mathbf{A}_L(x) = \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}_m(x) - \mathbf{k}_L(x)}^t \mathbf{A}_m(x) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}_m(x) - \mathbf{k}_L(x)}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This can also be written as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L(x) = \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}_m(x) - \mathbf{k}_L(x) - (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)U}^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m(x) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}_m(x) - \mathbf{k}_L(x) - (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)U}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where we define, for  $\bullet \in \{L, m\}$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\bullet(x) := \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\bullet)U}^t \mathbf{A}_\bullet(x) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\bullet)U} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{T}(x) := \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}_m(x) - \mathbf{k}_L(x) - (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)U}.$$

Using the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}^{-t} \mathbf{T}^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m \mathbf{T} \mathbf{T}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} \mathbf{T}^{-t} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L \mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \end{aligned}$$

We next use the identity

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} \mathbf{T}^{-t} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L \mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} (\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L (\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} (\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L - (\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}),$$

the triangle inequality and the cyclic property of the spectral norm to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} \mathbf{T}^{-t} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L \mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} (\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L (\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d})\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} (\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} (\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L\|_{L^\infty(U)} \|\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & = \|\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \|\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T}^{-t} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq 2\|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we also used that the spectral norms of  $\mathbf{T}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}^t$  and  $\mathbf{T}^{-t}$  are equal, due to (2.78). Therefore,

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq 2\|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)}^2.$$

A similar computation yields,

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq 2\|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)}^2.$$

Using this, we have, for all  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$

$$\begin{aligned} & P \cdot \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_L(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L)_U} P \\ &= \inf \left\{ \iint_U (X + P) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L(X + P) : X \in L_{\text{pot},0}^2(U) \times L_{\text{sol},0}^2(U) \right\} \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_L \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m^{-1/2}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \inf \left\{ \iint_U (X + P) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_m(X + P) : X \in L_{\text{pot},0}^2(U) \times L_{\text{sol},0}^2(U) \right\} \\ &\leq (1 + D) (P \cdot \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_m)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_m(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_m)_U} P), \end{aligned} \quad (2.84)$$

where for convenience we denote

$$D := 2\|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)}^2.$$

By a similar computation, we also obtain the estimate

$$P \cdot \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_m)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_m(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_m)_U} P \leq (1 + D) (P \cdot \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_L(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L)_U} P). \quad (2.85)$$

The previous three displays yield that

$$\left| \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2}(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_L(U) \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_m)_U} \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2}(U) - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \leq D.$$

We bound the random variable  $D$  by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}\|_{L^\infty(U)} &\leq \|\mathbf{k}_m(\cdot) - \mathbf{k}_L(\cdot) - (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)_U\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \sqrt{d} 3^n \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(3^{n-m}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.86)$$

In the last line, we used (2.51) and the assumption  $U \subseteq \square_n$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} D &\leq 2\sqrt{d} \cdot 3^n \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} + d 3^{2n} \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_L)\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)}^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(2 \cdot 3^{n-m}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(3^{2(n-m)}) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(3^{1+n-m}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.87)$$

This completes the proof of (2.81).

To prove (2.82), we observe by (2.84) with  $\mathbf{h} := (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_m)(U) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_m)_U$  we have

$$\mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{h}}^t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_L & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{-\mathbf{h}} \leq (1 + D) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_m & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently, by (2.12)

$$\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \leq (1 + D) \mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1}$$

and

$$\mathbf{s}_L \leq \mathbf{s}_L + \mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{h} \leq (1 + D) \mathbf{s}_m, \quad (2.88)$$

with the first inequality due to the fact  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}$  is positive definite and symmetric. An identical argument, using (2.85) instead, shows that

$$\mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1} \leq (1 + D) \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{s}_m \leq (1 + D) \mathbf{s}_L.$$

The previous three displays together with (2.87) yield (2.82). Similarly, using (2.88) we have

$$\mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_m \mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d \leq D \mathbf{I}_d$$

and

$$\mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} \mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} \leq (1+D) \mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_m \mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d \leq D \mathbf{I}_d + (1+D)(\mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_m \mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d) \leq D(2+D) \mathbf{I}_d,$$

which, by (2.87), implies (2.83). The proof is complete.  $\square$

The next lemma lets us compare gradients of solutions for different cut-offs.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $m, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $u \in H^1(\square_n)$  solves  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_m \nabla u = 0$  in  $\square_n$ , then there exists  $v \in u + H_0^1(\square_n)$  solving  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla v = 0$  in  $\square_n$  such that*

$$\|\nabla(u-v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \leq \nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell - (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_n}\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}. \quad (2.89)$$

*Proof.* Let  $v \in u + H_0^1(\square_n)$  solve  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla v = 0$  in  $\square_n$ . By testing the equation for  $v$  with  $(u-v)$  we have

$$0 = \int_{\square_n} \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla v \cdot \nabla(u-v) = \int_{\square_n} \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u \cdot \nabla(u-v) - \nu \|\nabla(u-v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2.$$

Since  $u$  solves  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_m \nabla u = 0$ , it also solves  $-\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{a}_m - \mathbf{h}) \nabla u = 0$  for every anti-symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{h}$ . In particular, for  $\mathbf{h} = (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_n}$  we then get, by also applying Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\square_n} \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u \cdot \nabla(u-v) &= - \int_{\square_n} (\mathbf{a}_m - \mathbf{a}_\ell - (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_n}) \nabla u \cdot \nabla(u-v) \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{2} \|\nabla(u-v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2 + \frac{1}{2\nu} \|\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell - (\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_n}\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)}^2 \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The result of the lemma follows by the previous two displays.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.11.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that for every  $h, n, \ell, L \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $h < n < \ell < L$  we have that*

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_n)(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_n}|^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L-\ell)|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h)|) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2,3}}\left(\frac{C}{\nu}(L-\ell)3^{-\frac{1}{4}(n-h)}\right), \quad (2.90)$$

and

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_n}| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(L-\ell)^{1/2}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h)|) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}\left(\frac{C}{\nu}(L-\ell)^{1/2}3^{-\frac{1}{4}(n-h)}\right), \quad (2.91)$$

and

$$\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C\nu^{-1}3^{-\frac{1}{4}(n-h)}). \quad (2.92)$$

*Proof.* We will first show (2.92). By subadditivity,

$$\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) + \sum_{z' \in 3^h \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z' + \square_h) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h)).$$

To estimate the last term, we use (2.82), which yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z' + \square_h) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(z' + \square_h)| &\leq 2\nu^{-1/2} |\mathbf{s}_{n',*}^{-1}(z' + \square_h) - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z' + \square_h)|^{1/2} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C\nu^{-1}3^{-\frac{1}{2}(n'-h)}) = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C\nu^{-1}3^{-\frac{1}{4}(n-h)}). \end{aligned}$$



Similarly,

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n',*}^{-1}(\square_h)| \leq C\nu^{-1}3^{-\frac{1}{4}(n-h)}.$$

The claim (2.92) now follows by Proposition 2.5 with  $\sigma = 2$ . For every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that

$$|(\mathbf{j}_k)_{\square_n}| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{j}_k)_{\square_n}] = 0,$$

and thus, by Proposition 2.5 with  $\sigma = 2$ , we obtain

$$|(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_n}| = \left| \sum_{i=\ell+1}^L (\mathbf{j}_i)_{\square_n} \right| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(L-\ell)^{1/2}).$$

This completes the proof of (2.90) and (2.91).  $\square$

### 3. A suboptimal lower bound on the renormalized diffusivities

In this section, we prove the precise version of the suboptimal lower bound which was vaguely stated in (1.47). The idea of the proof is that, if  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_m)$  does not grow sufficiently fast in  $m$ , then due to its monotonicity, we can find a range of scales across which it does not change much. But this allows us to compare the maximizers of the variational problem in (2.5) with  $(p, q) = (0, q)$  across this same range of scales and thereby deduce that the maximizer on the largest scale is “flat” (close to an affine function). We then argue that the existence of such a flat solution is only possible if the advection term is not contributing much (which is ruled out by assumption (J5)), or the effective diffusivity  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_m)$  is large. We deduce therefore that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_m)$  must be large.

**Proposition 3.1** (Suboptimal lower bound estimate). *There exist  $C(d) \in [1, \infty)$  and  $c(d) \in (0, 1/2]$  such that, for every  $L, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying*

$$L \geq m \geq n \geq \frac{C}{c_*} \log^3(3 + \nu^{-1}) \log \log(3 + \nu^{-1}), \quad (3.1)$$

we have

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L \geq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m) \geq cc_* m^{1/2} \log^{-\frac{13}{2}}(\nu^{-1}m) \quad (3.2)$$

and, consequently,

$$\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m) \leq Cc_*^{-1}n^{-1/2} \log^{\frac{13}{2}}(\nu^{-1}n) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C\nu^{-1}3^{-\frac{d}{2}(m-n)}). \quad (3.3)$$

The rest of this section is focused on the proof of Proposition 3.1. Throughout, we select parameters  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ ,  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying (3.1) and  $h, h' \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying

$$h \geq 10[K \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{12d \log(4\nu^{-1}L)}{\delta} h \leq h' \leq \frac{1}{10}L, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $K$  is a large constant to be selected later. We will also select the parameter  $h$  at the end of the proof. By the pigeonhole principle argument in [AK24b, Lemma 3.4], there exists

$$m \in \mathbb{N} \cap [L - 4h', L - h'],$$

satisfying

$$|\bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2}(\square_m) \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_{m-2h}) \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2}(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \leq \delta. \quad (3.5)$$

We next define scales  $n, \ell, \ell', L' \in \mathbb{N}$  by

$$\begin{cases} L' := m + [K \log(\nu^{-1}L)], \\ \ell' := m - h, \\ \ell := \ell' - [K \log(\nu^{-1}L)], \\ n := \ell - [K \log(\nu^{-1}L)]. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Note that, by taking  $K$  sufficiently large, we can ensure that

$$m - 2h < n < \ell < \ell' < m < L' < L. \quad (3.7)$$

Due to (2.82), we have that, for every  $k \in [m - 2h, m]$ ,

$$\max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\mathbf{s}_{L',*}(z + \square_k) \mathbf{s}_{L',*}^{-1}(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{I}_d| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C3^{-(L'-k)}) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C3^{-(L'-m)}). \quad (3.8)$$

Combining (3.8) with (3.5), we deduce that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}(\square_m) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{-1}(\square_{m-2h}) - 1| \leq \delta + C3^{-(L'-m)}. \quad (3.9)$$

Note that the quantity  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}(\square_k)$  is monotone nonincreasing in  $k$ , and therefore (3.9) says that across the range of scales  $k \in [m - 2h, m]$  the ratio of any two  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}(\square_k)$  is close to one. In particular, the parameters  $n, \ell$  and  $\ell'$  each represent scales which are within this range, that is,  $n, \ell, \ell' \in [m - 2h, m]$ .

We next fix a unit vector  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|e| = 1$ . For each  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let  $u_{k,y}$  denote the maximizer of  $J_{L'}(y + \square_k, 0, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{1/2}(\square_n)e)$ ; that is,

$$u_{k,y} := v_{L'}(\cdot, y + \square_k, 0, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{1/2}(\square_n)e), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we let  $\nabla u_k$  denote the vector field whose restriction in each cube of the form  $z + \square_k$  with  $z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d$  is equal to  $\nabla u_{k,z}$ . That is,

$$\nabla u_k := \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla u_{k,z} \mathbf{1}_{z + \square_k}.$$

This is a slight abuse of notation, since  $\nabla u_k$  is not necessarily a gradient field except on subdomains of a single cube of the form  $z + \square_k$ ,  $z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

We define the parameters  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$p := \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{-1/2}(\square_n)e \quad \text{and} \quad q := \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n)_{\square_\ell}]. \quad (3.10)$$

Observe that

$$|p| \leq \nu^{-1/2}. \quad (3.11)$$

By (2.30), we have that, for every  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\nabla u_n)_{z + \square_n}] = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{-1}(\square_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{1/2}(\square_n)e = p. \quad (3.12)$$

We next use the identity (2.21) with  $\mathbf{s} = \nu \mathbf{I}_d$  and the bound  $\mathbf{s}_{L',*}^{-1}(U) \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{I}_d$ , which is valid in every domain  $U$ , to obtain, for every  $z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d$ , the quenched estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_k\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_k)}^2 &= 2\nu^{-1} J_{L'}(z + \square_k, 0, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{1/2}(\square_n)e) \\ &= \nu^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{1/2}(\square_n)e \cdot \mathbf{s}_{L',*}^{-1}(z + \square_k) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{1/2}(\square_n)e \leq \nu^{-2} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}(\square_n)|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

We next write the equation for  $u_m := u_{m,0}$  as

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_m = (\mathbf{f}_\ell - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) \cdot \nabla u_m \quad \text{in } \square_m. \quad (3.14)$$

We let  $w \in H^2(\square_m)$  be the solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = (\mathbf{f}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) \cdot p & \text{in } \square_m, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial \square_m. \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is based on a comparison of  $w$  to  $u_m$ . We proceed by testing the equations (3.14) and (3.15) with  $w$  to get

$$\int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_m = \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_\ell - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) \cdot \nabla u_m = p \cdot \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_\ell - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) + \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_\ell - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) \cdot (\nabla u_m - p)$$

and

$$\int_{\square_m} |\nabla w|^2 = p \cdot \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) = p \cdot \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_\ell - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) + p \cdot \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{f}_\ell), \quad (3.16)$$

respectively. Combining these, we obtain, for every  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\square_m} |\nabla w|^2 &= \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_m - \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_\ell - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) \cdot (\nabla u_m - p) + p \cdot \int_{\square_m} w(\mathbf{f}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{f}_\ell) \\ &= \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_m - q) - \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_{L'}) (\nabla u_m - p) - p \cdot \int_{\square_m} (\mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell) \nabla w. \end{aligned}$$

To get the second line in the display above, we integrated by parts, using the anti-symmetry of  $\mathbf{k}_{L'}$  and  $\mathbf{k}_\ell$ , to remove the divergence from  $\mathbf{f}_\ell - \mathbf{f}_{L'}$  and put a gradient onto the  $w$ . We next split the terms on the right side of the previous display involving  $\nabla u_m$  into smaller scale maximizers and additivity defect terms. Noting also that  $\mathbf{a}_{L'} = \mathbf{a}_\ell + \mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell$ , we get, for every  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\square_m} |\nabla w|^2 &= \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_m - q) + \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell) (\nabla u_m - p) \\ &\quad + \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{a}_{L'} (\nabla u_m - \nabla u_n) - p \cdot \int_{\square_m} (\mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell) \nabla w. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

The strategy is to estimate the expectation of the left side of (3.17) from below in terms of  $p$ , and thus by means of  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)$ , and then to upper bound the expectation of the right side of (3.17). This will be done in a series of lemmas below.

We begin with some basic estimates on the function  $w$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *For each  $t \in (1, \infty)$ , there exists a constant  $C(t, d) < \infty$  such that*

$$\|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch^{1/2}|p|), \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$\|\nabla^2 w\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} \leq C\|(\mathbf{f}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) \cdot p\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^{-\ell'}). \quad (3.19)$$

*Proof.* Observe that by the regularity assumption (J3), the function on the right side of equation (3.15) is active only on scales larger than  $3^{\ell'}$ , and this is therefore true for  $w$  as well. In

particular,  $w$  is very smooth on scales much smaller than  $3^{\ell'}$ . Using this together with (2.61) and (J3) we see that the energy of  $w$  is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} &\leq C|p|\|\mathbf{f}_{L'} - \mathbf{f}_{\ell'}\|_{\underline{H}^{-1}(\square_m)} \\
&\leq C|p|\|\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell'})_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \\
&\leq C|p|\left\|\sum_{k=\ell'+1}^{m-1} \mathbf{j}_k\right\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + C|p|\sum_{k=m}^{L'} 3^{m-k}\|\nabla \mathbf{j}_k\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m - \ell')^{1/2}|p|). \tag{3.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Using odd reflection to extend  $w$  periodically to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we may then apply standard interior Calderón-Zygmund estimates together with the previous display, to obtain, for every  $t \in (1, \infty)$ , the existence of  $C(d, t) < \infty$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} &\leq C|p|\|\mathbf{f}_{L'} - \mathbf{f}_{\ell'}\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,t}(\square_m)} \\
&\leq C|p|\|\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell'})_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} \\
&\leq C|p|\left\|\sum_{k=\ell'+1}^{m-1} \mathbf{j}_k(3^{-k}\cdot)\right\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} + C|p|\sum_{k=m}^{L'} 3^{m-k}\|\nabla \mathbf{j}_k(3^{-k}\cdot)\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(m - \ell')^{1/2}|p|) \tag{3.21}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\nabla^2 w\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} \leq C(\mathbf{f}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{f}_{L'}) \cdot p\|_{\underline{L}^t(\square_m)} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^{-\ell'}) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^{-\ell'}). \tag{3.22}$$

To see the second inequality in the previous display, we use (J3) and compute, for each  $k > 0$ ,

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{j}_k\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} = \sum_{z \in 3^{m-k}\mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \|\nabla \mathbf{j}_k\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_k)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C3^{-k}).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We next prove a lower bound estimate for the expectation of the left side of (3.17), which matches the upper bound in (3.18).

**Lemma 3.3.** *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\square_m} |\nabla w|^2 \right] - (\log 3)c_* h |p|^2 \right| \leq C|p|^2 K \log(\nu^{-1}L). \tag{3.23}$$

*Proof.* We consider, for each  $n \in \{\ell' + 1, \dots, L'\}$ , the  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary random potential field  $\nabla \hat{w}_n$  defined by

$$\nabla \hat{w}_n := \nabla \Delta^{-1}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_n p). \tag{3.24}$$

That is,  $\hat{w}_n$  is the solution of the problem

$$-\Delta \hat{w}_n = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_n p \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The random field  $\hat{w}_n$  is well-defined and  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary in dimensions  $d \geq 3$  and is defined only up to an additive constant in two dimensions; the potential field  $\nabla \hat{w}_n$ , on the other hand, is well-defined and  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary in all dimensions and satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla \hat{w}_n(0)] = 0$ . Moreover, we have the estimates

$$\|\nabla \hat{w}_n\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|), \tag{3.25}$$

$$\|\nabla^2 \hat{w}_n\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^{-n}), \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$\|\hat{w}_n - (\hat{w}_n)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|(m-n)^{1/2}3^n), \quad \text{if } n < m. \quad (3.27)$$

These facts can be checked directly from the representation formula for  $\hat{w}$  in terms of a convolution of the fundamental solution of the Laplacian, and the assumptions on  $\mathbf{j}_n$  in **(J1)** and **(J3)**. Note that **(3.26)** and the Poincaré inequality imply that

$$\|\hat{w}_n - (\hat{w}_n)_{\square_m} - \ell_{\nabla \hat{w}_n(0)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^{2m-n}), \quad \text{if } n \geq m. \quad (3.28)$$

We next define

$$\hat{w} = \hat{w}_{\ell'+1} + \cdots + \hat{w}_{L'}.$$

Using the triangle inequality, **(3.27)**, **(3.28)**, the independence assumption and  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla \hat{w}_n(0)] = 0$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{w} - (\hat{w})_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \\ & \leq \sum_{n=\ell'+1}^{m-1} \|\hat{w}_n - (\hat{w}_n)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \sum_{n=m}^{L'} \|\hat{w}_n - (\hat{w}_n)_{\square_m} - \ell_{\nabla \hat{w}_n(0)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + 3^m \left| \sum_{n=m}^{L'} \nabla \hat{w}_n(0) \right| \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^m) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^m) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^m(L'-m)^{1/2}) \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|3^m(L'-m)^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

The assumption **(J5)** asserts precisely that, in any bounded domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \hat{w}(0)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U)}^2] - c_*(\log 3)(m-n)|p|^2 \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}[|\nabla \hat{w}(0)|^2] - c_*(\log 3)(m-n)|p|^2 \right| \leq \check{A}|p|^2. \quad (3.30)$$

In view of **(3.15)**, the difference  $\hat{w} - w$  is the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta(\hat{w} - w) = 0 & \text{in } \square_m, \\ \hat{w} - w = \hat{w} & \text{on } \partial \square_m. \end{cases} \quad (3.31)$$

By standard estimates for the Laplace equation and **(3.29)**, we obtain

$$\|\nabla(\hat{w} - w)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq C3^{-m}\|\hat{w} - (\hat{w})_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C|p|(L'-m)^{1/2}).$$

We now obtain the desired estimate **(3.23)** from the triangle inequality, the previous display and **(3.30)**.  $\square$

We next estimate the expectation of the first term on the right side of **(3.17)**.

**Lemma 3.4.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q) \right] \leq \frac{C}{\nu^{3/2}} \ell(m-\ell)3^{-(\ell-\ell)}. \quad (3.32)$$

*Proof.* The idea is to find stochastic cancellations between scales  $3^\ell$  and  $3^m$ , because the flux field  $\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n$  has a range of dependence of at most  $\sqrt{d}3^\ell$ . We compute

$$\int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q) \leq \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{H}^1(\square_m)} \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q\|_{\underline{H}^{-1}(\square_m)}.$$

By (3.10) and (3.19), we have

$$3^m \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{H}^1(\square_m)}^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C 3^{m-\ell'} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)|^{-1/2}.$$

By (3.10) and independence, we obtain, for every  $k \geq \ell$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |(\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q)_{z+\square_k}|^2 \right] \leq C 3^{-d(k-\ell)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_\ell)}^2 \right] \leq C 3^{-d(k-\ell)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_\ell)}^2 \right].$$

By (3.13) and (J3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_\ell)}^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_\ell\|_{L^\infty(\square_\ell)}^2 \|\nabla u_n\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_\ell)}^2 \right] \\ &\leq \nu^{-2} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nu \mathbf{I}_d + \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathbf{j}_k \right\|_{L^\infty(\square_\ell)}^2 \right] \leq \frac{C \ell^2}{\nu^2} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the multiscale Poincaré inequality (see [AKM19, Proposition 1.12]), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{-m} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q\|_{\underline{H}^{-1}(\square_m)}^2 \right]^{1/2} &\leq C 3^{\ell-m} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C \left( (m-\ell) \sum_{k=\ell}^m 3^{-2(m-k)} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathbb{E} \left[ |(\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q)_{z+\square_k}|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C 3^{\ell-m} \left( 1 + (m-\ell) \sum_{k=\ell}^m 3^{-(d-2)(k-\ell)} \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \nabla u_n - q\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_\ell)}^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\nu} \ell (m-\ell) 3^{\ell-m}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above displays yields (3.32).  $\square$

We next estimate the expectation of the second term on the right side of (3.17).

**Lemma 3.5.** *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \int_{z+\square_n} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell) (\nabla u_{n,z} - p) \right] \leq \frac{C}{\nu} (L' - \ell) (\ell - n) 3^{-(\ell-n)}. \quad (3.33)$$

*Proof.* By duality,

$$\int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell) (\nabla u_n - p) \leq \sum_{z \in 3^\ell \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \|\nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)\|_{\underline{H}^1(z+\square_\ell)} \|\nabla u_n - p\|_{\hat{\underline{H}}^{-1}(z+\square_\ell)}.$$

We estimate the first term using (3.18), (3.19), (J3) and Hölder's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{z \in 3^\ell \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \|\nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)\|_{\underline{H}^1(z+\square_\ell)} \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in 3^\ell \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{H}^1(z+\square_\ell)} \|\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{L^\infty(z+\square_\ell)} + \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_\ell)} \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)\|_{L^\infty(z+\square_\ell)} \right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C|p|(L' - \ell) 3^{-\ell'}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C|p|(m - \ell') 3^{-\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$3^\ell \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^\ell \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \|\nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)\|_{\underline{H}^1(z + \square_\ell)}^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C(L' - \ell)|p| \leq C\nu^{-1/2}(L' - \ell).$$

By the multiscale Poincaré inequality (see [AKM19, Proposition 1.12]) and stationarity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{-\ell} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla u_n - p\|_{\underline{H}^{-1}(z + \square_\ell)}^2 \right]^{1/2} &\leq C3^{n-\ell} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla u_n - p\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C \left( (\ell - n) \sum_{k=n}^{\ell} 3^{-2(\ell-k)} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathbb{E} \left[ |(\nabla u_n - p)_{z + \square_k}|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |(\nabla u_n)_{\square_n}|^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ |(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{1/2}(\square_n)) e|^2 \right] \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)|^2 \right] = \nu^{-1},$$

we see by (J1) and (3.12) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |(\nabla u_n - p)_{z + \square_k}|^2 \right] \leq C3^{-d(k-n)} \mathbb{E} \left[ |(\nabla u_n - p)_{\square_n}|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C}{\nu} 3^{-d(k-n)}.$$

We deduce that

$$\sum_{k=n}^{\ell} 3^{-2(\ell-k)} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_\ell} \mathbb{E} \left[ |(\nabla u_n - p)_{z + \square_k}|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C}{\nu} 3^{-2(\ell-n)} \sum_{k=n}^{\ell} 3^{-(d-2)(k-n)} \leq \frac{C}{\nu} (\ell - n) 3^{-2(m-n)}.$$

Combining the above displays then yields (3.33).  $\square$

The estimate of the third term on the right in (3.17) is the most involved one, and requires some coarse-graining ideas. We first record a consequence of the localization estimates in (the proof of) Lemma 2.9.

**Lemma 3.6.** *For every  $m, n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < \min\{m, \ell\}$  and every  $U \subseteq \square_n$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathbf{b}_\ell - \mathbf{b}_m)(U)| &\leq \varepsilon |\mathbf{b}_m(U)| + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) |(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_U^t \mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_m - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_U \mathbf{b}_m^{-1/2}(U)| \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(C\nu^{-1}m(\ell - m)3^{n-m}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

*Proof.* Recalling that the top left corner of  $\mathbf{A}_\ell - \mathbf{A}_m$  is equal to  $\mathbf{b}_\ell - \mathbf{b}_m$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_\ell - \mathbf{A}_m &= \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-t} \mathbf{A}_m \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}_m \\ &\quad + \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-t} \mathbf{A}_m^{1/2} (\mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_\ell \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U} \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) \mathbf{A}_m^{1/2} \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We bound the spectral norm of the second term using (2.63), (2.74), (2.87) and Lemma 2.2:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-t} \mathbf{A}_m^{1/2} (\mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_\ell \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U} \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}) \mathbf{A}_m^{1/2} \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-1} \right| \\ &\leq |\mathbf{A}_m| \left| \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^t \mathbf{A}_\ell \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U} \mathbf{A}_m^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \left| \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U} \right|^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C\nu^{-1}m) \times \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(3^{1+n-m}) \times \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(\ell - m)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(C\nu^{-1}m(\ell - m)3^{n-m}). \end{aligned}$$

To bound the top left corner of the first term above, we use (2.12) and observe that, with  $P := (e, 0)$  for  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} P \cdot \left( \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-t} \mathbf{A}_m \mathbf{G}_{(\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}_m \right) P \\ = e \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U^t \mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1}(U) (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U e + 2e \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U^t \mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1}(U) \mathbf{k}_m e. \end{aligned}$$

Using Young's inequality, we have that, for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$  the last term on the right side may be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} 2|e \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U^t \mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1}(U) \mathbf{k}_m(U) e| \\ \leq \varepsilon |\mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1/2}(U) \mathbf{k}_m(U) e|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} |\mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1/2}(U) (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U e|^2 \\ = \varepsilon (e \cdot (\mathbf{b}_m - \mathbf{s}_m)(U) e) + \varepsilon^{-1} (e \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U^t \mathbf{s}_{m,*}^{-1}(U) (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_m)_U e). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous four displays yields (3.34).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_n) \right] \\ \leq C(\delta + 3^{-(L'-m)})^{1/2} \left( (L' - \ell)^2 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)|^2 + |\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ + C\nu^{-4} L^4 \left( 3^{-\frac{1}{2}(\ell'-n)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{8}(\ell'-n)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}(\ell'-\ell)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{8}h} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

*Proof.* We split the term on the left in (3.35) into two parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\square_m} \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_n) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \int_{z+\square_n} (\nabla w - (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n}) \cdot \mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}) \right] \\ + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z+\square_n} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

The second term on the right side is now ready for coarse-graining, while the first term will be brutally estimated using the separation of scales between the small cubes  $z + \square_n$  and the scales on which  $w$  varies, which are at least of order  $3^{\ell'}$ . The two terms on the right side of (3.36) are estimated in the following four steps below, in (3.39) and (3.37), respectively. Together, these inequalities imply (3.35).

*Step 1.* We estimate the first term on the right side of (3.36). The claim is that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \int_{z+\square_n} (\nabla w - (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n}) \cdot \mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}) \right] \leq \frac{C}{\nu^{3/2}} (\delta + 3^{-(L'-m)})^{1/2} (L')^{1/2} 3^{-(\ell'-n)}. \quad (3.37)$$

Here we will make a very crude estimate because we have scale separation to our advantage. We use Cauchy-Schwarz and then use the Poincaré inequality in each cube of the form  $z + \square_n$ , taking advantage of the fact that the  $\nabla w$  terms are centered, and then apply (3.19). We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{z+\square_n} (\nabla w - (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n}) \cdot \mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}) \\ \leq \|\nabla w - (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n}\|_{\underline{H}^1(z+\square_n)} \|\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z})\|_{\hat{\underline{H}}^{-1}(z+\square_n)}. \end{aligned}$$



By (3.19) we have that

$$\sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w - (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n}\|_{\underline{H}^1(z+\square_n)}^3 \right] \leq C 3^{3n} \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla^2 w\|_{\underline{L}^3(z+\square_n)}^3 \right] \leq \frac{C}{\nu^{3/2}} 3^{-3(\ell'-n)}$$

and, by the multiscale Poincaré inequality, Hölder's inequality, and (2.29)

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z})\|_{\underline{H}^{-1}(z+\square_n)}^{3/2} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j=-\infty}^n 3^j \left( \sum_{z' \in z+3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |(\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z'+\square_j}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^{3/2} \right] \\ & \leq C 3^{\frac{3}{2}n} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{s}^{1/2}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z})\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}^{3/2} \sum_{j=-\infty}^n 3^{j-n} \left( \max_{z' \in z+3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{b}_{L'}(z'+\square_j)| \right)^{3/4} \right] \\ & \leq C 3^{\frac{3}{2}n} (L' \nu^{-1})^{3/4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{s}^{1/2}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z})\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}^2 \right]^{3/4}. \end{aligned}$$

The last factor on the right side can be estimated by (2.20) and (3.9):

$$\sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{s}^{1/2}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z})\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}^2 \right] = |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}(\square_m) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{-1}(\square_n) - 1| \leq \delta + C 3^{-(L'-m)}. \quad (3.38)$$

Combining the above displays with Hölder's inequality yields (3.37).

*Step 2.* In this step we start to estimate the second term on the right side of (3.36). Let  $k = \lceil \frac{4}{d+4} \ell' + \frac{d}{d+4} \ell \rceil$ . The claim is that there exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z+\square_n} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z'+3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} |\mathbf{b}_{L'}^{1/2}(z+\square_n) (\nabla w)_{z'+\square_k}|^2 \right]^{1/2} (\delta + C 3^{-(L'-m)})^{1/2} \\ & \quad + C 3^{-\frac{1}{4}(\ell'-\ell)} (L')^2 \nu^{-5/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

We first record, that, by (2.29) and (3.38),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\mathbf{b}_{L'}^{-1/2}(z+\square_n) (\mathbf{a}_{L'} \nabla(u_m - u_{n,z}))_{z+\square_n}|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \int_{z+\square_n} \nabla(u_m - u_{n,z}) \cdot \mathbf{s} \nabla(u_m - u_{n,z}) \right] \leq \delta + C 3^{-(L'-m)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

Decompose the left side of (3.39) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z+\square_n} \\ & = \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z'+3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} (\nabla w)_{z'+\square_k} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z+\square_n} \\ & \quad + \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z'+3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left( (\nabla w)_{z+\square_n} - (\nabla w)_{z'+\square_k} \right) \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z+\square_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

The first term on the right of (3.41) is estimated using Cauchy-Schwarz and (3.40)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z + \square_n} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \mathbf{b}_{L'}^{1/2}(z + \square_n) (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \cdot (\mathbf{b}_{L'}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n) \mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z + \square_n} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left| \mathbf{b}_{L'}^{1/2}(z + \square_n) (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \mathbf{b}_{L'}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n) \mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left| \mathbf{b}_{L'}^{1/2}(z + \square_n) (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} (\delta + C3^{-(L'-m)})^{1/2}. \tag{3.42}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left( (\nabla w)_{z + \square_n} - (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \right) \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{L'}(\nabla u_m - \nabla u_{n,z}))_{z + \square_n} \right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left| \mathbf{b}_{L'}^{1/2}(z + \square_n) \left( (\nabla w)_{z + \square_n} - (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \right) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left| (\nabla w)_{z + \square_n} - (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \right|^4 \right]^{1/4} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathbf{b}_{L'}(\square_n)|^2 \right]^{1/4} \\
&\leq C(\nu^{-1} L')^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left| (\nabla w)_{z + \square_n} - (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \right|^4 \right]^{1/4} \\
&\leq C3^k (\nu^{-1} L')^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^4(\square_m)}^4]^{1/4} \\
&\leq C3^{k-\ell'} (\nu^{-1} L')^2 \nu^{-1/2} = C3^{-\frac{d}{d+4}(\ell'-\ell)} (\nu^{-1} L')^2 \nu^{-1/2}, \tag{3.43}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used (3.22) and (3.11). Combining the above displays yields (3.39).

*Step 3.* We are left to estimate the expectation on the right in (3.39). For this we use independence and the regularity of  $w$ . The claimed estimate is that there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left| \mathbf{b}_{L'}^{1/2}(z + \square_n) (\nabla w)_{z' + \square_k} \right|^2 \right] \\
&\leq C \left( (L' - \ell)^2 |\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)|^2 + |\bar{\mathfrak{b}}_\ell(\square_n)|^2 + \nu^{-2} (L' - \ell)^2 L' (3^{-\frac{1}{4}(\ell-n)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{2}(\ell-\ell)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}h}) \right). \tag{3.44}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall from Step 2, the selection  $k = \lfloor \frac{4}{d+4} \ell' + \frac{d}{d+4} \ell \rfloor$ . To prove (3.44), we first decompose

$$|\mathbf{b}_{L'}(z + \square_n)| \leq |\mathbf{b}_{L'}(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n)| + |\mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n)|$$

and bound the first term using (3.34) as

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{b}_{L'}(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n)| &\leq C |(\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}^t \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n) (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}| \\ &\quad + C |\mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n)| + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(C\nu^{-1}(L' - \ell)L'3^{-(\ell-n)}), \end{aligned}$$

and then continue to decompose,

$$|\mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n)| \leq d |\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)| + \sum_{i=1}^d e_i \cdot (\mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)) e_i.$$

By combining the above three displays we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{b}_{L'}(z + \square_n)| &\leq C |\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)| + C |(\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}^t \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n) (\mathbf{k}_{L'} - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}| \\ &\quad + C \sum_{i=1}^d e_i \cdot (\mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)) e_i + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/4}}(C\nu^{-1}(L' - \ell)L'3^{-(\ell-n)}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

We now estimate using Hölder's inequality and (3.45),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{z' \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\nabla w)_{z'+\square_k}|^2 \sum_{z \in z' + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} |\mathbf{b}_{L'}(z + \square_n)| \right] \\ &\leq C |\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)| \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 \right] + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^4(\square_m)}^4 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_{L'})_{z+\square_n}^t \mathbf{s}_{L',*}^{-1}(z + \square_n) (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_{L'})_{z+\square_n} \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^4(\square_m)}^4 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C\nu^{-1}(L' - \ell)L'3^{-(\ell-n)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^4(\square_m)}^4 \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

We estimate these terms separately. First, we have by (3.18) that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)| \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 \right] \leq C |\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)| (L' - \ell) |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{-1}(\square_n)|.$$

Next, since the average is over a collection of independent  $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(CL'\nu^{-1})$  random variables, by concentration and (3.21)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \mathbf{b}_\ell(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^4(\square_m)}^4 \right]^{1/2} &\leq \frac{C}{\nu} (m - \ell') L' 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k-\ell)} \\ &= \frac{C}{\nu} (m - \ell') L' 3^{-\frac{2d}{d+4}(\ell'-\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by Lemma 2.11 and (3.9),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_{L'})_{z+\square_n}^t \mathbf{s}_{L',*}^{-1}(z + \square_n) (\mathbf{k}_\ell - \mathbf{k}_{L'})_{z+\square_n} \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^4(\square_m)}^4 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C(L' - \ell)^2 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{-1}(\square_{m-2h})| |p|^2 + C\nu^{-1}(L' - \ell)^2 3^{-\frac{1}{4}h} \\ &\leq C(L' - \ell)^2 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L',*}^{-2}(\square_n)| + C\nu^{-1}(L' - \ell)^2 3^{-\frac{1}{4}h}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

Finally, we use (3.21) again to see that

$$(L' - \ell)L'3^{-(\ell-n)}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^4(\square_m)}^4\right]^{1/2} \leq C\nu^{-1}(L' - \ell)^2L'3^{-(\ell-n)}.$$

Combining the above four displays with Young's inequality yields the desired estimate in (3.44).

*Step 4.* Combining (3.37), (3.39) and (3.44) concludes the proof.  $\square$

We estimate the fourth and final term on the right side of (3.17).

**Lemma 3.8.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[p \cdot \int_{\square_m} (\mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell}) \nabla w\right] \leq C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m). \quad (3.48)$$

*Proof.* We use (3.19) and (2.52) to find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[p \cdot \int_{\square_m} (\mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell}) \nabla w\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|(\mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell})p\|_{\hat{H}^{-1}(\square_m)} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{H}^1(\square_m)}\right] \\ &\leq |p| \mathbb{E}\left[\|(\mathbf{k}_{\ell'} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell})\|_{\hat{H}^{-1}(\square_m)}^2\right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla w\|_{\underline{H}^1(\square_m)}^2\right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C3^{\ell'}|p|^23^{-\ell'} = C|\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)|, \end{aligned}$$

which is (3.48).  $\square$

We are almost done with the proof of Proposition 3.1 except for an estimate of the factor  $|\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{\ell}(\square_n)|$  in (3.35). To estimate this factor, we first localize, using Lemma 2.9, and replace the factor by  $|\bar{\mathbf{b}}_k(\square_n)|$  for a parameter  $k \ll n$ . The replacement is a coarse-grained matrix coming from a high-contrast *local* equation at the scale  $3^k$ . Since the local equation homogenizes, by [AK24b], the ratio  $|\bar{\mathbf{b}}_k(\square_m)\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{k,*}^{-1}(\square_m)|$  is bounded. This argument leads to the following estimate.

**Lemma 3.9.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, if  $n \geq C \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)$ , then we have that, for every  $\ell > n$ ,*

$$\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{\ell}(\square_n) \leq C(\ell - n + \log^3(\nu^{-1}\ell))^4 \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_n). \quad (3.49)$$

*Proof.* Fix parameters  $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k_1 < k_2 < k_3 < n$  to be selected below. We start from the pointwise identity, valid for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ :

$$\mathbf{A}_{\ell}(x) = \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}_{k_1}(x) - \mathbf{k}_{\ell}(x)}^t \mathbf{A}_k(x) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{k}_{k_1}(x) - \mathbf{k}_{\ell}(x)},$$

where  $\mathbf{G}$  is as in (2.13). Therefore, we get that

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{\ell}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_{k_1} \mathbf{A}_{\ell}^{-1/2}\|_{L^{\infty}(\square_n)} \vee \|\mathbf{A}_{k_1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_{\ell} \mathbf{A}_{k_1}^{-1/2}\|_{L^{\infty}(\square_n)} \leq (1 + \|\mathbf{k}_{k_1} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell}\|_{L^{\infty}(\square_n)})^2.$$

Thus, for every  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &P \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\ell}(\square_n) P \\ &= \inf \left\{ \int_{\square_n} (X + P) \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\ell}(X + P) : X \in L_{\text{pot},0}^2(\square_n) \times L_{\text{sol},0}^2(\square_n) \right\} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}_{k_1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_{\ell} \mathbf{A}_{k_1}^{-1/2}\|_{L^{\infty}(\square_n)} \inf \left\{ \int_{\square_n} (X + P) \cdot \mathbf{A}_{k_1}(X + P) : X \in L_{\text{pot},0}^2(\square_n) \times L_{\text{sol},0}^2(\square_n) \right\} \\ &\leq (1 + \|\mathbf{k}_{k_1} - \mathbf{k}_{\ell}\|_{L^{\infty}(\square_n)})^2 P \cdot \mathbf{A}_{k_1}(\square_n) P. \end{aligned} \quad (3.50)$$

By subadditivity and independence, using (2.48) with  $\sigma = 2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}_{k_1,*}^{-1}(\square_{k_3}) &\leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{k_1,*}^{-1}(\square_{k_2}) + \sum_{z \in 3^{k_2} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{h'}} (\mathbf{s}_{k_1,*}^{-1}(z + \square_{k_2}) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{k_1,*}^{-1}(\square_{k_2})) \\ &\leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{k_1,*}^{-1}(\square_{k_2}) + \nu^{-1} \wedge \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C\nu^{-1}3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k_3-k_2)}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbf{b}_{k_1}(\square_n) \leq \bar{\mathbf{b}}_{k_1}(\square_{k_3}) + \sum_{z \in 3^{k_3} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} (\mathbf{b}_{k_1}(z + \square_{k_3}) - \bar{\mathbf{b}}_{k_1}(\square_{k_3})) \leq \bar{\mathbf{b}}_{k_1}(\square_{k_2}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ck_2 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k_3-k_1)}).$$

By (2.54) we have the bound

$$\|\mathbf{k}_{k_1} - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(\ell - k_1))$$

and, thus, we obtain by (3.50) that

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}^{-1}(\square_{k_3}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ (1 + \|\mathbf{k}_{k_1} - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k_3})})^2 \mathbf{s}_{k_1,*}^{-1}(\square_{k_3}) \right] \leq C(\ell - k_1)^2 (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{k_1,*}^{-1}(\square_{k_2}) + \nu^{-1} 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k_3-k_2)}). \quad (3.52)$$

and

$$\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ (1 + \|\mathbf{k}_{k_1} - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)})^2 \mathbf{b}_{k_1}(\square_n) \right] \leq C(\ell - k_1)^2 (\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{k_1}(\square_{k_2}) + Ck_1 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k_3-k_1)}).$$

By subadditivity  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_{k_3}) \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_n)$ . Using this and (3.52) yields

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{k_1,*}(\square_{k_2}) \leq C(\ell - k_1)^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_n) + C\nu^{-1} \ell(\ell - k_1)^2 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k_3-k_2)}.$$

Furthermore, by [AK24b, Theorem 3.1], we deduce that if  $k_2 \geq k_1 + C \log^3(\nu^{-1}k_1)$ , then

$$\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{k_1}(\square_{k_2}) \leq 2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{k_1,*}(\square_{k_2}).$$

Combining the previous three displays then yields that

$$\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n) \leq C(\ell - k_1)^4 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_n) + C\nu^{-1} \ell^8 (3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k_3-k_2)} + 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(k_3-k_1)}).$$

We complete the proof by selecting  $k_1 := n - C \log^3(\nu^{-1}\ell)$  with large enough  $C(d) < \infty$ , as well as  $k_2 := k_1 + \lceil \frac{1}{3}(k_1 - n) \rceil$  and  $k_3 := k_2 + \lceil \frac{1}{3}(k_1 - n) \rceil$ .  $\square$

We conclude with the proof of Proposition 3.1.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* By taking the parameter  $K$  sufficiently large, depending only on  $d$ , we can ensure that  $h \geq 100(\ell - n)$ ,

$$(\log 3)c_*h > 2C_{(3.23)}K \log(\nu^{-1}L),$$

and

$$C(\nu^{-1}L)^9 (3^{-\frac{1}{2}(\ell-n)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{8}(\ell-n)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}(\ell-\ell)} + 3^{-\frac{1}{8}h}) \leq \nu L^{-1000}.$$

Therefore, by combining Lemma 3.3 and (3.17) with (3.32), (3.33), (3.35) and (3.48), taking note of (3.10), we see that

$$c_*^2 h \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) \leq C(\delta + 3^{-h})^{1/2} (\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n) + h \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)) + CK \log(\nu^{-1}L) |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)|.$$

If  $K$  is chosen sufficiently large and  $\delta$  is chosen sufficiently small, then the factors of  $|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)|$  can be reabsorbed from the right, and we deduce that

$$c_*^2 h |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)| \leq \frac{1}{2} |\bar{\mathbf{b}}_\ell(\square_n)|.$$

Combining this with (3.49), we obtain

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)| \leq \frac{C \log^{12}(\nu^{-1}L)}{c_*^2 h} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_n)|. \quad (3.53)$$

To optimize this inequality, we take  $h$  as large as we are permitted, which in view of (3.4) leads to the choice  $h := cL \log(\nu^{-1}L)$ . Substituting this into the previous display yields

$$c_*^2 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n)| \leq CL^{-1} \log^{13}(\nu^{-1}L) |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_n)|.$$

Finally, by (2.82), (3.9) and subadditivity, we see that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)| \leq 2 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)| \leq 4 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}(\square_n)| \leq 8 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)| \leq 8 |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_m)|.$$

Combining the last two displays, we obtain (3.2). We then obtain the quenched estimate (3.3) from (3.2) and (3.51), which completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4. Homogenization on scales below the infrared cutoff

In this section we prove homogenization estimates for the infrared cutoff field  $\mathbf{a}_L$  defined in (1.46) on a range of length scales which include scales smaller than  $3^L$ . The goal, as described in the introduction, is to show that the operator  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_L \nabla$  is close to the operator  $\nabla \cdot \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L \nabla$  on length scales of order  $3^m$  with  $m \in [L - CL^\alpha, L]$  for  $\alpha < 1/2$ .

Before giving the statement of the proposition, we first introduce some random variables which quantify the homogenization error in a way that turns out to be convenient. Given any (general) coefficient field  $\mathbf{a}$ , a deterministic matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with symmetric part  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$  and anti-symmetric part  $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$ , an exponent  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define

$$\mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(\square_m; \mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}) := \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^m s 3^{s(k-m)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_*)(z + \square_k; \mathbf{a})| \right)^{1/2} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_s^*(\square_m; \mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) &:= \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^m s 3^{s(k-m)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_*^{-1/2}(z + \square_k; \mathbf{a}) (\mathbf{s}_*(z + \square_k; \mathbf{a}) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_*^{-1/2}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &+ \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^m s 3^{s(k-m)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_*^{-1/2}(z + \square_k; \mathbf{a}) (\mathbf{k}(z + \square_k; \mathbf{a}) - \bar{\mathbf{k}}) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_*^{-1/2}|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Moreover, we set

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\square_m; \mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) := \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(\square_m; \mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}) + \mathcal{E}_s^*(\square_m; \mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}). \quad (4.3)$$

The random variables in (4.1) and (4.2) measure, respectively, the coarse-graining error (the difference between  $\mathbf{s}(\square)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_*(\square)$ ) and the difference between the coarse-grained matrices and the given deterministic matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ . These differences are taken with respect to all triadic subcubes of  $\square_m$ , with

a geometric discount (represented by the exponent  $s$ ) for smaller scales. We think of their sum, that is, the random variable defined (4.3), as quantifying the difference between the operators  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}\nabla$  and  $\nabla \cdot \bar{\mathbf{a}}\nabla$  in a weak sense.

In what follows, we will need a lower bound on the length scale with strength of the bound depending on other parameters. For this purpose, we introduce, for every  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  and  $M \in [1, \infty)$ , a constant  $L_0$  defined by

$$L_0(M, \alpha, c_*, \nu) := \left( \frac{CM}{(1-\alpha)^{16} c_*^2} \log^{16} \left( \frac{M}{\nu(1-\alpha)c_*} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad (4.4)$$

where the universal constant  $C$  is chosen to be so large that

$$L \geq L_0 \implies L^{1-\alpha} \geq M c_*^{-2} \log^{16}(\nu^{-1} L).$$

We have defined  $L_0$  in such a way that Proposition 3.1 yields

$$L \geq L_0(M, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \implies \inf_{h \in \mathbb{N} \cap [L/2, \infty)} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^2(\square_h) \geq c(d) M L^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1} L). \quad (4.5)$$

The following proposition is the main result of this section. It states that, on sufficiently large scales and for  $L$  sufficiently large, the coarse-grained matrices for the infrared cutoff  $\mathbf{a}_L$  will be close to  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_L$  in a family of cubes with sizes which may be smaller than  $L$ . Recall that  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m$  is defined as an infinite-volume limit defined in (2.72).

**Proposition 4.1.** *There exist a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  and, for every  $\delta, s \in (0, 1]$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$  and  $M \in [10^4 d, \infty)$ , a minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{4\rho}}(L_0(C^2 s^{-1} \delta^{-1} M, 1 - 2\rho, c_*, \nu)) \quad (4.6)$$

such that, for  $h := \lceil CM s^{-1} \log((\nu \wedge \delta)^{-1} m) \rceil$  and every  $L, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying

$$L, m \geq L_0(C^2 s^{-1} \delta^{-1} M, 1 - 2\rho, c_*, \nu), \quad 3^m \geq \mathcal{X} \quad \text{and} \quad m - h \leq n \leq m, \quad (4.7)$$

we have the estimate

$$\max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L \wedge (m+h)} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge (m+h)})_{\square_m}) \leq \begin{cases} \delta \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m, & m \leq L + h, \\ \delta m^{-100}, & m > L + h. \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

The error on the right in (4.8) is not sharp and will be improved in Proposition 6.1 below, where we strengthen (4.8) by replacing the factor of  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho$  by  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho$ .

In view of the fact that  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \lesssim m^{-1/4+\rho}$  by Proposition 3.1, the estimate (4.8) above asserts that the relative differences of  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m$  and the coarse-grained matrices for  $\mathbf{a}_L$  in cubes proportional to  $\square_m$ , with  $m$  in the range  $\log L \leq m \leq L$ , are at most of order  $m^{-1/4+\rho}$ , where  $\rho$  in any parameter in  $(0, 1/4)$ . This range of  $m$  is much more unconstrained than the one suggested in (1.40). However, the constant matrix in the estimate (4.8) is essentially  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L \wedge m}$ , not  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_L$ . This is very natural, as we expect the effective diffusivity to depend on the scale of the infrared cutoff, or the scale being observed, whichever is smaller. However, as we will see in Lemma 4.38 below, the estimates in Proposition 3.1 imply some continuity of  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m$  in  $m$ . This allows us to replace  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m$  by  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_L$  in this estimate, provided that  $m$  is in the range  $L - L^{1/2-\rho} \leq m \leq L$ , and make a small relative error. In practice, this yields a homogenization result across this more limited range of scales, with effective diffusivity  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_L$ , matching (1.40).

The proof of Proposition 4.1 appears in Section 4.4, below. We continue in the next subsection with a presentation of the needed decorrelation estimates for the coarse-grained matrices.

**4.1. Concentration properties of the coarse-grained coefficients.** In this subsection we prove a mixing property for the infrared cutoff coarse-grained matrices with the strength of the estimate dependent on the scale separation.

**Proposition 4.2** (Mixing below the infrared cutoff). *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $L, m, n, h \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying*

$$L - n \leq C^{-1} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^2(\square_h), \quad n \leq m - \lceil C \log(\nu^{-1}m) \rceil \quad \text{and} \quad h := n - \lceil C \log(\nu^{-1}m) \rceil, \quad (4.9)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)) \right|_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(L-n)^{1/2} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L-n) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^{-2}(\square_h)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-1000}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)) \right|_{\{m > L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-1000}).$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* Let  $L, m, n, h \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that

$$L - n \leq K^{-1} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L,*}^2(\square_h), \quad n \leq m - \lceil K \log(\nu^{-1}m) \rceil \quad \text{and} \quad h \leq n - \lceil K \log(\nu^{-1}m) \rceil, \quad (4.11)$$

where  $K \geq 1$  is a large constant to be selected below, depending only on  $d$ . We first consider the case that  $m \leq L + K \log(\nu^{-1}L)$ , which we note also implies  $n < L - K \log(\nu^{-1}L)$ . The argument in the case  $m > L + K \log(\nu^{-1}L)$  is much simpler, as we explain at the end of the proof. Also, we may suppose without loss of generality that

$$m - n \in [K \log(\nu^{-1}L), 10K \log(\nu^{-1}L)]. \quad (4.12)$$

Indeed, if  $n < m - 10K \log(\nu^{-1}L)$ , we may split the sum into smaller subcubes and then apply the result in each of those subcubes.

Select a parameter  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  which satisfies

$$n < \ell < \min\{m, L\}. \quad (4.13)$$

We will require gaps of at least  $K \log(\nu^{-1}L)$  between each of these parameters, so we further assume

$$\min\{L - \ell, m - \ell, \ell - n, n\} \geq \frac{K}{10} \log(\nu^{-1}L). \quad (4.14)$$

We begin the proof with the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)) &= \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_\ell(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell(\square_n)) \\ &+ \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{A}_\ell(z + \square_n)) \\ &+ (\bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell(\square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

To estimate the first term on the right side of (4.15), we use Proposition 2.5 with  $\sigma = 1$ , (2.74) and (4.24) to obtain

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_\ell(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell(z + \square_n)) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C \nu^{-2} \ell 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(m-\ell)}) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-2000}), \quad (4.16)$$



where we used (4.14) for  $K$  suitably large in the last inequality. Estimating the last two terms on the right side of (4.15) involves comparing the coarse-grained coefficients for different infrared cutoffs and this is our focus for the rest of the proof. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \overline{\mathbf{A}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{\square_m}} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{A}_\ell(z + \square_n)) \right| \\ & \leq C \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-2}(\square_h) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 + C \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-1500}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

We decompose the summand on the left of (4.17) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{A}_\ell(z + \square_n) \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_\ell + \mathbf{k}_\ell^t (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}) \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) & -(\mathbf{k}_\ell^t (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}))(z + \square_n) \\ -((\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}) \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) & (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1})(z + \square_n) \end{pmatrix} \\ & \quad + \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{k}_L^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) & -((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1})(z + \square_n) \\ -(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

To estimate the contribution of the first matrix on the right side of the previous display, we use (2.82) and Lemma 2.7 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \overline{\mathbf{A}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_\ell + \mathbf{k}_\ell^t (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}) \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) & -(\mathbf{k}_\ell^t (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}))(z + \square_n) \\ -((\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}) \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) & (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1})(z + \square_n) \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(C\nu^{-1} \ell 3^{-(\ell-n)}) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(m^{-2000}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

provided that  $K(d)$  is large enough. It remains to bound the second matrix on the right side of (4.18):

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \overline{\mathbf{A}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{\square_m}} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{k}_L^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) & -((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1})(z + \square_n) \\ -(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ & \leq C \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + C \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-2}(\square_h) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-1600}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Indeed, (4.18), (4.19) and (4.20) yields (4.17).

The off-diagonal terms in (4.20) are estimated as follows. First, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \\ & = \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n) (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n} + (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n)) ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.7 and (2.83), the second term above is bounded by

$$\left| (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n)) ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(m^{-2000}).$$

For the first term, we set  $\ell' := \frac{1}{2}(\ell - n)$  and use (2.51) together with subadditivity to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{z \in y + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{\ell'}} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n) (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n} \right| \\ & \leq |(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{y+\square_{\ell'}}| \left| \sum_{z \in y + 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{\ell'}} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n) \right| + C\nu^{-1} 3^{\ell'} \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)\|_{L^\infty(y+\square_{\ell'})} \\ & \leq \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) |(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{y+\square_{\ell'}}| + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(m^{-2000}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above three displays yields

$$\left| \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \right| \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{L^1(\square_m)} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(m^{-1900}). \quad (4.21)$$

We next focus on the upper left corner of matrix in (4.20). We rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{k}_L^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) \\ &= ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell) + \mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell) + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n). \end{aligned}$$

For the last two terms on the right, we obtain by Young's inequality, for every  $\theta \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( \frac{1}{\theta} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n)| ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) + \theta |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n)| (\mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We then observe by (2.82) and Lemma 2.7,

$$\sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) (\mathbf{k}_\ell^t (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1}) \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n)| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-2000}),$$

and, using the fact that  $|A| \leq |\text{trace}(A)| \leq d|A|$  for  $d \times d$  positive semi-definite matrices  $A$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) (\mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n)| \\ & \leq C \left| \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) (\mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) \right| \\ & \leq C + C \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( (\mathbf{s}_\ell + \mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell(\square_n) \right) \right| \\ & \leq C + C \left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_\ell(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell(z + \square_n)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By combining the previous four displays with (4.16) and taking

$$\theta := \min \left\{ 1, \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \right|^{1/2} \right\},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{k}_L^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) \right| \\ & \leq C \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \right| \\ & \quad + C \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \right|^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(m^{-1800}). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the remaining term, we use (2.83) and Lemma 2.7, subadditivity, and Proposition 2.5 with  $\sigma = 1$  to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \right| \\
& \leq \left| \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n) \left( (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n} \right) \right| + \left| \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n) (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \mathbf{s}_L(z + \square_n) \right|^{1/2} \left| \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n) \left( (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n} \right) \mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2}(z + \square_n) \right| \\
& \quad + \left( \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_h) + \left| \sum_{z' \in z + 3^h \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(z' + \square_h) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h)) \right|^{1/2} \right) |(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}| \\
& \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_h) |(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_n}| + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(m^{-2000}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1} \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell,*}^{-1}$ , the localization estimate (2.82) and again Lemma 2.7

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} ((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell))(z + \square_n) \right| \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-2}(\square_h) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-2000}).$$

From the previous three displays we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{k}_L^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_n) \right| \\
& \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-2}(\square_h) \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-1600}). \quad (4.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above display with (4.21) completes the proof of (4.20) and thus of (4.17).

We next take the expected value of (4.17) and use (2.53) to obtain an estimate for the third term on the right in (4.15):

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n) - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \leq C(L - \ell)^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) + C(L - \ell) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-2}(\square_h) + Cm^{-1000}.$$

This implies, by (4.11) for  $K$  sufficiently large that

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n) - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right| \leq C(L - \ell)^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h).$$

Combining the above display with (4.16) and (4.17) together with (2.53) yields (4.10). This completes the proof when  $m \leq L + K \log(\nu^{-1}L)$ .

We conclude with the proof in the (easier) case when the scale separation is large, specifically, when  $m \geq L + K \log(\nu^{-1}L)$ . By Proposition 2.5 with  $\sigma = 1$ , (2.74) and (4.24) we obtain

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)^{-1} \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1} \left( C \nu^{-2} L 3^{-\frac{d}{2}(m-L)} \right) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-1000}).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**4.2. The renormalized ellipticity bound.** In order to homogenize the infrared cutoffs, we require the following rather crude ellipticity-type bound.

**Proposition 4.3.** *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $m, L \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq L/4$ , we have the estimate*

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \cap (-\infty, m]} 3^{\gamma(k-m)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\overline{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_m) \mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k)| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C\gamma^{-1}\nu^{-2}L). \quad (4.23)$$

*Proof.* With  $\mathbf{E}_L$  defined in (2.73), we use the following crude estimate comparing it to  $\overline{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)$ : for every  $L, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$|\mathbf{E}_L \overline{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_n)| \leq 4(\nu + C\nu^{-1}L)|\overline{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}(\square_n)| + 4\nu^{-1}|\overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)| \leq C\nu^{-2}L. \quad (4.24)$$

Let  $K(d)$  be a large constant to be selected just below. Using a union bound, (4.24) and (2.74), we have that, for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq \frac{1}{4}L$  and  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[ \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [-\infty, m]} 3^{\gamma(k-m)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\overline{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_m) \mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k)| > K\gamma^{-1}\nu^{-2}mt \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^m 3^{d(m-k)} \mathbb{P} \left[ |\mathbf{E}_L^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_k)| > cK\gamma^{-1}\nu^2 mL^{-1} 3^{\gamma(m-k)} t \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 3^{dk} \exp(-cK\gamma^{-1}3^{\gamma k} t) \leq \exp(-t), \end{aligned}$$

where the validity of the last inequality was obtained by choosing  $K(d)$  sufficiently large. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**4.3. Homogenization and renormalization.** In this subsection, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.6 by appealing to [AK24b]. To be able to invoke [AK24b, Section 5] we need to verify that our field satisfies certain ellipticity and concentration assumptions. This verification has essentially already been carried out above, but to be explicit we record it in the following lemma. For the statements of the assumptions (P1), (P2'), (P3') and (P4), we refer to [AK24b, Section 5.1].

**Lemma 4.4.** *There exists a constant  $C(d)$  such that for every  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ ,  $M \geq 1$ , and every  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  with*

$$L \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu),$$

*the infrared cutoff field  $\mathbf{A}_L$  satisfies the assumptions (P1) and (P4). Moreover, (P2') is satisfied with parameters*

$$\begin{aligned} H &:= C_{(4.23)}\gamma^{-1}\nu^{-2}, \quad m_2 := L/4, \quad \Psi_S = \Gamma_1, \\ D &:= 1, \quad K_{\Psi_S} := 2\exp(2) \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\Psi_S} := 2d. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

*We also have that (P3') is satisfied with parameters*

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &:= 1/2, \quad m_3 := L - ML^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1}L), \quad L_1 = 2C_{(4.9)}, \quad L_2 := \nu^{-1}, \\ \omega_n &= \tilde{\omega}_n + n^{-1000}, \quad \Psi := \Gamma_{1/3}, \quad K_\Psi := C \quad \text{and} \quad p_\Psi := 2d, \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

*for  $\tilde{\omega}_n$  defined by*

$$\tilde{\omega}_n := \begin{cases} C(L-n)^{1/2} \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_{h_n}), & n \leq L + C_{(4.10)} \log(\nu^{-1}L), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

*where  $h_n := n - [C_{(4.9)} \log(\nu^{-1}L)]$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfies

$$L \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu), \quad (4.27)$$

where the constant  $C(d) < \infty$  is such that, if  $L \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu)$  and  $L - n \leq ML^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)$  then the first condition in (4.9) is satisfied. The existence of such a constant is guaranteed by (4.5).

Assumption (P1) holds as each  $\mathbf{j}_n$  is  $\mathbb{R}^d$  stationary and (P4) follows from (J4). Next, Proposition 4.3 gives us, for every  $j \geq m_2$ ,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \cap (-\infty, j]} 3^{\gamma(k-j)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_j} |\overline{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_j) \mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k)| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C_{(4.23)} \gamma^{-1} \nu^{-2} L),$$

which is (P2') with parameters given by (4.25). It remains to check (P3'), and for that we apply Proposition 4.2, which yields that, for every  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $i \geq m_3$  and  $j \geq i + L_1 \log(L_2 j)$ ,

$$\left| \overline{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_i) \sum_{z \in 3^i \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_j} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_i) - \overline{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_i)) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(\tilde{\omega}_i + i^{-1000}). \quad (4.28)$$

This is (P3') with parameters given by (4.26).  $\square$

We next use [AK24b, Theorem 5.1] to prove the following homogenization bound.

**Proposition 4.5** (Homogenization below the infrared cutoff). *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  and  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and for every  $L, m \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying*

$$L \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq L - ML^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1}L), \quad (4.29)$$

*we have the estimate*

$$|\overline{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_d| + |\overline{\mathbf{s}}_L \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_d| \leq C \overline{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2}(L - m + \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} + Cm^{-1000}. \quad (4.30)$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfies

$$L \geq L_0(KM, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \quad (4.31)$$

for a constant  $K \geq C_{(4.27)}$ , depending only on  $d$ , to be determined below. Let  $\ell := K \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)$ , select  $\gamma = 1/2$  and fix parameters as in Lemma 4.4, so that we may apply [AK24b, Theorem 5.1]. Observe that the microscopic ellipticity ratio  $\Theta_{L,0}$  in [AK24b, Theorem 5.1] for our field  $\mathbf{a}_L$  is bounded via  $\mathbf{E}_L$  (defined in (2.73)), so that

$$\Theta_{L,0} \leq C(d) \nu^{-2} L.$$

We also have that

$$\Upsilon_1 := \frac{CK_{\Psi}^{4d^2}}{\min\{d+1, p_{\Psi}\} - d} = C(d)$$

and

$$\Upsilon_2 := \frac{C}{\min\{3, p_{\Psi_S}\} - 2} \exp\left(C\left(L_1 \log L_2 + \frac{D + \log(H + K_{\Psi_S})}{1 - \gamma}\right)\right) = C \exp(C \log(\nu^{-1}L)),$$

Furthermore, for large enough  $K$  there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that for  $m_0 := C \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)$  and every  $\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\tilde{m} \geq m_3$  the inequality [AK24b, (5.5)] is satisfied. Consequently, by [AK24b,

Theorem 5.1], there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for  $n, \tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq \tilde{m} + m_0$  and  $\tilde{m} \geq m_3$ ,

$$\Theta_{L,n} - 1 \leq C(d)\omega_{\tilde{m}}^2 + C(d)\tilde{m}^{-2000} \leq 1/4, \quad (4.32)$$

increasing  $K$  if necessary. Also, by subadditivity, we obtain for every  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L \leq |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_h)| \leq \Theta_{L,h} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_h)| \leq \Theta_{L,h} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_j)| = \Theta_{L,h} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L. \quad (4.33)$$

In particular, for every  $\tilde{m} \geq m_3$  by the previous two displays with

$$n = \tilde{m} + 2m_0 \quad \text{and} \quad h = n$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L \leq |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n)| \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L. \quad (4.34)$$

Next, for each such choice of  $\tilde{m}$ , select  $\tilde{m}'$  such that  $h_{\tilde{m}'} = n$ , let

$$n' = \tilde{m}' + 2m_0 \quad \text{and} \quad h' = n'$$

and apply (4.33), the first inequality in (4.32), and the improved bound (4.34) to see that

$$\Theta_{L,n'} - 1 \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2} (L - n' + \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)) \mathbf{1}_{\{n' \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} + n^{-1000}.$$

This concludes the proof after possibly increasing  $K$ .  $\square$

Using the previous proposition and the concentration estimate (Proposition 4.2), we obtain quenched homogenization estimates.

**Proposition 4.6** (Quenched homogenization below the cutoff scale). *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ ,  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and  $L, m \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying*

$$L \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq L - ML^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1}L), \quad (4.35)$$

we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(\square_m)| + |(\mathbf{k}_L^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_L)(\square_m)| + |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)|^2 \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}}) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L)) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-1000}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

*Proof.* Denote  $n := m - [C_{(4.9)} \log(\nu^{-1}(L \vee m))]$ . Using (2.9), subadditivity and Proposition 4.5, we have that, for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|e| = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 2J_L(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{1/2} e) &= \begin{pmatrix} -e \\ e \end{pmatrix} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} (\mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L) \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} -e \\ e \end{pmatrix} \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \begin{pmatrix} -e \\ e \end{pmatrix} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L) \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} -e \\ e \end{pmatrix} \\ &\leq 2 \left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L) \right| \\ &\leq 4 \left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)) \right| + 4 |\bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_n) \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L - \mathbf{I}_{2d}|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the condition (4.35) implies the hypotheses of Proposition 4.2 are satisfied if  $C_{(4.35)}$  is taken sufficiently large. Thus, we may apply Propositions 4.2, 4.5 and (4.34) to the above display to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & J_L(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{1/2} e) \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}(L-n)^{1/2}\mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L+C_{(4.9)}\}}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2}(L-n)\mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L+C_{(4.9)}\}}) \\ & \quad + C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2}(L-n+\log^3(\nu^{-1}L))\mathbf{1}_{\{n \leq L+C_{(4.9)} \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-1000}). \end{aligned}$$

An identical bound for  $J_L^*(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{1/2} e)$  is obtained by the same argument. For a symmetric matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$  and skew symmetric matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} = \tilde{\mathbf{s}} + \tilde{\mathbf{k}}$  and observe that (2.23) gives us, for every bounded Lipschitz set  $U$ ,  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} & J_L(U, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^t e) + J_L^*(U, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}} e) \\ & = |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})^{1/2}(U)e|^2 + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U)(\mathbf{k}_L(U) - \tilde{\mathbf{k}})e|^2 + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \tilde{\mathbf{s}})e|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

Finally, we can replace each of the three indicator functions with  $\mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L+2C_{(4.9)} \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}}$ . We can then drop the last, deterministic term on the right side, since

$$L \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \implies \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2}(L-n+\log^3(\nu^{-1}L)) \leq C(L-n)^{1/2}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}.$$

Combining the above completes the proof.  $\square$

We record an application of Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 2.9 which enables us to compare the effective diffusivity for different infrared cutoffs.

**Lemma 4.7.** *There exists a constant  $C(d)$  such that, for every  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ ,  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and  $L, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying*

$$L \geq \ell \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \geq L - ML^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1}L), \quad (4.38)$$

we have

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L - \mathbf{I}_d| \leq CML^\alpha \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2} \log^3(\nu^{-1}L) \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.39)$$

Moreover,

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L \leq Cc_*^{-1}L^{1/2} \log^{13/2}(\nu^{-1}L). \quad (4.40)$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $L, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy

$$L \geq \ell \geq L_0(KM, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad n := \ell - [100 \log L],$$

where  $K$  is a large enough constant so that  $n \geq L - ML^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)$ . According to Proposition 4.5,

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell(\square_n)| \leq 2C_{(4.30)}ML^\alpha(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-2} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2}) \log^3(\nu^{-1}L) \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

provided that  $K(d)$  is large enough. By (2.82), on the other hand, we get

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_n)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1}(\square_n) - \mathbf{I}_d| \leq CL^{-100} \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Now (4.39) follows by the above two displays, the triangle inequality and Proposition 3.1 provided that  $C_{(4.38)}$  is large enough.

To show (4.40), Proposition 3.1 and (4.39) yield

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell| \leq Cc_*^{-1}\ell^{-1/2} \log^{19/2}(\nu^{-1}L).$$

Iterating this leads to (4.40).  $\square$

**4.4. Minimal scales.** We next show that Proposition 4.1 follows from Proposition 4.6. We just need to write the quenched homogenization result in terms of the random variables defined in (4.1) and (4.2) and then formulate the result in terms of a random minimal scale, which we do using union bounds.

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* We let  $K$  to be a constant to be determined below satisfying  $K \geq C_{(4.29)} \vee C_{(4.35)} \vee C_{(4.38)}$  and assume that

$$L \geq L_0 := L_0(K^2 s^{-1} \delta^{-1} M, 1 - 2\rho, c_*, \nu).$$

Set also

$$h := \lceil K s^{-1} \log((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1} m) \rceil \quad \text{and} \quad \ell := m + 2h. \quad (4.41)$$

We also define, for each  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ , the random variable

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} := & \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_k) \right| \\ & + \left| \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_k) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1/2} \right|^2 + \left| (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2} \mathbf{k}_L)(z + \square_k) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1/2} \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

We will use the crude bound, by Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.3 that, for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $L \leq 4m$ ,

$$\max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \leq O_{\Gamma_1}(C\nu^{-2}m^2). \quad (4.43)$$

*Step 1.* We first observe that when  $L_0 \leq L \leq \ell$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have, by the definition (4.42),

$$\max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L) + \mathcal{E}_s^*(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)) \leq 2 \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (4.44)$$

*Step 2.* We next consider the case of large cutoff, arguing that the choice of normalization gives us a similar bound as in Step 1. More precisely, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{L \geq \ell} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell) + \mathcal{E}_s^*(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m})) \\ & \leq 2 \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,\ell} \right)^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-500}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

We first observe, by the triangle inequality, that for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\sup_{L \geq m+2h} \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_k) \right| \leq \mathcal{U}_{z,k,\ell} + \sup_{L \geq m+2h} \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1} ((\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}) - (\mathbf{s}_\ell - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}))(z + \square_k) \right|.$$

Since  $\ell = m + 2h$ , Lemmas 2.9 and 2.3 yield that

$$\sup_{L \geq \ell} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1} ((\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}) - (\mathbf{s}_\ell - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}))(z + \square_k) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-2000}).$$

Combining the previous two displays establishes the bound in (4.45) for the  $\mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L)$  term. In the remainder of the step we consider the  $\mathcal{E}_s^*(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m})$  term. Using (2.82) and (4.43) we get that, for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $k \leq m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{L > \ell} \left| \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_k) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2} \right|^2 \\ & \leq 2 \left( 1 + \sup_{L > \ell} |(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*})(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{I}_d| \right) \mathcal{U}_{z,k,\ell} + 2 \sup_{L > \ell} \left| (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{s}_{L,*} - \mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}))(z + \square_k) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2} \right|^2 \\ & \leq 2\mathcal{U}_{z,k,\ell} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(m^{-2000}). \end{aligned}$$



We also have, for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $k \leq m$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)(\mathbf{k}_L(z + \square_k) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m})\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \leq 2|(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}\mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m})\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right in the above display can be bounded using (2.82) and (4.43) as

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{L \geq \ell} |(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}\mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 & \leq \left(1 + \sup_{L \geq \ell} |(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}\mathbf{s}_{\ell,*})(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{I}_d|\right) |(\mathbf{s}_{\ell,*}^{-1/2}\mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \leq \mathcal{U}_{z,k,\ell} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(m^{-2000}). \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be split as

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m})\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \leq 2|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_k})\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \quad + 2|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_k} - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m})\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and then estimated using (2.82), (2.83) and Lemma 2.7 as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{L \geq \ell} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_k})\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \leq \sup_{L \geq \ell} |\mathbf{s}_L(z + \square_k)| |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)(z + \square_k) - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_k})\mathbf{s}_L^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(m^{-2000}) \end{aligned}$$

and, by (2.51),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{L \geq \ell} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)((\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{z+\square_k} - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m})\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \leq C\nu^{-2}3^{2m} \sup_{L \geq \ell} \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C\nu^{-1}3^{-2h}) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-2000}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above displays yields (4.45).

*Step 3.* In the next two steps we bound geometric sums involving  $\mathcal{U}_{z,k,L}$ . In this step, we consider the case  $L_0 \leq L \leq m - 2h$  and show

$$\left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s3^{s(k-n)} \max_{L_0 \leq L \leq m-2h} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \right)^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(m^{-400}). \quad (4.46)$$

Proposition 4.6 and Lemma 2.3 yield that, for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \in [n-h, m]$  and  $L \in [L_0, m-2h]$ ,

$$\max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-999}).$$

By (4.43) we get that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-h} s3^{s(k-n)} \max_{L_0 \leq L \leq 4m} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C3^{-sh}\nu^{-2}m^2) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-2000}). \quad (4.47)$$

Combining the above two displays yields (4.46).

*Step 4.* We next consider the case  $|L - m| < 2h$ . We show that, for  $m, n, L$  with  $|m - L| \leq 2h$  and  $m - h' \leq n \leq m$  and every  $\sigma > 0$

$$\left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s3^{s(k-n)} \max_{\ell-4h \leq L \leq \ell} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \right)^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_4}(Ch^{1/2} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-400}). \quad (4.48)$$

By Proposition 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 we have for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \in [L - 2h, n]$  and  $\sigma > 0$  the bound

$$\mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} h^{1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-2} h) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-999}).$$

By the above display and Lemma 2.3 we deduce that

$$\left( \sum_{k=n-h}^n s3^{s(k-n)} \max_{m-2h \leq L \leq m+2h} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \right)^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_4}(C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} h^{1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} h) + \mathcal{O}_{2/3}(m^{-498}).$$

Combining the previous display with (4.47) yields (4.48).

*Step 5.* We combine the previous steps and conclude by proving existence of the minimal scale as in the claim. Let

$$\tilde{m} := \begin{cases} \delta \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log^{1/2} m, & m \leq L + h, \\ m^{-300}, & m > L + h. \end{cases}$$

We first show that there exists  $c(d) \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \sup_{L \geq L_0} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L \wedge \ell} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge \ell})_{\square_m}) > \tilde{m} \right] \leq \exp \left( -c \delta^2 s^2 M^{-2} K^{-2} \log^{-2}((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1}) m^{4\rho} \right). \quad (4.49)$$

By (4.48) and (4.46) we see that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s3^{s(k-n)} \max_{L_0 \leq L \leq \ell} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \right)^{1/2} > \tilde{m} \right] \leq \exp \left( -c (\delta \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log^{1/2} m)^4 h^{-2} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^2 \right).$$

We then obtain (4.49) by (4.44) and (4.45). The minimal scale is revealed to be

$$\mathcal{X} := \sup_{m \geq L_0} \left\{ 3^{m+1} : \sup_{L \geq L_0} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L \wedge \ell} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge \ell})_{\square_m}) > \tilde{m} \right\}.$$

By (4.49) and a union bound we then deduce that, for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq L_0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[\log \mathcal{X} > \frac{1}{3} L_0 m] \leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \exp(-c K \rho^{-2} k^{4\rho}) \leq C \exp(-c K m^{4\rho}) \leq \exp(-m^{4\rho}),$$

where the last inequality follows by taking  $C_{(4.6)}$  large enough by means of  $K$ . The above estimate concludes the proof.  $\square$

For flexibility, we bound the larger matrices  $\mathbf{A}(U)$  by the factor on the left in (4.8). For the statement, recall the definition of  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_m$  from (2.72) and  $\mathbf{G}$  from (2.13).

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let the parameters  $m, n, h \in \mathbb{N}$  be as in Proposition 4.1 and set  $\ell := m + h$ . Then we have, with  $\mathbf{h} := (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge \ell})_{\square_m}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}^t \mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \\ & + \sum_{k=-\infty}^m s 3^{s(k-m)} \left| \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}}^t (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m)) \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{h}} \right|^{1/2} \\ & \leq 8\mathcal{E}^2 + 16\mathcal{E} \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}_s(\square_m; \mathbf{a}_L, \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge \ell} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge \ell})_{\square_m}).$$

*Proof.* For convenience, we write  $\overline{\mathbf{s}} := \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge \ell}$ ,  $\overline{\mathbf{k}} := (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge \ell})_{\square_m}$  and  $\overline{\mathbf{a}} := \overline{\mathbf{s}} + \overline{\mathbf{k}}$ . Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded Lipschitz set. We start with the identity,

$$\overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(U) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{1/2} + \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} - 2\mathbf{I}_d = \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \overline{\mathbf{s}}) \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(U) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \overline{\mathbf{s}}) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}.$$

From the above display and the fact that, for all  $\lambda, t > 0$  we have

$$0 \leq \lambda + \lambda^{-1} - 2 \leq t^2 \implies (\lambda - 1) \vee (\lambda^{-1} - 1) \leq t + t^2$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ |\overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d|, |\overline{\mathbf{s}}^{1/2} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(U) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d| \right\} \\ & \leq |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \overline{\mathbf{s}}) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}| + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \overline{\mathbf{s}}) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

Recall the definition of  $\mathbf{G}$  from (2.13). By the above display, (2.12) and the triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_{\overline{\mathbf{k}}}^t \mathbf{A}_L(U) \mathbf{G}_{\overline{\mathbf{k}}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \\ & \leq 2|\overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_L(U) + (\mathbf{k}_L(U) - \overline{\mathbf{k}})^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(U) (\mathbf{k}_L(U) - \overline{\mathbf{k}}) - \overline{\mathbf{s}})| + 2|\overline{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(U) - \mathbf{I}_d| \\ & \leq 2|\overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_L(U) - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U))| + 4|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U) (\mathbf{k}_L(U) - \overline{\mathbf{k}}) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \quad + 4|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \overline{\mathbf{s}}) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}| + 4|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(U) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \overline{\mathbf{s}}) \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the previous display that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_{\overline{\mathbf{k}}}^t \mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) \mathbf{G}_{\overline{\mathbf{k}}} - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \leq 8\mathcal{E}^2 + 8\mathcal{E},$$

which gives (4.50) for the first term.

We next turn to the estimate of the second term in (4.50). By (2.9) and the fact  $\overline{\mathbf{k}}$  is skew, we have, for every  $e, e' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the identities

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & \leq \begin{pmatrix} -e \\ e \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}_{\overline{\mathbf{k}}}^t (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m)) \mathbf{G}_{\overline{\mathbf{k}}} \overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \right) \begin{pmatrix} -e \\ e \end{pmatrix} \\ & = 2 \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( J_L(z + \square_k, \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \overline{\mathbf{a}}^t \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) - J_L(\square_m, \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \overline{\mathbf{a}}^t \overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \binom{e'}{e'} \cdot \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}^t (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m)) \mathbf{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} \overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \right) \binom{e'}{e'} \\
&= 2 \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( J_L^*(z + \square_k, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e', \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e') - J_L^*(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e', \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e') \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The matrix in the middle is nonnegative by the subadditivity. Since  $\mathbb{R}^{2d} = \text{span}\{(-p^t, p^t)^t, (q^t, q^t)^t : p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ , the above two displays imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}^t (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m)) \mathbf{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} \right| \\
&\leq C \sup_{|e| \leq 1} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( J_L(z + \square_k, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) - J_L(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) \right) \\
&\quad + C \sup_{|e| \leq 1} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( J_L^*(z + \square_k, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) - J_L^*(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We also have, by (4.37) that

$$\left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^m s 3^{s(k-m)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sup_{|e| \leq 1} \left( J_L(z + \square_k, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) + J_L^*(z + \square_k, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e, \bar{\mathbf{a}} \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e) \right) \right)^{1/2} \leq 2\mathcal{E}.$$

Recalling that  $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge \ell}$ , the above two displays and Jensen's inequality imply that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^m s 3^{s(k-m)} \left| \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \overline{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}^t (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m)) \mathbf{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} \right|^{1/2} \leq 8\mathcal{E}.$$

This proves (4.50), and concludes the proof.  $\square$

The above corollary can be used to control a composite quantity appearing below in Section 6. For the statement, recall that  $\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(U) = \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(U) - \mathbf{k}_L^t(U)$ .

**Remark 4.9.** Let  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$  be a symmetric and  $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$  an antisymmetric matrix, and let

$$\overline{\mathbf{A}} := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{s}} + \bar{\mathbf{k}}^t \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{k}} & -\bar{\mathbf{k}}^t \bar{\mathbf{s}} \\ -\bar{\mathbf{s}} \bar{\mathbf{k}} & \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For every  $m, L \in \mathbb{N}$  we have, with  $\bar{\mathbf{a}} := \bar{\mathbf{s}} + \bar{\mathbf{k}}$ , that

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\bar{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}^t(\square_m)) \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}| \leq 8 |\overline{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \quad (4.52)$$

and

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{a}})| \leq 8 |\overline{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_d| (1 + |\overline{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_d|). \quad (4.53)$$

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality we get, for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|e| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\bar{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}^t(\square_m)) \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e|^2 \\
&\leq 2 |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\bar{\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)) \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e|^2 + 2 |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{k}}) \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} e|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and, together with (4.37) and (2.9), this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(\square_m)| + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\bar{\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m))\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}|^2 + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{k}})\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}|^2 \\ & \leq \sup_{|e| \leq 1} \left( J_L(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}e, \bar{\mathbf{a}}^t \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}e) + J_L^*(\square_m, \bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}e, \bar{\mathbf{a}}\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}e) \right) \leq |\bar{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}|. \end{aligned}$$

If  $|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| > 1/2$ , the above display, upon taking a square-root, implies (4.52). Otherwise, if  $|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \leq 1/2$ , we have  $|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)\bar{\mathbf{s}}| \vee |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}| \leq 4$ , and hence

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\bar{\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m))\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}| \leq |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}|^{1/2} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{I}_d| \leq 2|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}|$$

and

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{k}})\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}| \leq |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}|^{1/2} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_m)(\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{k}})| \leq 6|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}|.$$

Combining the above two displays completes the proof of (4.52). By (4.52) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{a}})| & \leq |\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{1/2}(\square_m)| |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\bar{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m))\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{-1/2}| \\ & \leq 8(1 + |\bar{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_d|) |\bar{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_d|, \end{aligned}$$

and thus (4.53) follows.  $\square$

We next prove another consequence of Propositions 4.2 and 4.5.

**Proposition 4.10.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ ,  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and  $L, m \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying*

$$L \geq L_0(CM, \alpha, c_*, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq L - ML^\alpha \log^3(\nu^{-1}L), \quad (4.54)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}}) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L)) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2} \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-999}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.55)$$

*Proof.* First, by [AK24b, Lemma 4.3], we have, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \leq m$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m(\square_n)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{m,*}^{-1}(\square_n) \leq 1 + (80d)^{-1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_m)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{I}_{2d}| \\ & \leq 10d(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_n)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_n) - 1) + 4 \left| \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \bar{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{I}_{2d} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.56)$$

Fix  $n := m - \lceil C_{(4.9)} \log(\nu^{-1}L) \rceil$ . Choose  $C_{(4.54)}$  sufficiently large so (4.29) and (4.9) are valid. Consequently, by Proposition 4.5 and Proposition 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L(\square_n) - \mathbf{I}_d| + |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}(\square_n) - \mathbf{I}_d| \\ & \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2}(L - m + \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} + Cn^{-1000} \end{aligned} \quad (4.57)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \overline{\mathbf{A}}_L^{-1}(\square_n) \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} (\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_n) - \overline{\mathbf{A}}_L(\square_n)) \right| \\
& \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))^{1/2} \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}}) \\
& \quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L)) \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-2}(\square_h) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-999}), \tag{4.58}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $h := n - \lceil C_{(4.9)} \log(\nu^{-1}L) \rceil$ .

Using Proposition 3.1, we may assume, after making  $C_{(4.54)}$  larger if necessary,

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{(4.57)} \overline{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-2}(L - m + \log^3(\nu^{-1}L)) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C_{(4.57)} \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} + C_{(4.57)} n^{-1000} \\
& \leq C_{(4.58)} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}L) (L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))^{1/2} \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_h) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq L + C_{(4.58)} \log(\nu^{-1}L)\}} \leq (160d)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous displays with Proposition 4.5 again completes the proof.  $\square$

**4.5. Auxillary minimal scale.** In the proof of Lemma 5.6 below, we will use a minimal scale to control another random quantity involving the coarse-grained matrices.

**Lemma 4.11.** *For every  $t > 0$  there is a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  and a minimal scale  $\mathcal{Y}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C), \tag{4.59}$$

such that for every  $L, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying

$$L \geq C c_*^{-2} \log^{16}(\nu^{-1})$$

and  $3^n \geq \mathcal{Y}$  we have

$$t \sum_{k=-\infty}^n 3^{-t(n-k)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)| \leq C \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{n \wedge L}^{-1}. \tag{4.60}$$

*Proof.* Suppose that

$$L \geq KC_{(4.29)} \max\left\{(c_*^{-2} \log(\nu^{-1}))^2, \log^3(\nu^{-1})\right\} \tag{4.61}$$

for large  $K(d) < \infty$  to be selected below, where the constant  $C_{(4.29)}$  is as in Proposition 4.5 with parameter  $\alpha = 1/2$ . We show that

$$t \sum_{k=-\infty}^n 3^{-t(n-k)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)| \leq C \overline{\mathbf{s}}_{n \wedge L}^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(L^{-100}) \tag{4.62}$$

from which the result follows by a union bound.

We claim that we may reduce to the case

$$n \geq L - \frac{1}{16} L^{1/2}. \tag{4.63}$$

Indeed, if  $n \leq L - \frac{1}{16} L^{1/2}$ , then by (2.82), letting  $n' := L - \frac{1}{8} L^{1/2}$ , we have, for each  $k \in (-\infty, n) \cap \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_k)| \leq (1 + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_k) \mathbf{s}_{n',*}(\square_k) - \mathbf{I}_d|) |\mathbf{s}_{n',*}^{-1}(\square_k)| \leq |\mathbf{s}_{n',*}^{-1}(\square_k)| + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(L^{-1000}),$$

with the last inequality holding after possibly increasing  $K$ ; consequently, by (2.43),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=-\infty}^n 3^{-t(n-k)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)| \\
& \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^n 3^{-t(n-k)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{s}_{n',*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)| + \sum_{k=-\infty}^n 3^{-t(n-k)} \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(n-k)L^{-1000}) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^n 3^{-t(n-k)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{s}_{n',*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)| + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(L^{-500}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we may assume (4.63).

We now consider two cases for the indices  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  in the sum in (4.62). First, we consider  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$k \geq L - \frac{1}{32}L^{1/2}$$

and let  $k' := k - A \log(\nu^{-1}L)$  for a sufficiently large constant  $A(d) < \infty$  to be determined. Then, by (2.92) we have, for large enough  $A$ ,

$$\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_k) \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L,*}^{-1}(\square_{k'}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(L^{-1000}) \leq 2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(L^{-1000}), \quad (4.64)$$

where the last inequality holds by Proposition 4.5 (with  $\alpha = 1/2$ ) and (3.2), after increasing  $K$  if necessary. We next consider indices  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with

$$k < L - \frac{1}{32}L^{1/2}$$

and use the brutal bound

$$3^{-t(n-k)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)| \leq 3^{-t(n-k)/2} \nu^{-1} L^{-1000}, \quad (4.65)$$

with the latter inequality due to (4.63). Combining (4.64) and (4.65) and enlarging  $K$  yields

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^n 3^{-(n-k)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_n} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)| \leq C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(L^{-250}).$$

This implies (4.62) after using (4.39) to switch  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}$  to  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n \wedge L}^{-1}$  in the above display. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. The Liouville theorem and large-scale regularity

The proof of Theorem D is based on the classical idea of *regularity by harmonic approximation*: if a given function can be well-approximated by harmonic functions on a range of length scales, then it inherits some regularity properties on those scales. In the context of uniformly elliptic homogenization, this leads to a large-scale Lipschitz estimate on solutions, meaning that solutions possess  $L^2$  oscillation bounds which have a Lipschitz-type scaling but are valid only on scales above a (random) multiple of the correlation length scale (see for instance [AK24a, Theorem 1.21]). One can prove higher-order regularity statements which assert that a general solution can be well-approximated by *corrected polynomials* (solutions which are close to harmonic polynomials) with approximation errors that scale like a Taylor remainder (see for instance [AKM19, Section 3.3]).

As discussed in the introduction, what is different in our context is that we cannot expect this Lipschitz-type estimate to hold across an infinite range of length scales, as it is inconsistent with superdiffusivity. Nor do we expect corrected polynomials to exist in infinite volume—indeed, even corrected affine functions do not exist. In particular, a solution which is *flat*—close to an affine function—at a certain scale will typically deviate substantially from this affine function on other scales. The key observation which allows the regularity iteration to work is that solutions should nevertheless be *flat at every scale*, even if the slopes of the affine approximations change across scales. This is the main step of the proof of Theorem D, and the argument appears below (inside of an induction loop) in Step 1 of the proof of Proposition 5.7.

In the next subsection we collect the needed harmonic approximation lemmas as well as the coarse-grained Poincaré and Caccioppoli inequalities. Given these ingredients, the regularity iteration arguments are entirely deterministic and the errors terms appearing in the subsequent subsections will come from these lemmas. At this stage, these errors originate in the homogenization error in the previous section, which is suboptimal in size. This homogenization error is improved in Section 6, below, using the regularity estimates proved here. We can then return to the arguments here and improve the error, and thus the regularity estimates themselves.

Therefore, in order to avoid repetition, we will work under the following general assumption on the homogenization error in this section. This assumption is in force in the rest of this section.

**Assumption H.** *There exist constants  $\sigma, s \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C \in [1, \infty)$ , a decreasing sequence*

$$\{\omega_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1] \quad (5.1)$$

and, for every  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ , a constant  $L_0 \in [1, \infty)$  with  $L_0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  as in (4.4),

$$L_0 \geq L_0(C_{(4.7)}^2 \delta^{-1}, 1/2, c_*, \nu)$$

and a random variable  $\mathcal{X}(\delta)$  satisfying

$$\log \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(L_0) \quad (5.2)$$

such that, for  $h := \lceil Cs^{-1} \log((\nu \wedge \delta)^{-1} m) \rceil$  and every  $L, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying

$$L, m \geq L_0, \quad 3^m \geq \mathcal{X} \quad \text{and} \quad m - h \leq n \leq m, \quad (5.3)$$

we have the estimate

$$\max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge (m+h)} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge (m+h)})_{\square_m}) \leq \delta \omega_m. \quad (5.4)$$

We next present a version of Theorem D which is valid under Assumption H.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Suppose that Assumption H is valid and let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . Then the following statements are valid.*

1. Liouville theorem. *Almost surely with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ , the space  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  has dimension  $1 + d$  and does not depend on  $\gamma$ .*
2. Flatness at every scale. *For every  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $r \geq \mathcal{X}$ , we have*

$$\inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\phi - \ell_e - (\phi)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \omega_{\lfloor \log_3 r \rfloor} \|\phi\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}. \quad (5.5)$$



3. Large-scale  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate. For each  $R \in [\mathcal{X}, \infty)$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}(B_R)$ , there exists  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla \phi\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}, \quad \forall r \in [\mathcal{X}, R]. \quad (5.6)$$

The proof of Proposition 5.1 is the focus of the rest of this section.

**Remark 5.2.** Proposition 4.1 gives us the validity of Assumption H with any choice of  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  and  $s \in (0, 1]$  and with parameters  $C = 10^4 d C_{(4.6)}$ ,  $L_0 = L_0(C^2 s^{-1} \delta^{-1}, 1/2, c_*, \nu)$  as in the statement of the proposition, and with

$$\omega_m := \sup_{k \geq m} \rho_k \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\rho_m$  is defined by

$$\rho_m := \begin{cases} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^{\sigma/4} \log m, & m \leq L + h, \\ m^{-100}, & m > L + h. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

In view of (3.2), by making  $L_0$  larger, if necessary, we can ensure that  $\omega_m$  is no larger than 1 for every  $m \geq L_0$ , and then redefine it to be equal to 1 for  $m < L_0$ .

**5.1. Approximation lemmas.** In this section, we switch from using mostly cubes as our domains to using mostly balls. We are making this choice for readability, and because regularity iterations are traditionally done in balls. However, this does require some additional notation, as in some places we need to switch between balls and cubes in order to quote the estimates from previous sections. We define a parameter

$$\theta := 9\sqrt{d},$$

which is chosen so that, for every ball  $B_r$  with  $r > 0$ , there exists  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that

$$B_r \subseteq \square_{k-1} \subseteq \square_k \subseteq B_{\theta^{-1}r}.$$

Given  $r \in [1, \infty)$ , we define

$$N_r := \log(2\theta^{-2}r) / \log 3,$$

which is the smallest  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  such that  $B_{\theta^{-2}r} \subseteq \square_k$ . It is convenient to express diffusivities in terms of the parameter  $r$ , so we define, for every  $r \geq 1$ , the renormalized diffusivity at scale  $r$  by

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r := \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L \wedge N_r}. \quad (5.9)$$

Note that Lemma 4.7 implies that these diffusivities do not change much across a small number of scales; precisely, for every  $r \geq \log_3 L_0$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\theta^2 r} \leq 2 \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r. \quad (5.10)$$

We also extend the definition of  $\omega$  by setting, for every  $r \in [1, \infty)$ ,

$$\tilde{\omega}_r := \omega_{\lfloor \log_3 r \rfloor}. \quad (5.11)$$

Throughout, we let  $\mathcal{X}_\delta$  be the maximum of the minimal scales in Assumption H and Lemma 4.11. Also recall the definition of the maximizer  $v_L(\cdot, U, e)$  from (2.31), and the matrix  $\mathbf{A}_m$  from (2.72). For every open subset  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , we let  $\mathcal{H}(U)$  denote the set of harmonic functions in  $U$ ,

$$\mathcal{H}(U) := \{w \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(U) : -\Delta w = 0 \text{ in } U\}.$$

In the next lemma, we use Assumption H and a deterministic estimate found in [AK24b] to obtain harmonic approximation for arbitrary solutions.

**Lemma 5.3** (Harmonic approximation). *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$ ,*

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{A}_L(B_r)} \inf_{w \in \mathcal{H}(B_{\theta r})} \frac{r^{-1} \|u - w\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta r})}}{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}} \leq C \delta \tilde{\omega}_r.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$ , let  $m := \lceil \log_3 r \rceil$  and let  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(B_r)$  and assume by normalization that  $\nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}^2 = 1$ . By [AK24b, Proposition 6.6] and (5.10), there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  and  $w \in \mathcal{H}(\square_m)$  such that, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $n < m - 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & 3^{-m} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_m^{1/2} \|u - w\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \\ & \leq C \left( 3^{-\frac{1}{2d}(m-n)} + \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{m+1}} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge (m+h)} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge (m+h)})_{\square_m}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We then obtain the conclusion by (5.4) with  $\alpha = 1/2$  and  $M = 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4** (Affine approximation). *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $m, L \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^m \geq \mathcal{X}_\delta$ ,  $L \geq L_0$ ,*

$$3^{-m} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \ell_e + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq C \delta \omega_m |e| \quad (5.12)$$

and

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m}^{-1} |\nu \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m} |e|^2| \leq 4\delta |e|^2 \omega_m. \quad (5.13)$$

*Proof.* Assume by normalization that  $|e| \leq 1$ . Let  $\ell := m + h$  with  $h$  being as in Assumption H, and let

$$\mathbf{h} := (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge \ell})_{\square_m} \quad \text{and} \quad q := \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) e.$$

By (2.32),

$$\left( \left( (\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e))_{\square_m} \right)_{\left( (\mathbf{a}_L - \mathbf{h}) \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e) \right)_{\square_m}} \right) = \left( \begin{matrix} e \\ (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{k}_L^t(\square_m) + \mathbf{h}^t) e \end{matrix} \right).$$

We substitute this into [AK24b, Lemma 2.15], using (2.31) and (5.4) to see that there exists a universal constant  $C < \infty$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & 3^{-m} \left[ \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \left( \begin{matrix} \nabla v_L(\cdot, e, \square_m) - e \\ (\mathbf{a}_L(\square_m) - \mathbf{h}) \nabla v_L(\cdot, e, \square_m) - (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{k}_L^t(\square_m) + \mathbf{h}^t) e \end{matrix} \right) \right]_{\hat{H}^{-1}(\square_m)} \\ & \leq C 3^d \left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \left( \begin{matrix} 0 \\ q \end{matrix} \right) \right| \sum_{k=-\infty}^m 3^{-(m-k)} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_\mathbf{h}^t(\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m)) \mathbf{G}_\mathbf{h}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \quad + C 3^d \left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \left( \begin{matrix} 0 \\ q \end{matrix} \right) \right| \sum_{k=-\infty}^m 3^{-(m-k)} \left| \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_\mathbf{h}^t(\mathbf{A}_L(z + \square_k) - \mathbf{A}_L(\square_m)) \mathbf{G}_\mathbf{h} \right|^{1/2}. \quad (5.14) \end{aligned}$$

The summands on the right can be estimated using Corollary 4.8. We also have that

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \left( \begin{matrix} 0 \\ q \end{matrix} \right) \right| \leq |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)| \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{1/2} (1 + 3\delta m^{-\rho} \log^4 m) \leq 4\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge \ell}^{1/2} \leq 8\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m}^{1/2},$$

where we used Lemma 4.7 with  $\alpha = 1/2$  and  $M = 1$ . Consequently, by the previous two displays and the inequality

$$\|f - (f)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq C(d) \|\nabla f\|_{\hat{H}^{-1}(\square_m)},$$

and Corollary 4.8 together with (5.4), we obtain that

$$3^{-m} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \ell_e + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq 3^{-m} [\nabla v_L(\cdot, e, \square_m) - e]_{\hat{H}^{-1}(\square_m)} \leq C\delta\omega_m.$$

Finally, we observe from (2.33) that

$$\nu \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 = e \cdot \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) e.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 4.7 and the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_s^*$  in (4.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 - e \cdot \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m} e| &\leq |e|^2 |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m}| \\ &\leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m} \underbrace{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m}^{-1/2} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{1/2}(\square_m)|}_{\leq 4} \underbrace{|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m) (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m}) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m}^{-1/2}|}_{\leq \mathcal{E}_s^*(\square_m; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m})} \\ &\leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge m} \cdot 4\delta\omega_m. \end{aligned}$$

This is (5.13).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5** (Superdiffusive Caccioppoli estimate). *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$ ,  $L \geq L_0$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(B_r)$ ,*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{\theta^2 r}^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^2 r})} \leq Cr^{-1} \|u - (u)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} + C\delta\tilde{\omega}_r \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}. \quad (5.15)$$

*Proof.* We apply the large-scale Caccioppoli estimate proved in [AK24b, Lemma 6.5]. It yields, for every  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^k \geq \mathcal{X}_\delta$  and  $\ell \leq k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{k-1})}^2 &\leq C3^{-2k} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge k} \|u - (u)_{\square_k}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}^2 + C3^{-\frac{1}{2}(k-\ell)} \nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}^2 \\ &\quad + \max_{z \in 3^\ell \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge k}^{-1} \left( \mathcal{E}_{1/2}^\dagger(z + \square_\ell; \mathbf{a}_L) + \mathcal{E}_{1/2}^*(z + \square_\ell; \mathbf{a}_L - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_k)_{\square_k}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_k) \right) \nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by choosing  $\ell := k - 100 \lceil \log(\delta^{-1}k) \rceil$ , we deduce that

$$\nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{k-1})}^2 \leq C3^{-2k} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge k} \|u - (u)_{\square_k}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}^2 + C(\delta \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge k}^{-1/2} k^\rho \log^{4/3} k) \nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}^2.$$

After iterating this and using Lemma 4.7, we obtain (5.15).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6** (Superdiffusive Poincaré inequality). *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(B_r)$ ,*

$$\|u - (u)_{B_{\theta r}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta r})} \leq Cr \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}. \quad (5.16)$$

*Proof.* Let  $m := \lceil \log_3 r \rceil$ . By [AK24b, Lemma 2.12] we have

$$\|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 \leq C\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \sum_{k=-\infty}^m 3^k \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_k)|^{1/2}.$$

We then conclude by appealing to Lemma 4.11 and using (5.10).  $\square$

**5.2. Excess decay iteration.** In this subsection we prove the following finite-volume version of Proposition 5.1.

**Proposition 5.7.** *For every  $\gamma \in [1/2, 1)$ , there exist constants  $C(\gamma, d) \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\delta_0(\gamma, d) \in (0, 1)$  such that, for every  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ ,  $L \geq L_0$ ,  $R \in [C\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^m \geq R$ , and for every  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(B_R)$ , there exists  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that*

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}, \quad \forall r \in [C\mathcal{X}_\delta, R]. \quad (5.17)$$

Moreover, there exists constants  $c(d), C(d) < \infty$  such that we have the implication

$$r \in [C\mathcal{X}_\delta, R], \quad \frac{R}{r} \leq \exp\left(\frac{c}{\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r}\right) \implies \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}. \quad (5.18)$$

Furthermore, for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\delta_1(\alpha, d)$  and  $C(\alpha, d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$ , we have that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\alpha-1} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)} \quad \forall r \in [C\mathcal{X}_\delta, R]. \quad (5.19)$$

*Proof.* Throughout we suppress the dependence of the maximizers  $v_L(\cdot, U, e)$  from (2.31) on the infrared cutoff parameter  $L$ . The parameter  $\delta$  will be a small number chosen at the end of the proof and depend only on  $(\gamma, d)$ , in the case of (5.17), and depend only on  $(\alpha, d)$ , in the case of (5.19).

The strategy is to first prove the following statement by induction in  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , for each  $\gamma \in [1/2, 1)$ : for every  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, m]$  with  $3^n \geq \mathcal{X}_\delta$  and every  $r, R \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, 3^n]$  with  $r \leq R$ ,

$$\inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \|\nabla u - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_n, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R^{-1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{A}_L(B_R). \quad (5.20)$$

We will denote this statement by  $R(m, C, \gamma, \delta)$ .

Taking  $m_0 := \lceil \log_3 \mathcal{X}_\delta \rceil$  so that  $3^{m_0-1} < \mathcal{X}_\delta \leq 3^{m_0}$ , we have that (5.20) is trivially valid (since we only have to check one scale) for any  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  with  $C = 2 \cdot 3^{1+d/2}$  and  $e = 0$ . Here we also use (5.10) to control the ratio of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r$  and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R$ . This establishes that  $R(m_0, 2 \cdot 3^{1+d/2}, \gamma, \delta)$  is valid, which is the base case of the induction.

In Steps 1-4 below, we will prove the following implication: for every exponent  $\gamma \in [1/2, 1)$  and constant  $C_1 \in [1, \infty)$ , there exist parameters  $C_0(d, \gamma) < \infty$  and  $\delta_4(C_1, d, \gamma) \in (0, 1/2]$  such that, for every  $\delta \in (0, \delta_4]$ , if then  $C_1 \geq C_0$  then

$$R(m, C_1, \gamma, \delta) \implies R(m+1, C_1, \gamma, \delta). \quad (5.21)$$

In the proof of the inductive step, we fix a small parameter  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  defined by  $\rho := (8C_1)^{-10}$ .

Once we have proved the implication (5.21), we will obtain by induction that, for  $C_2 := C_0(d, \gamma) \vee (2 \cdot 3^{1+d/2})$ , the statement  $R(m, C_2, \gamma, \delta)$  is valid for every  $m \geq m_0$  and  $\delta \leq \delta_4(C_2, d, \gamma)$ . The proof of the proposition will then be completed in Step 5, where it is shown that the  $e$  in the infimum in (5.20) can be chosen independently of the scale  $r$  at the price of modestly increasing the constant  $C$  on the right side of the estimate.

*Step 1.* Under the assumption that  $R(m, C_1, \gamma, \delta)$  is valid, we show that  $v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)$  is flat on every scale. The claim is that there exists  $\delta_1(C_1, d) \in (0, 1)$  such that, for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$  and  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, 3^{m+1}]$ , there exists  $e_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq \delta^{1/2} \tilde{\omega}_r |e_r|. \quad (5.22)$$

We break the proof of (5.22) into two cases. We first handle the case in which  $r$  is relatively large:  $r \geq \rho 3^{m-2}$ . By Lemma 5.4 we have, for every  $t \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$  and  $s \in (0, t]$ , that

$$s^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, e) - \ell_e - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_s)} \leq C \delta \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{1+d/2} \tilde{\omega}_t |e|. \quad (5.23)$$

Thus, by the triangle inequality, for every  $t \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$ ,

$$t^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, e) - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}t})} \leq C \delta \left(\frac{3^m}{t}\right)^{d/2+1} \tilde{\omega}_t |e|.$$

Denote  $w := v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, e)$  for convenience. Using Lemmas 5.4 and (5.10), we obtain the very crude estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1} \nu \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}t})}^2 &\leq \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1} \nu \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}t})}^2 + \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1} \nu \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}t})}^2 \\ &\leq C \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1} \left(\frac{3^m}{t}\right)^d \left(\nu \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{m+1})}^2 + \nu \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{N_t})}^2\right) \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{3^m}{t}\right)^d |e|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Caccioppoli inequality in Lemma 5.5, using the previous two displays and (5.10), we obtain the more refined estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} &\leq C(t^{-1} \|w - (w)_{B_{\theta^{-2}t}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}t})} + \delta \tilde{\omega}_t \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}t})}) \\ &\leq C \delta \left(\frac{3^m}{t}\right)^{d/2+1} \tilde{\omega}_t |e|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

We next impose a restriction on  $\delta_1(C_1, d) \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$C_{(5.24)} \left(\frac{\rho}{9}\right)^{d/2+1} \delta_1^{1/4} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.25)$$

By the previous two displays, we obtain (5.22) for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta \vee (\rho 3^{m-2}), 3^{m+1}]$ .

We turn to the case in which  $r$  is smaller than  $\rho 3^{m-2}$ . For each  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \rho 3^{m-2})$ , we let  $e_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$  attain the following infimum (with ties broken by lexicographical ordering):

$$\begin{aligned} E_r &:= \inf_{e' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e')\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \\ &= \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

Applying the induction hypothesis  $R(m, C_1, \gamma, \delta)$  we find, for every  $r, t \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \rho 3^{m-2})$  with  $t < r$ , an element  $\tilde{e}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, \tilde{e}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \leq C_1 \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^\gamma E_r. \quad (5.27)$$

By the triangle inequality and a similar computation as in (5.24) we then deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} E_t &\leq \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, \tilde{e}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} (\|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, \tilde{e}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} + \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, \tilde{e}_t) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, \tilde{e}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}) \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^\gamma E_r + \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, \tilde{e}_t) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, \tilde{e}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^\gamma E_r + C \delta \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1} \tilde{\omega}_r |\tilde{e}_t|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

For every  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have, by the triangle inequality and (5.23), for every  $r, t \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, \infty)$  with  $t < r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |q| &\leq Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, q) - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} + Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, q) - \ell_q - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \\ &\leq Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, q) - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} + C\delta \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1} \tilde{\omega}_r |q|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if  $t \geq \rho r$ , using (5.25) and taking  $\delta_1(\rho, d)$  smaller, if necessary, we may reabsorb the last term on the right side. We obtain that, for every  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r, t \in [\theta^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, \rho 3^{m-2})$  with  $\rho r \leq t < r$ ,

$$|q| \leq Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, q) - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})}.$$

Applying the large-scale Poincaré inequality in Lemma 5.6, we obtain that, for every  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r, t \in [\theta^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, \rho 3^{m-2})$  with  $\rho r \leq t < r$ ,

$$|q| \leq C\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, q)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}. \quad (5.29)$$

Applying (5.29) with  $q = e_r - \tilde{e}_t$  and then using the triangle inequality, (5.26) and (5.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |e_r - \tilde{e}_t| &\leq C\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r - \tilde{e}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \\ &\leq C\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} (\|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} + \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, \tilde{e}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}) \\ &\leq C \left( \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1} + C_1 \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^\gamma \right) E_r. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

By applying (5.28) and (5.30) with  $t = \rho r$  and then using the triangle inequality, we obtain that, for every  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, \rho 3^{m-2})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\rho r} &\leq C_1 \rho^\gamma E_r + C\delta \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \tilde{\omega}_r |\tilde{e}_{\rho r}| \\ &\leq C_1 \rho^\gamma E_r + C\delta \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \tilde{\omega}_r |e_r - \tilde{e}_{\rho r}| + C\delta \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \tilde{\omega}_r |e_r| \\ &\leq C_1 \rho^\gamma E_r + C\delta \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \tilde{\omega}_r (\rho^{-(d/2+1)} + C_1 \rho^\gamma) E_r + C\delta \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \tilde{\omega}_r |e_r| \\ &\leq C_1 \rho^\gamma E_r + C\delta \rho^{-(d+2)} \tilde{\omega}_r (1 + C_1) E_r + C\delta \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \tilde{\omega}_r |e_r| \\ &\leq (C_1 \rho^\gamma + C\delta \rho^{-(d+2)} (1 + C_1)) E_r + C\delta \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \tilde{\omega}_r |e_r|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

Using that  $\rho = (8C_1)^{-10}$ , which implies  $C_1 \rho^{1/2} \leq 2^{-10}$  and selecting  $\delta_1(C_1, d)$  small enough that (5.25) holds as well as

$$C_{(5.31)} \delta_1 \rho^{-(d+2)} (1 + C_1) \leq 2^{-10} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{(5.31)} \delta_1^{1/4} \rho^{-(d/2+1)} \leq 2^{-10}$$

we obtain, for every  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, \rho 3^{m-2})$ ,

$$E_{\rho r} \leq 2^{-8} E_r + 2^{-8} \delta^{3/4} \tilde{\omega}_r |e_r|. \quad (5.32)$$

Furthermore, we observe, using the triangle inequality, Lemma 5.4, the large-scale Poincaré in-

equality in Lemma 5.6 and the definition of  $E_r$  in (5.26),

$$\begin{aligned}
|e_r - e_t| &\leq Ct^{-1} \|\ell_{e_r - e_t}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})} \\
&\leq Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r) - \ell_{e_r} - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} + Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, e_t) - \ell_{e_t} - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \\
&\quad + Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r) - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})} \\
&\quad + Ct^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - v(\cdot, \square_{N_t}, e_t) - c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})} \\
&\leq C\delta\tilde{\omega}_t|e_t| + C\delta\left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r| + CE_t + C\left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1}E_r \\
&\leq C\delta\left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_t - e_r| + C\delta\left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1}\tilde{\omega}_t|e_t| + CE_t + C\left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{d/2+1}E_r.
\end{aligned}$$

We apply the previous display with  $t = \rho r$  and use (5.32) to obtain

$$|e_r - e_{\rho r}| \leq C(\delta\rho^{-(d/2+1)} + \delta^{3/4})\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r - e_{\rho r}| + C(\delta\rho^{-(d/2+1)} + \delta^{3/4})\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| + C\rho^{-(d/2+1)}E_r. \quad (5.33)$$

Restricting  $\delta_1(C_1, d)$  again so that

$$C_{(5.33)}\delta^{1/4}\rho^{-(d/2+1)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2C_{(5.33)}\delta^{3/4} \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

which allows us to absorb the first term on the right side, we obtain, for every  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, \rho 3^{m-2})$ ,

$$|e_r - e_{\rho r}| \leq C\delta^{3/4}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| + C\rho^{-(d/2+1)}E_r. \quad (5.34)$$

Requiring also that  $C_{(5.34)}\delta_1^{3/4} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , the triangle inequality then implies that

$$\max\{|e_r|, |e_{\rho r}|\} \leq 2\min\{|e_r|, |e_{\rho r}|\} + C\rho^{-d/2-1}E_r. \quad (5.35)$$

We are now ready to show that (5.22) follows from (5.32) and (5.34), by induction down the scales. We have already established that (5.22) holds for every  $r \geq \rho 3^{m-2}$ .

Let us suppose that (5.22) is valid for every  $r \geq \rho^k 3^{m-2}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\rho^{k+1} 3^{m-2} \geq (\rho\theta)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho}$ . Suppose that  $r \in [\rho^k 3^{m-2}, \rho^{k+1} 3^{m-2})$  and use (5.34) and the induction hypothesis (which says that  $E_r \leq \delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r|$ ) to obtain, using also  $\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r} < 1$ ,

$$E_r \leq \delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r| \leq 4\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| + C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r\rho^{-d/2-1}E_r,$$

which after restricting  $\delta_1$  again, allowing reabsorption of the last term on the right side, leads to

$$E_r \leq 4\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}|.$$

Using this, (5.32) and (5.35) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\rho r} &\leq 2^{-8}E_r + 2^{-8}\delta^{3/4}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r| \\
&\leq 2^{-8}\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| + \delta^{3/4}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| + C\delta^{3/4}\rho^{-(d/2+1)}E_r \\
&\leq 2^{-8}\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| + \delta^{3/4}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| + C\delta^{5/4}\rho^{-(d/2+1)}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}| \\
&\leq \delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_{\rho r}|e_{\rho r}|,
\end{aligned}$$

after further restriction of  $\delta_1$ . This completes the induction and thus the proof of (5.22).

Step 2. Denote, for  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r > 0$ ,

$$P_r[e] := \frac{2(d+2)}{dr^2} \int_{B_r} x v(x, \square_{m+1}, e) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_r[e](x) := P_r[e] \cdot x. \quad (5.36)$$

It is immediate from the above that  $e \mapsto P_r[e]$  and  $e \mapsto \ell_r[e](\cdot)$  are linear maps. Equivalently,  $\ell_r[e]$  is the orthogonal projection of  $v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)$  onto the vector space of affine functions, i.e.,

$$\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \ell_r[e] + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} = \min_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}. \quad (5.37)$$

In this step we show that there exist constants  $C(d) < \infty$  and  $\delta_2(C_1, \nu, d) \in (0, \delta_1]$  such that, if  $\delta \in (0, \delta_2]$  and  $R(m, C_1, \gamma, \delta)$  holds, then for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, 3^{m+1}]$ , we have that

$$r^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \ell_r[e] + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r|P_r[e]|. \quad (5.38)$$

We also show that the linear map  $e \mapsto P_r[e]$  is invertible and bounded for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\delta, 3^{m+1}]$ ; in particular, for every  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, 3^{m+1}]$  and every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we have that

$$r^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, P_r^{-1}[e]) - \ell_e + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C\delta^{1/2}|e|. \quad (5.39)$$

This statement can be considered as a converse to (5.38): the vector space of affine functions can be approximated at every scale by the vector space  $\{v(\cdot, \square_m, e) + c : (e, c) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\}$ .

We start with the proof of (5.38). By Lemma 5.4, (5.22) and the Poincaré inequality in Lemma 5.6, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & r^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \ell_{e_r} + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta r})} \\ & \leq C\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_r^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} + r^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, e_r) - \ell_{e_r} + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \\ & \leq C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.40)$$

By (5.37), the above estimate and the triangle inequality imply that

$$|P_r[e] - e_r| \leq Cr^{-1}\|\ell_r[e] - \ell_{e_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq Cr^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \ell_{e_r} + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r|, \quad (5.41)$$

from which we deduce

$$|e_r| \leq |P_r[e]| + C_{(5.41)}\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r|e_r|.$$

Upon taking  $\delta_2$  so small that  $C_{(5.41)}\delta_2^{1/2} < 1/2$  we may reabsorb the second term on the right in the above display to get

$$|e_r| \leq 2|P_r[e]|. \quad (5.42)$$

We get (5.38) by combining the previous display with (5.40) and (5.37).

We next turn to the proof of (5.39). We first observe that there exists a constant  $c(d) < \infty$  such that for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r, t \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, 3^{m+1}]$ ,

$$1 \leq \frac{r}{t} \leq \exp\left(\frac{c}{\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r}\right) \implies \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{|P_r[e]|}{|P_t[e]|} \leq 2. \quad (5.43)$$

To see this, use (5.38) and the triangle inequality and compute

$$\sup_{t \in [r/2, r]} |P_r[e] - P_t[e]| \leq C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r \left( \sup_{t \in [r/2, r]} |P_t[e]| + |P_r[e]| \right),$$



from which (5.43) follows via an iteration.

From (5.43) we deduce that for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\kappa \in (0, 1/2]$  there exists  $\tilde{\delta}_2(d, \kappa) \in (0, \delta_2]$  such that for all  $\delta < \tilde{\delta}_2$  and  $r, t \in [\mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho}, 3^{m+1}]$  with  $t \leq r$  we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{r}{t} \right)^{-\kappa} \leq \frac{|P_r[e]|}{|P_t[e]|} \leq 2 \left( \frac{r}{t} \right)^{\kappa}. \quad (5.44)$$

For now, we take  $\delta_2 \leq \tilde{\delta}_2(d, 1/2)$ , so that

$$\sup_{t \in [r/2, r]} |P_r[e] - P_t[e]| \leq \frac{1}{2} |P_r[e]| \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{r}{t} \right)^{-1/2} \leq \frac{|P_r[e]|}{|P_t[e]|} \leq 2 \left( \frac{r}{t} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (5.45)$$

Continuing with the proof of (5.39), we next notice that, by (5.12) and the triangle inequality,

$$|P_{3^{m+1}}[e] - e| \leq \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} C 3^{-m} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \ell_e + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{m+1})} \leq C \delta^{1/2} |e| \leq \frac{1}{2} |e| \quad (5.46)$$

provided that  $\delta_2$  is small enough. Consequently, by (5.45) and (5.46) we see that

$$C^{-1} (3^{-m} r)^{1/2} |e| \leq |P_r[e]| \leq C (3^{-m} r)^{-1/2} |e|. \quad (5.47)$$

Hence the linear map  $e \mapsto P_r[e]$  is injective and bounded for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_{\delta}, 3^{m+1}]$ , as claimed. Then (5.39) follows from (5.38).

*Step 3.* We show that there exists constants  $\delta_3(C_1, d) \in (0, \delta_2]$  and  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and every  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1} \mathcal{X}_{\delta}, 3^{m+1}]$  we have that

$$C^{-1} |P_r[q]| \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, q)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C |P_r[q]|. \quad (5.48)$$

Denote  $v := v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, q)$ . For the first inequality, we use (5.38) and the Poincaré inequality to obtain

$$|P_r[q]| \leq C r^{-1} \|v - (v)_{B_{\theta r}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta r})} + C \delta^{1/2} |P_r[q]| \leq C \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} + \frac{1}{2} |P_r[q]|, \quad (5.49)$$

and the last term can be reabsorbed on the left. For the second inequality, we observe first that it follows for  $r \in [\theta^2 3^{m+1}, 3^{m+1}]$  by (5.47) and (5.13). For  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1} \mathcal{X}_{\delta}, \theta^2 3^{m+1}]$ , we use the Caccioppoli estimate in Lemma 5.5, (5.38) and Lemma 5.4 to obtain

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C r^{-1} \|v - (v)_{B_{\theta^{-2}r}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}r})} + C \delta \tilde{\omega}_{\theta^{-2}r} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\theta^{-2}r}^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-2}r})}$$

Taking  $\delta_3$  small enough, we obtain the second inequality by induction.

*Step 4.* In the first three steps, we have shown that the vector space of finite-volume corrected affines defined with respect to  $\square_m$  is close to the vector space of affine functions, in every ball smaller than  $3^m$ . Using this, and the harmonic approximation property obtained in Lemma 5.3, we will perform a  $C^{1,\gamma}$ -type excess decay iteration to obtain the statement  $R(m+1, C_1, \gamma, \delta)$ .

In particular, in this step we show that there exist constants  $C(\gamma, d) < \infty$  and  $\delta_4(C_1, d) \in (0, \delta_3]$  such that, if  $\delta \in (0, \delta_4]$  and  $C_1 \geq C$ , then (5.21) is valid. Assume thus  $\delta \in (0, \delta_4]$ ,  $C_1 \geq C$  and  $R(m, C_1, \gamma, \delta)$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^{m+1} \geq \mathcal{X}_{\delta}$ . Let  $R \in [\mathcal{X}_{\delta}, 3^{m+1}]$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}(B_R)$  be given. We show that, for every  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1} \mathcal{X}_{\delta}, R]$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla u - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{\gamma} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R^{-1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}. \quad (5.50)$$

Showing this will establish (5.21). Let  $e_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be the slope achieving the minimum on the left in the above display. Denote, for each  $t \in [\mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho}, R]$  and for the rest of this step,  $z_t := v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e_t)$ . Applying Lemma 5.3 to  $u - z_t$ , we find a harmonic function  $\bar{w}_t$  in  $B_{\theta t}$  satisfying

$$\|u - z_t - \bar{w}_t\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})} \leq Ct\delta\tilde{\omega}_t\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}. \quad (5.51)$$

By the interior  $C^{1,1}$  estimate for harmonic functions, Lemma 5.6 and the triangle inequality, we have, for every  $s \in (0, \theta t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|\bar{w}_t - \ell_{\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)} + c\|_{L^\infty(B_s)} &\leq C\left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^2 \|\bar{w}_t - (\bar{w}_t)_{B_{\theta t}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})} \\ &\leq C\left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^2 (\|u - z_t - (u - z_t)_{B_t}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})} + t\delta\tilde{\omega}_t\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}) \\ &\leq C\left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^2 t\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

and, similarly,

$$|\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)| \leq \|\nabla\bar{w}_t\|_{L^\infty(B_{\theta t})} \leq Ct^{-1}\|\bar{w}_t - (\bar{w}_t)_{B_{\theta t}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\theta t})} \leq C\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}. \quad (5.53)$$

Let  $\tilde{e}_t := P_t^{-1}[\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)]$  denote the element of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  achieving the minimum in the below display (with ties broken by lexicographical ordering)

$$\inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \ell_{\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)} + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}.$$

We have by (5.39) and (5.53) that  $\tilde{z}_t := v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, \tilde{e}_t)$  satisfies

$$\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|\tilde{z}_t - \ell_{\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)} + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \leq C\delta^{1/2}t|\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)| \leq C\delta^{1/2}t\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}.$$

By the above display, (5.51) and (5.52) we obtain, for  $s \in (0, \theta t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|u - z_t - \tilde{z}_t + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_s)} &\leq \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|\bar{w}_t - \ell_{\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)} + c\|_{L^\infty(B_s)} + \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{d/2} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - z_t - \bar{w}_t + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta t})} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{d/2} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|\tilde{z}_t - \ell_{\nabla\bar{w}_t(0)} + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \\ &\leq Ct\left(\left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^2 + \delta^{1/2}\left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{d/2}\right)\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we choose  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  small enough so that  $C\eta^{1-\gamma} \leq \alpha/2$  with small  $\alpha(d, \nu)$  being determined below. We then require that  $\delta_4$  is so small that  $C\eta^{-d/2}\delta_4^{1/2} \leq \eta^2\alpha/2$ . With these selections and  $s = \theta^{-1}\eta t$ , the above display may be written as

$$(\eta t)^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - z_t - \tilde{z}_t + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-1}\eta t})} \leq \alpha\eta^\gamma\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}.$$

By the Caccioppoli estimate (Lemma 5.5) and the above display, we deduce, with small enough  $\alpha$  and  $\delta_4$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\eta t}^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t - \tilde{z}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\eta t})} \\ &\leq C(\eta t)^{-1} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - z_t - \tilde{z}_t + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-1}\eta t})} + C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t - \tilde{z}_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-1}\eta t})} \\ &\leq C(\alpha\eta^\gamma + \delta^{1/2}\eta^{-d/2})\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} + C\delta^{1/2}\eta^{-d/2}\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla\tilde{z}_t\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4}\eta^\gamma\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} + C\delta^{1/2}\eta^{-d/2}\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_t^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla\tilde{z}_t\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

By (5.48), the definitions of  $\tilde{e}_t$ ,  $\tilde{z}_t$  and (5.53) we have that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla \tilde{z}_t\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \leq C |P_t[\tilde{e}_t]| = C |\nabla \bar{w}_t(0)| \leq C \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla(u - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}.$$

By the above two displays and linearity, we have that for small enough  $\delta_4$  and every  $t \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, R]$

$$\inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{\eta t}^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\eta t})} \leq \frac{1}{2} \eta^\gamma \inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_t^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)}.$$

This implies (5.50) after a standard iteration argument.

*Step 5.* In this last step we upgrade the statement of (5.50) by removing the dependence of the slope  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  on the domain  $B_r$ . This will yield (5.17).

Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\mathcal{X}_\delta \leq 3^{m+1}$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathcal{X}_\delta \leq R \leq 3^{m+1}$ . For given  $r \in [(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta, R]$ , let  $e_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be the minimizer on the left in (5.20), and denote  $z_r := v(\cdot, \square_m, e_r)$ . Fix  $\tilde{\gamma} \in [1/2, 1)$ , let  $\kappa = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \tilde{\gamma})$  and  $\gamma' = \tilde{\gamma} + \kappa$ ,  $\gamma'' = \tilde{\gamma} + 2\kappa$ . Also select  $\delta < \delta_5(\tilde{\gamma}, d) \in (0, \delta_4 \wedge \delta_2(d, \kappa))$  so that (5.44) is valid with  $\kappa$  and (5.50) is valid with  $\gamma''$ .

We next note that by iterating Lemma 4.7 we have that there exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that for every  $(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta < r \leq R$ ,

$$C^{-1} \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^{-\kappa} \leq \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_r}{\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_R} \leq C \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\kappa. \quad (5.55)$$

By the above display, (5.50) and the triangle inequality we have for every  $(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta < s \leq 1/2R$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in [s, 2s]} \|\nabla(z_s - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_s)} \leq C \left(\frac{s}{R}\right)^{\gamma'} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}.$$

For  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta < s < t \leq R$ , we apply (5.44) and (5.48) to get

$$C^{-1} \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{-\kappa} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_s)} \leq \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_t)} \leq C \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^\kappa \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_s)}.$$

We deduce from the above two displays that, for every  $s, r \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta < s < r/2 < r \leq R$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [s, 2s]} \|\nabla(z_s - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} &\leq C \left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^\kappa \sup_{t \in [s, 2s]} \|\nabla(z_s - z_t)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_s)} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^\kappa \left(\frac{s}{R}\right)^{\gamma'} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)} \leq C \left(\frac{s}{r}\right)^\kappa \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}. \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $e := e_{(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta}$  and telescoping the above display yields for every  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $(\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta < r \leq R$ ,

$$\|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e_r) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}. \quad (5.56)$$

Therefore, by (5.20) and (5.55), the above estimate and the triangle inequality, we obtain (5.17) (for a slightly smaller  $\gamma$ ).

*Step 6.* We show how the above estimates yield (5.18) and (5.19). Fix  $r \geq (\theta\rho)^{-1}\mathcal{X}_\delta$  with  $\frac{R}{r} \leq \exp(c_{(5.43)} r(\delta^{1/2} \tilde{\omega}_r)^{-1})$ . Using (5.17) we find  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}. \quad (5.57)$$

In particular, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}.$$

Hence, by (5.48), we have

$$|P_R[e]| \leq C\nu^{1/2}\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R^{-1/2}\|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}.$$

Using again (5.48), (5.43) and the above display yields

$$\nu^{1/2}\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2}\|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C|P_r[e]| \leq C|P_R[e]| \leq C\nu^{1/2}\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R^{-1/2}\|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}.$$

Combining the above display with (5.55) and (5.57) yields (5.18). A similar computation together with (5.44), taking  $\kappa$  small depending on  $\alpha$ , yields (5.19).  $\square$

We record an estimate which follows from the above proof.

**Lemma 5.8.** *There exist  $C(d) < \infty$  and  $\delta_0(\nu, d) \in (0, 1)$  such that, for every  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ ,  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^m > 3^n \geq C\mathcal{X}_\delta$ ,  $L \geq L_0$  and  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\inf_{e' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e')\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \leq C\delta^{1/4}\omega_n\|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}. \quad (5.58)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\delta_0$  be as in Proposition 5.7. By (5.22) and (5.48), there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that for all  $r \in [C\mathcal{X}_\delta, 3^m]$ , there is a linear map  $e \mapsto H_{m,r}[e]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_{N_r}, H_{m,r}[e])\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{N_r})} &\leq C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r|H_{m,r}[e]| \\ &\leq C\delta^{1/2}\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2}\tilde{\omega}_r\|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, H_{m,r}[e])\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{N_r})}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 5.7 shows that the map  $H_{m,r}$  is invertible.

Next, we use (2.21), (2.33), subadditivity of  $J$ , and the definition of the minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}_{\delta,\rho}$  to obtain that for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu\|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_{n+k}, e) - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2 \\ &\leq C3^{dk} \sum_{z \in 3^n\mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{n+k}} (J_L(z + \square_n, 0, \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_n)e) - J_L(\square_{n+k}, 0, \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_{n+k}e))) \\ &= C3^{dk} \sum_{z \in 3^n\mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{n+k}} e \cdot (\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_{n+k}))e \\ &\leq C3^{dk}\delta^{1/2}n^{-\rho}e \cdot \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_n)e = C3^{dk}\delta^{1/2}n^{-\rho}\nu\|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.59)$$

By combining the previous two displays, we obtain (5.58).  $\square$

**5.3. Infinite volume corrected affines.** The statement of Proposition 5.7 is very close to the large-scale  $C^{1,\gamma}$  estimate claimed in (5.6). The difference is that (5.17) approximates solutions with finite-volume corrected affines (defined on an arbitrarily larger scale) rather than the elements of the vector space  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . To obtain the statement of the theorem, we need to use the estimate (5.17), and its proofs, to obtain the statement of the Liouville theorem—that is, to characterize the elements of  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  as limits of the finite-volume corrected affines. We will deduce that this linear space has dimension  $d + 1$  and be able to show that the estimates (5.6) and (5.17) are essentially equivalent.

Proposition 5.1 is stated for solutions to the equation without an infrared cutoff. Accordingly, in the proof, we use the fact that none of the estimates in the previous subsections degenerate with  $L$  and therefore we may apply them after sending  $L \rightarrow \infty$  to obtain the statements for solutions of the equation without cutoff.

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* In Steps 1–3 we take limits of the “local corrected affines,” that is, the minimizers  $v(\cdot, \square_m, e)$  to construct “global corrected affines”,  $\phi_e$  which span  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}$ . Since global corrected affines are close to local ones, we then deduce in Steps 4–5 the statements of Theorem D.

*Step 1.* We collect some parameters and preliminary estimates from the proof of Proposition 5.7. To give ourselves some room, define  $\kappa = \frac{1}{8}(1-\gamma)$ ,  $\gamma' := \gamma + \kappa$  and  $\gamma'' = \gamma' + \kappa$ . Also take  $s = \frac{1}{2}$ . We let  $\delta := \delta(\nu, \rho, \gamma'', d) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  be the minimum of  $\delta_0$  in the statement of Proposition 5.7,  $\tilde{\delta}_2(C_1, \nu, d, \kappa)$  from (5.44) and  $\tilde{\delta}_0(\rho, \gamma, d) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  to be selected below. Select the minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}_\gamma := C_{(5.17)}\mathcal{X}_\delta$ .

Fix  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^m \geq \mathcal{X}_\gamma$ . Observe that by (5.24), (5.10) and (5.59) we have

$$\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^m})} \leq C\delta|e|. \quad (5.60)$$

Define the linear map  $e' \mapsto T_m[e'] \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by prescribing, for each unit vector  $e_i$ , (with ties broken by lexicographical ordering)

$$\|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e_i) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, T_m[e_i] - e_i)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\mathcal{X}_\delta})} = \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e_i) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, q)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\mathcal{X}_\delta})}.$$

Observe that, by (5.56) and (5.60), we have, for every  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, 3^m]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, T_m[e])\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \\ &= \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \left( \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, T_m[e] - e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \right) \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1} \delta \left( \frac{r}{3^m} \right)^{\gamma''} |e|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.61)$$

Consequently, by (5.29), (5.60), the previous display and the triangle inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |T_m[e] - e| & \leq C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, T_m[e] - e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^m})} \\ & \leq C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^m})} \\ & \quad + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e) - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_{m+1}, T_m[e])\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^m})} \leq \delta^{1/2}|e|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.62)$$

where in the last inequality we decreased  $\delta$  if needed, to absorb constants. Note that this shows that the linear map  $e' \mapsto T_m[e']$  is close to the identity.

*Step 2.* In this step a subspace of  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is constructed using the linear map  $e' \mapsto T_m[e']$  from Step 1. (Later we will show this subspace is actually  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , modulo constant functions.) Fix  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $n \geq N_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma}$  and consider the sequence  $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  recursively defined by

$$\begin{cases} e_n := e, \\ e_k := T_{k-1}[e_{k-1}], \quad \text{if } k > n. \end{cases}$$

(The parameter  $n$  will be shown to be superfluous at the end of this step.) Observe that by iterating (5.62) together with the triangle inequality we have that

$$|e_k| \leq (1 + \delta^{1/2})^{k-n} |e| \quad \forall k \geq n.$$

Using this and denoting  $v_k[n, e] := v(\cdot, \square_k, e_k) - (v(\cdot, \square_k, e_k))_{\square_k}$  we see that by (5.61) for each  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, 3^k]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v_{k+1}[n, e] - \nabla v_k[n, e]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} & \leq C\nu^{-1} \delta \left( \frac{r}{3^k} \right)^{\gamma''} |e_k| \\ & \leq C\nu^{-1} \delta (1 + \delta^{1/2})^{k-n} \left( \frac{r}{3^k} \right)^{\gamma''} |e|. \end{aligned}$$

This implies, upon taking  $\tilde{\delta}_0(\gamma, \nu)$  sufficiently small,

$$\|\nabla v_{k+1}[n, e] - \nabla v_k[n, e]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq \delta^{1/2} \left(\frac{r}{3^k}\right)^{\gamma''} |e| \quad \forall r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, 3^k]. \quad (5.63)$$

Consequently, we have the existence of the limit (locally in  $H^1$ ) of

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v_k[n, e] = \phi_e[n]$$

and the map  $e' \mapsto \phi_{e'}[n]$  is linear. We also deduce from (5.63) that

$$\|\nabla \phi_e[n] - \nabla v_k[n, e]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \delta^{1/2} \left(\frac{r}{3^k}\right)^{\gamma''} |e| \quad \forall r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, 3^k]. \quad (5.64)$$

Moreover, by (5.44) and (5.48) we have, for every  $k \geq n$

$$\|\nabla v_k[n, e]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \geq C \left(\frac{r}{3^k}\right)^\kappa \|\nabla v_k\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^k})} \quad \forall r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, 3^k].$$

By combining the above display with (5.64) and the triangle inequality, we have that, for every  $k \geq n$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \phi_e[n]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^k})} &\leq \|\nabla v_k[n, e]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^k})} + \|\nabla \phi_e - \nabla v_k[n, e]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{3^k})} \\ &\leq C 3^{\kappa k} \|\nabla v_k[n, e]\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\mathcal{X}_\delta})} + |e|, \end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce  $\phi_e[n] \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Denote by  $\mathcal{A}^1[n]$  the linear subspace of  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  spanned by  $\phi_e[n]$  and the constant functions. Observe that the dimension of  $\mathcal{A}^1[n]$  is  $d + 1$  and for every  $n' \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n' \geq N_{\mathcal{X}_\gamma}$  we have that  $\mathcal{A}^1[n] = \mathcal{A}^1[n']$ . Indeed, by Steps 1–3 of the proof of Proposition 5.7, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  above the minimal scale there is an invertible linear map from the vector space of finite-volume corrected affines in  $\square_m$  to the vector space of affines in  $\square_m$ . Consequently, since the map  $T_k$  is invertible, (5.64) implies the infinite-volume corrected affines also have that property. This shows that the dimension of  $\mathcal{A}^1[n]$  is at least  $d + 1$  and it cannot be more since it is the image of a linear map from a space of dimension  $d + 1$ . From this we also deduce that  $\mathcal{A}^1[n]$  is independent of  $n$ . We henceforth write  $\mathcal{A}^1$  and  $\phi_e$  instead of  $\mathcal{A}^1[n]$  and  $\phi_e[n]$ .

*Step 3.* Our goal now is to show that  $\mathcal{A}^1$  coincides with  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . In order to do so, in this step we give a growth rate for the gradient term on the right in (5.17). To be specific, in this step we show that if  $u \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , then for every  $\rho_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , there exists  $R_0(d, \nu, u, \rho_0) \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, \infty)$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R^{-1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)} \leq \rho_0 R^\gamma \quad \forall R \geq R_0. \quad (5.65)$$

First observe that by Lemma 5.5 we have, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^n \geq \mathcal{X}_\gamma$

$$\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2 \leq C \nu^{-1} 3^{-2n} \|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{n+1})}^2 + C \delta \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+1}^{-1} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{n+1})}^2,$$

and so, by iteration,

$$\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2 \leq C \nu^{-1} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \delta^{k-n} 3^{-2k} \|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}^2.$$

Fix  $\rho_1(\rho_0, \nu) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  to be determined below. Since  $u \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2 \leq \rho_1 3^{-2(1+\gamma)n} \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

Consequently, by the above two displays, for  $\tilde{\delta}_0(d)$  sufficiently small we have that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq n_0$  and  $3^n \geq \mathcal{X}_\gamma$

$$\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \delta^{k-n} 3^{-2k} \|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}^2 \leq C\nu^{-1} \rho_1 \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \delta^{k-n} 3^{-2k} 3^{2(1+\gamma)k} \leq C\nu^{-1} \rho_1 3^{2\gamma n}.$$

This implies (5.65) for  $\rho_1$  small enough.

*Step 4.* In this step we show that  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathcal{A}^1$  and then deduce that  $\dim \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d) = d + 1$  on an event of full  $\mathbb{P}$ -probability. Fix  $u \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Let  $r_0 \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, \infty)$  and  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1)$  be given and choose  $R_0 > 0$  as in (5.65) depending on  $\rho_0$ . Using (4.40), we select  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large that

$$3^n \geq R_0 \vee r_0 \quad \text{and} \quad 3^{-n\kappa} r_0^{\gamma''} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{1/2} < 1. \quad (5.66)$$

By Proposition 5.7, there exists  $\tilde{e}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that for all  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, 3^n]$

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_n, \tilde{e}_n)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{3^n}\right)^{\gamma''} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \leq C\rho_0 r^{\gamma''} 3^{-2n\kappa} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{1/2}, \quad (5.67)$$

with the latter inequality following by (5.65). By the triangle inequality, we deduce that

$$\|\nabla v(\cdot, \square_n, \tilde{e}_n)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \leq C\rho_0 3^{n\gamma} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{1/2}.$$

From the above display, (5.64) and (5.29), we deduce that, for all  $r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, 3^n]$ ,

$$\|\nabla \phi_{\tilde{e}_n} - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, \tilde{e}_n)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C\delta^{1/2} \left(\frac{r}{3^n}\right)^{\gamma''} |\tilde{e}_n| \leq C\rho_0 \delta^{1/2} \left(\frac{r}{3^n}\right)^{\gamma''} 3^{n\gamma}.$$

Combining the above display and (5.67) together with (5.66) yields

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla \phi_{\tilde{e}_n}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{r_0})} \leq C\rho_0. \quad (5.68)$$

Since  $\rho_0$  and  $r_0$  were arbitrary, this shows  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^1$ . As  $\mathcal{A}^1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{1+\kappa} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}$ , this implies  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathcal{A}^1$ . Consequently, by the paragraph at the end of Step 2, the dimension of  $\mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}$  is  $d + 1$ .

*Step 5.* We conclude with the proofs of (5.5) and (5.6). Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^{1+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathcal{A}^1 = \mathcal{A}^{1+\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $r \geq \mathcal{X}_\gamma$ . By Proposition 5.7, since  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , for all  $R \geq r$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^m \geq R$ , we have the existence of  $e_R \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\|\nabla \phi - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e_R)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^{-1}r})} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\gamma'} \|\nabla \phi\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}.$$

Combining this with (5.16) and then (5.65) with  $\kappa$  in place of  $\gamma$  and  $\rho_0 = 1$ , we obtain, for sufficiently large  $R$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} r^{-1} \|\phi - v(\cdot, \square_m, e_R) + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} &\leq C \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \left(\frac{r}{\theta^2 R}\right)^{\gamma'} \|\nabla \phi\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\theta^2 R})} \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R^{1/2} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by (5.12), if  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  is chosen to be the smallest integer with  $3^m \geq R$ ,

$$\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} r^{-1} \|v(\cdot, \square_m, e_R) - \ell_{e_R} + c\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C\delta \tilde{\omega}_r |e_R|.$$

Next, select  $R$  possibly larger, depending on  $\phi$  so that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_R^{1/2} \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_r^{-1/2} \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \leq \frac{1}{4} \tilde{\omega}_r \|\phi - (\phi)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}.$$

Combining the above three displays and the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\|\phi - \ell_{e_R} - (\phi)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq \frac{1}{4} \tilde{\omega}_r \|\phi - (\phi)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} + C\delta \tilde{\omega}_r \|\ell_{e_R}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}.$$

After partially reabsorbing the first term on the right side, we obtain

$$\|\phi - \ell_{e_R} - (\phi)_{B_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C\tilde{\omega}_r \|\ell_{e_R}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)}.$$

This is (5.5).

To prove (5.6), we first observe that the estimate (5.17) is valid for  $\phi_e[m]$  in place of  $v(\cdot, \square_m, e)$  in Proposition 5.7. Let  $R \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, \infty)$  and let  $u \in \mathcal{A}(B_R)$ . By Proposition 5.7, we have the existence of  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)}, \quad \forall r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, R].$$

By (5.64), (5.29), the above display and the triangle inequality we have

$$\|\nabla \phi_e[m] - \nabla v(\cdot, \square_m, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R)} \quad \forall r \in [\mathcal{X}_\gamma, R]. \quad (5.69)$$

The above two displays and the triangle inequality imply (5.6).  $\square$

## 6. Coarse-graining and improved homogenization estimates

In this section, we use the results in Section 5 to improve the quenched homogenization estimate in Proposition 4.1. This improved estimate verifies Assumption H for a smaller  $\omega_m$  than that given in Remark 5.2. In particular, here we show that the factor of  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^{\sigma/4}$  in (5.8) can be improved to  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^{\sigma/2}$ . This is essentially sharp, as we cannot expect the quantity  $|\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_L^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_L)|$ , which represents this difference, to be better than  $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_L^{-1}$ . Indeed, it is easy to see that a resampling of  $\mathbf{j}_k$  with  $k \in [L-10, L]$  will change the values of  $\mathfrak{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)$  and  $\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m)$  by at least  $O(1)$ . As mentioned in the introduction, we need this improved bound to proceed—our estimates will otherwise not be strong enough to obtain the sharp recurrence relation stated below in Proposition 7.2.

**Proposition 6.1.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  and, for every  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\delta, s \in (0, 1)$  and  $M \in [10^4 d, \infty)$ , a minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho}}(\hat{L}_1) \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{L}_1 := L_0(C\rho^{-4}(1-2\rho)^{-4}\delta^{-4}s^{-4}M^4, 1 - \frac{1}{4}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu) \quad (6.1)$$

*such that, with  $h := \lceil CMs^{-1} \log((\nu \wedge \delta)^{-1}m) \rceil$ , and for every  $L, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $3^m \geq \mathcal{X}$ ,  $m, L \geq \hat{L}_1$  and  $m - h \leq n \leq m$ , we have the estimate*

$$\max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{L \wedge (m+h)} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L \wedge (m+h)})_{\square_m}) \leq \begin{cases} \delta \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m, & m \leq L + h, \\ \delta m^{-100}, & m > L + h. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$



Recall that  $L_0(M, \alpha, c_*, \nu)$  has been defined in (4.4), and it blows up as  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$  or  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore the lower bound  $L_1$  blows up either when  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  (corresponding to the optimal *size* estimate) or  $\rho \rightarrow 1/2$  (corresponding to the optimal *stochastic integrability* estimate).

Before proceeding with the proof of Proposition 6.1, we observe it gives us the validity of Assumption H with any choice of  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  and  $s \in (0, 1]$  and with parameters  $C = 10^4 dC_{(6.1)}$ ,  $L_0 = L_1$  as in the statement of the proposition and with  $\omega_m$  defined as

$$\omega_m := \begin{cases} \sup_{k \geq m} \bar{s}_k^{-1} k^\sigma \log k, & m \leq L + h, \\ m^{-100}, & m > L + h. \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

Consequently, the results of Section 5 immediately lead to Theorem D and nearly Theorem C. In particular, at this point, we may deduce Theorem C with right-hand side  $f = 0$ , the case  $f \neq 0$  will be deferred to right below the proof of Proposition 8.12 below.

*Proof of Theorem D assuming Proposition 6.1.* By the discussion preceding this proof, we have Assumption H with  $\omega_m$  given by (6.3). Hence, we have Proposition 5.1 and thus parts 1 and 3 of Theorem D. To see that (5.5) implies (1.31) we use (3.2) to bound

$$\omega_m \leq C m^{-1/2 + \sigma/2} \log^{\frac{13}{4} + 1} (\nu^{-1} m) c_*^{-1/2}.$$

By decreasing  $\sigma$  slightly and allowing the constant  $C$  to depend on  $\nu$  and  $c_*$  we may rewrite this as

$$\tilde{\omega}_r \leq C (\log r)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\sigma)},$$

which bounds the right side of (5.5) by the right of (1.31). This concludes the proof.  $\square$

In this section we assume, for every  $\delta, \rho \in (0, 1)$  the validity of Assumption H with minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho} := \mathcal{X}$ , lower bound  $\hat{L}_0 := L_0$ . We also let  $\mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho}(z)$  denote the random variable  $\mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho}$  for the environment centered at  $z$ . Recall that Assumption H holds with  $\hat{L}_0 := L_0(2C^2\delta^{-1}, 1/2, c_*, \nu)$  and the parameters from Remark 5.2 with  $s := 1/2$ .

Under this assumption, all of the results in Section 5 become available. Also, after proving Proposition 6.1 we may use the results of this section with the improved  $\omega_m$  given in (6.3).

**6.1. Coarse-graining estimates in weak norms.** We use the following coarse-graining inequality below: by [AK24a, (5.64)] we have that, for every  $L, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(\square_n)$ ,

$$\left| \int_{\square_n} (\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_n) - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right| \leq 2^{1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(\square_n)|^{1/2}. \quad (6.4)$$

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$ ,  $p \in [1, 2)$  and  $t \in (0, 1]$ . There exists a constant  $C(p, d) \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\delta_0(d)$  such that, for every  $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ ,  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ , and scales  $L, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with*

$$n, L \geq \hat{L}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad n \leq m - Ct^{-1} \log(\nu^{-1} m), \quad (6.5)$$

we have, for every  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(\square_m) \setminus \mathbb{R}$ , the estimate

$$\frac{3^{-tm} \|(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u\|_{\underline{W}^{-t,p}(\square_m)}}{\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}} \leq C \delta^{1/\delta} \omega_n \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{2-p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2p}} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(n^{-400}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{4\rho\sigma}}((C\hat{L}_0 n^{-1})^{1/\sigma - 4\rho} \log^{1/4}(\nu^{-1} n)). \quad (6.6)$$

To prove this, we require the following improvement of (6.4).

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$ . There exist constants  $C(\gamma, d) \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\delta_0(\gamma, d) \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  such that, for every  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ , and scales  $L, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \leq m$  and  $L \geq \hat{L}_0$  and solution  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(\square_m)$ , we have*

$$\left| \int_{\square_n} (\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_n) - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right| \leq |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(\square_n)|^{1/2} \left( C 3^{-\gamma(m-n)} + \delta^{1/8} \omega_n + 2^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}_{\delta,\rho} > 3^n\}} \right) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}. \quad (6.7)$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of [AK24a, Lemma 6.8]. In the case  $3^n \leq \mathcal{X}_{\delta,\rho}$ , the inequality (6.4) already implies (6.7). We continue therefore under the assumption that  $3^n \geq \mathcal{X}_{\delta,\rho}$ . We assume that  $\delta_0(\gamma, d)$  is small enough so that Proposition 5.7 is applicable.

By (2.32), the coarse-graining inequality (6.4) is exact for  $v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e)$ ; in fact, for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\square_n} \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e) = e, \\ \int_{\square_n} \mathbf{a}_L \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e) = \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_n) e. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, we deduce from (6.4) that, for every  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(\square_n)$ ,

$$\left| \int_{\square_n} (\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_n) - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right| \leq 2 |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(\square_n)|^{1/2} \inf_{e \in \mathbb{R}^d} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}. \quad (6.8)$$

If  $u \in \mathcal{A}_L(\square_m)$ , then, since  $3^n \geq \mathcal{X}_{\delta,\rho}$ , we may apply Proposition 5.7 to find  $e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \leq C(\gamma, d) 3^{-\gamma(m-n)} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}. \quad (6.9)$$

We next apply Lemma 5.8 to obtain  $e_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1) - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e_2)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \leq C \delta^{1/4} \omega_n \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}. \quad (6.10)$$

Assume  $\delta_0 \leq C_{(6.10)}^{-8}$ , so that  $\delta \leq \delta_0$  implies  $C_{(6.10)} \delta^{1/8} \leq 1$ . By the triangle inequality and the above estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e_2)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \\ & \leq \|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} + \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1) - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_n, e_2)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \\ & \leq \|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} + C \delta^{1/4} \omega_n \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \\ & \leq 2 \|\nabla u - \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e_1)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} + \delta^{1/8} \omega_n \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \\ & \leq C 3^{-\gamma(m-n)} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \delta^{1/8} \omega_n \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (6.8) we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\square_n} (\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_n) - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right| \leq |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(\square_n)|^{1/2} \left( C 3^{-\gamma(m-n)} + \delta^{1/8} \omega_n \right) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We now prove Proposition 6.2.

*Proof of Proposition 6.2.* Assume that, for a large constant  $K(d)$  to be fixed,

$$n \leq m - K(t \wedge (p-2))^{-1} \log(\nu^{-1}m).$$

We select  $\gamma = 1/2$ ,  $\delta := \delta_0(1/2, d)$  as in Lemma 6.3, and for convenience write  $\mathcal{X}(z) := \mathcal{X}_{\delta, \rho}(z)$ . By scaling we may also assume without loss of generality that  $\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq 1$ .

*Step 1.* We show that there exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that

$$3^{-ptm} \|(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u\|_{\underline{W}^{-t,p}(\square_m)}^p \leq C \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/p}}(m^{-1000p}). \quad (6.11)$$

To see this, we use [AK24b, Lemma A.2] and compute

$$3^{-ptm} \|(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u\|_{\underline{W}^{-t,p}(\square_m)}^p \leq C \sum_{k=-\infty}^m t 3^{pt(k-m)} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p. \quad (6.12)$$

On the one hand, by Jensen's inequality, we have for  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [n, m]$  that

$$\left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right| \leq \sum_{z' \in z+3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_k} \left| \int_{z'+\square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|$$

and, thus,

$$\sum_{k=n}^m t 3^{pt(k-m)} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \leq C \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p. \quad (6.13)$$

On the other hand, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $k \leq n$ , by (6.4) and (2.28) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,k}) \nabla u \right| + 2 |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z+\square_k)|^{1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_k)} \\ & \leq \left( |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z+\square_k)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z+\square_n) - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z+\square_k))| + 2 |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z+\square_k)|^{1/2} \right) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_k)} \\ & \leq \left( |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z+\square_k)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z+\square_n) - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z+\square_k))| + 2 |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z+\square_k)|^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

where in the last inequality we used the assumption  $\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq 1$ . Possibly localizing using Lemma 2.9 and using the ellipticity estimates in Lemmas 2.6, 2.7 then yield

$$\sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/p}}((C\nu^{-1}m)^p).$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^n t 3^{pt(k-m)} \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/p}}((C\nu^{-1}m)^p 3^{-pt(m-n)}).$$

Combining the above display with (6.12) and (6.13) and possibly increasing  $K$  gives us (6.11).

*Step 2.* In this step we show that there is a constant  $C(p, d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$\left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z + \square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) > 3^n\}} \right)^{1/p} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{4\rho\sigma}}((C\hat{L}_0 n^{-1})^{1/\sigma - 4\rho} \log^{1/4}(\nu^{-1}n)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(n^{-400}). \quad (6.15)$$

By (6.4), Hölder's inequality and the normalization  $\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq 1$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z + \square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) > 3^n\}} \right)^{1/p} \\ & \leq C \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{\frac{2p}{2-p}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{4p}} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) > 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{4p}}. \end{aligned}$$

The stochastic integrability of the “bad” event  $\{\mathcal{X}(z) > 3^n\}$  is controlled by Proposition 4.1 and (2.44)

$$\left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) > 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{4p}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{4\rho\sigma}}((C\hat{L}_0 n^{-1})^{1/\sigma}) \quad \forall \sigma \in (0, \infty). \quad (6.16)$$

By Proposition 4.6 with parameter  $\alpha = 1/2$  and (2.82) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{\frac{2p}{2-p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) > 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{4p}} \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_4}(C \log^{1/4}(\nu^{-1}n)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_n^{-1/2} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}n)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(n^{-400}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

Combining the above two displays, using also

$$n \geq \hat{L}_0 \implies \bar{\mathbf{s}}_n^{-1} \log(\nu^{-1}n) \leq 1,$$

we get by (2.41) the estimate, for every  $\sigma \in (0, 2]$  and  $\beta := \frac{4\rho\sigma}{1+4\rho\sigma}$ ,

$$\left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) > 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2p}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\beta}((C\hat{L}_0^2 n^{-1})^{1/\sigma} \log^{1/4}(\nu^{-1}n)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(n^{-400}).$$

Selecting  $\beta = 4\rho\sigma$  completes the proof of (6.15).

*Step 3.* In this step we conclude by showing

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z + \square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \right)^{1/p} \\ & \leq C \delta^{1/8} \omega_n \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2p}} + m^{-2000}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

We select another parameter  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < k < m$  representing a mesoscale between  $n$  and  $m$ , to be selected below, and we split  $3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m$  into a set of “interior points” and “boundary layer points,” denoted by

$$I := \{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m : z + \square_k \subseteq \square_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad B := (3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m) \setminus I.$$

We first compute the average over subcubes in  $B$ . Using (6.4), the assumption  $\nu^{1/2}\|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq 1$ , Hölder's inequality and the definition of  $\mathcal{X}(z)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3^{-d(m-n)} \sum_{z \in B} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \\
& \leq 2^p 3^{-d(m-n)} \nu^{p/2} \sum_{z \in B} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}^p |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{p/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \\
& \leq (2\delta\omega_n \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge n}^{-1/2})^p 3^{-d(m-n)} \nu^{p/2} \sum_{z \in B} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}^p \\
& \leq (2\delta\omega_n \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{L \wedge n}^{-1/2})^p 3^{-\frac{2-p}{2}(m-k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $z \in I$ , we use Lemma 6.3 with  $\square_m$  replaced by  $z + \square_k$  and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right| \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \\
& \leq C |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \left( 3^{-\frac{1}{2}(k-n)} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_k)} + \delta^{1/8} \omega_n \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing the previous display over  $z \in I$  and applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3^{-d(m-n)} \sum_{z \in I} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \\
& \leq C \left( 3^{-\frac{1}{2}(k-n)} + \delta^{1/8} \omega_n \right)^p \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \left( 3^{-\frac{1}{2}(k-n)} n^2 \right)^p + C \left( \delta^{1/8} \omega_n \right)^p \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We select  $k := \frac{1}{2}((2-p)m + n)$  so that

$$3^{-\frac{1}{2}(k-n)} + 3^{-\frac{p-2}{2}(m-k)} \leq 2 \cdot 3^{-\frac{2-p}{4}(m-n)} \leq m^{-3000}$$

and combine the above to get (6.18).

Combining (6.11), (6.15) and (6.18) completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

**6.2. Optimal homogenization estimates.** In this subsection, we prove an optimal estimate on the difference of the coarse-grained matrices and the deterministic matrices  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L$ . The estimate (6.20) below is an improvement of the one proved in Proposition 4.6, since the leading order error is of size  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}$ , up to logarithmic factors, which is to be compared with logarithmic error in (4.36). In particular, this estimate implies that the fluctuations of the matrices  $\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_L(\square_m)$  and  $\mathbf{k}_L(\square_m)$  are at most of order  $(L-m)^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}L) + \log(\nu^{-1}L)$ . This is optimal, up to the logarithmic factors, since these matrices have fluctuations at least of order  $(L-m)^{1/2}$ , since this is the expected change we get from resampling the fields  $\{\mathbf{j}_k\}_{m \leq k \leq L}$ .

**Proposition 6.4** (Optimal homogenization estimates). *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\theta \in (0, 1/8)$ ,  $M \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\sigma \in (0, 1]$  and  $L, m \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying*

$$m, L \geq L_0(C\theta^{-1}M, 1 - \theta/2, c_*, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq L - M \log^3(\nu^{-1}L), \quad (6.19)$$

we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(\square_m)| + |(\mathbf{k}_L^t \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_L)(\square_m)| + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)|^2 \\
& \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+ \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-3}) \\
& \quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}((C\hat{L}_0 m^{-1})^{(1-\theta)(1/\sigma-2)} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}m)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(m^{-400}). \tag{6.20}
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof is based on the argument in [AK24a, Section 6.2]. Let  $\delta := \delta_0(1/2, d)$ , with  $\delta_0$  as in the statement of Lemma 6.3. Fix  $\theta \in (0, 1/8)$  and select

$$\gamma := 1/2, \quad \rho := \frac{1-\theta}{4}, \quad m, L \geq L_1 := L_0(K\theta^{-1}M, 1-\theta/2, c_*, \nu),$$

where  $K(d) \geq 1$  is a constant to be determined below. Observe that  $L_1 \geq \hat{L}_0$ , where  $\hat{L}_0$  is as in the previous subsection.

By [AK24a, Lemma 6.7], we have that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_L(\square_m, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) & \leq \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| e \cdot \int_{z + \square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) \right| \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}^t(z + \square_n))e|^2. \tag{6.21}
\end{aligned}$$

We start by estimating the first expression in the above display. By Young's inequality, (6.15), (6.18) (with  $p = 1$ ), and the fact

$$\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{s}_L(z + \square_n) - \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_n)| \leq \sup_{|e| \leq 1} J(z + \square_n, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z + \square_n} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) \right| \\
& \leq C\delta^{1/4} \omega_n^2 \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sup_{|e| \leq 1} J(z + \square_n, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} + \frac{\nu}{4} \|\nabla v_L(\cdot, \square_m, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 \\
& \quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho\sigma}}((C\hat{L}_0 n^{-1})^{2/\sigma-8\rho} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}n)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(m^{-700}).
\end{aligned}$$

We use (2.21) to reabsorb the second term on the right above. To estimate the second term on the right side of (6.21) we combine Proposition 4.10 and (4.52) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}^t(z + \square_n))|^2 \\
& \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+ \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-3}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(m^{-498}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two displays and (6.21) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{|e| \leq 1} J_L(\square_m, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) & \leq C\delta^{1/4} \omega_n^2 \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \sup_{|e| \leq 1} J_L(z + \square_n, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}(z) \leq 3^n\}} \\
& \quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+ \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho\sigma}}((C\hat{L}_0^2 n^{-1})^{2/\sigma-8\rho} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}n)) \\
& \quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+ \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-3}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(m^{-400}). \tag{6.22}
\end{aligned}$$

We next iterate (6.22) starting from  $n := m - [K(1 - 4\rho)^{-1} \log(\nu^{-1}m)]$ . We establish the base case by observing the crude bound, by (2.23), Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.3 that

$$\sup_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} J_L(z + \square_n, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C\nu^{-2}m^2),$$

and, by (4.5),

$$m \geq L_1 \implies \omega_n^2 \leq C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}m^{2\rho} \log^2(\nu^{-1}m) \leq m^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-4\rho)} \log^{-1/2}(\nu^{-1}m).$$

Thus, iterating  $[20(1 - 4\rho)^{-1}]$  times, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|e| \leq 1} J_L(\square_m, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e) &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+ \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho\sigma}}((C\hat{L}_0^2 n^{-1})^{2/\sigma - 8\rho} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}n)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(C(L - m + \log(\nu^{-1}L))_+^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-3}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(m^{-300}). \end{aligned}$$

An analogous bound is valid for  $J_L^*(\square_m, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L e)$ . The conclusion (6.20) is then obtained via the identity (2.23) after redefining  $\sigma$ .  $\square$

With the aid of Proposition 6.4, we can improve Proposition 4.1.

*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* Fix  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and set  $\theta := \frac{1}{4}(1 - 2\rho)$  and  $\sigma(\rho, d) \in (0, 1/2)$  to be selected below. Denote also

$$\begin{cases} \hat{L}_1 := L_0(K^4 \rho^{-4} (1 - 2\rho)^{-4} \delta^{-4} s^{-4} M^4, 1 - \frac{1}{4}(\rho \wedge (1 - 2\rho)), c_*, \nu), & \text{and} \\ h := [Ms^{-1}C_{(4.41)} \log((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1}m)], \end{cases}$$

for  $K(d) \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $K \geq C_{(6.19)}$  to be determined below. Assume that  $n, m, L \in \mathbb{N}$  are such that  $m, L \geq \hat{L}_1$  and  $m - h \leq n \leq m$ . We also denote  $\ell := m + 2h$ .

For each  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , recall the random variable

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} &:= |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_k)| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_k)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_k) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1/2}|^2 + |(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2} \mathbf{k}_L)(z + \square_k) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_L^{-1/2}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

from the proof of Proposition 4.1. Recall also, by (4.44) and (4.45), the bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{L \geq \hat{L}_0} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{\ell \wedge L} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{\ell \wedge L})_{\square_m}) \\ &\leq 2 \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L \wedge \ell} \right)^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(m^{-500}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

By our choice of parameters, after possibly increasing  $K$ , we may invoke Proposition 6.4 and (4.39) to see that, for  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [n - h, n]$  and  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L \wedge \ell} \mathbf{1}_{\{L \geq m - 2h\}} &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(Ch\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-2}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/2}}(Ch^2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-4}) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}((C\hat{L}_0 m^{-1})^{(1-\theta)(1/\sigma-2)} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} \log^{1/2}(\nu^{-1}m)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(m^{-399}), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, by combining the above display with (4.44)

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L \wedge \ell} \right)^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{L \geq m - 2h\}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(Ch^2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-2}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\sigma}}((C\hat{L}_0 m^{-1})^{(1-\theta)(\frac{1}{2\sigma}-1)} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} \log(\nu^{-1}m)) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(m^{-150}), \end{aligned}$$

and, by (4.46)

$$\left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L} \right)^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{L \leq m-2h\}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(m^{-400}).$$

It follows from the above two displays and (4.5), (4.40), with,

$$\tilde{m} := \begin{cases} \delta \bar{s}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m, & m \leq L+h, \\ \delta m^{-300}, & m > L+h \end{cases}$$

and, for small enough  $\sigma$ , depending on  $\rho$ , that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^n s 3^{s(k-n)} \max_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{U}_{z,k,L \wedge \ell} \right)^{1/2} > \tilde{m} \right] \leq \exp(-cK m^{2\rho}).$$

The previous display and (6.23) yield that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{s}_{\ell \wedge L} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{\ell \wedge L})_{\square_m}) \geq \tilde{m} \right] \leq C \exp(-cK m^{2\rho}).$$

Consequently, following the end of the proof of Proposition 4.1, we define

$$\mathcal{X} := \sup_{m \geq L_1} \left\{ 3^{m+1} : \sup_{L \geq L_1} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{E}_s(z + \square_n; \mathbf{a}_L, \bar{s}_{\ell \wedge L} + (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{\ell \wedge L})_{\square_m}) > \tilde{m} \right\},$$

to see, via a union bound, that

$$\mathbb{P}[\log \mathcal{X} > m] \leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \exp(-cK k^{2\rho}) \leq C \exp(-cK m^{-2\rho}) \leq \exp(-m^{-2\rho}),$$

for a sufficiently large choice of  $K(d)$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Using Proposition 6.1, we can prove a variant of Proposition 6.2 with improved error.

**Proposition 6.5.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  and, for every  $s, \delta \in (0, 1]$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ , a minimal scale  $\mathcal{Y}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(\widehat{L}_2) \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{L}_2 := L_0(C\rho^{-4}(1-2\rho)^{-4}\delta^{-4}s^{-4}, 1 - \frac{1}{4}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu)$$

such that, for every  $L', L, m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $3^m \geq \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $L', L \geq m + Cs^{-1} \log((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1}m)$  and  $L, L', m \geq \widehat{L}_2$ , and for every  $u \in \mathcal{A}_{L'}(\square_m) \setminus \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\frac{3^{-sm} \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m)) \nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)} + 3^{-ms} \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \bar{s}_m - (\mathbf{k}_L)_{\square_m}) \nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)}}{\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}} \leq C \delta \bar{s}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m \quad (6.24)$$

and

$$\frac{3^{-sm} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)}}{\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}} \leq C \bar{s}_m^{-1/2}. \quad (6.25)$$

Moreover, for every  $\sigma \in (0, 1/6]$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}_{L'}(\square_m) \setminus \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\frac{3^{-sm} \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m)) \nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)}}{\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}} \leq C \delta \bar{s}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(C(\widehat{L}_2 m^{-1})^{\frac{1-\sigma}{6\sigma}}). \quad (6.26)$$



*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the minimal scale from Proposition 6.1 corresponding to the parameters  $s, \delta, \rho$  as in the statement and  $M := 10^4 d$ . Assume by scaling that  $\nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 = 1$ . Fix

$$h := \lceil K s^{-1} \log((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1} m) \rceil \quad \text{and} \quad h' := \lceil C_{(6.1)} M s^{-1} \log((\nu \wedge \delta)^{-1} m) \rceil,$$

and assume

$$\widehat{L}_2 := L_0(K^4 \rho^{-4} (1 - 2\rho)^{-4} \delta^{-4} s^{-4}, 1 - \frac{1}{4}(\rho \wedge (1 - 2\rho)), c_*, \nu)$$

for  $K(d) \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $K \geq C_{(6.1)}$  to be determined below. Assume that  $m, L, L' \in \mathbb{N}$  are such that  $m, L, L' \geq \widehat{L}_2$  and that  $L', L \geq m + h$ . We also denote  $\ell := m + 2h'$ . By taking  $K$  larger, we may assume that  $\ell \leq m + h$ .

Below we will use the following special case of the multiscale Poincaré inequality (see [AK24b, Lemma A.2]): for all  $f \in L^2(\square_m)$ ,

$$\|f\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)}^2 \leq \sum_{n=-\infty}^m s^{2sn} \sum_{y \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |(f)_{y+\square_n}|^2 \leq s^{2ms} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2. \quad (6.27)$$

*Step 1.* We first establish a minimal scale for  $|(\mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m}|$ , that is we show that there exists  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  such that  $\log \mathcal{Y}_2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho}}(\widehat{L}_2)$  and

$$3^m \geq \mathcal{Y}_1 \implies |(\mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m}| \leq \delta m^\rho \log m. \quad (6.28)$$

We first observe by (2.54) and (2.59),

$$|(\mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m}| \leq |(\mathbf{k}_m)_{\square_m}| + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch') \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch').$$

This implies, using  $m \geq \widehat{L}_2$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[|(\mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m}| > \delta m^\rho \log m] \leq \exp(-cK m^{2\rho}),$$

and so we deduce, via a union bound, for  $K$  large enough, the existence of  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  as stated.

*Step 2.* In this step we show that there is a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  and a minimal scale  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  such that, if  $K \geq C$ , we have  $\log \mathcal{Y}_2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(\widehat{L}_2)$  and if  $3^m \geq \mathcal{Y}_2$ , then for every  $v \in \mathcal{A}_{L'}(\square_m)$ , there exists  $w \in \mathcal{A}_L(\square_m)$  such that

$$3^{-ms} \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m)) \nabla(v - w)\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)} + 3^{-ms} \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k}_L)_{\square_m}) \nabla(v - w)\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)} \leq m^{-100}$$

This allows us to reduce to the case  $L = L'$  below.

Let  $v \in \mathcal{A}_{L'}(\square_m)$  be given and suppose, by scaling, that  $\nu \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} = 1$ . By Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 2.6

$$\|\nabla(u - v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} \leq \|\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L'} - (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_{L'})_{\square_m}\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(3^{-h})$$

and, using also Lemma 2.7 and (4.40),

$$\|(\mathbf{a}_L - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m))\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} + \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k}_L)_{\square_m})\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C\nu^{-1}c_*^{-1}m^2).$$

Combining the previous two displays with (6.27) shows

$$3^{-ms} \left( \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m)) \nabla(v - w)\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)} + \|(\mathbf{a}_L - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k}_L)_{\square_m}) \nabla(v - w)\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)} \right) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(m^{-1000}),$$

for  $K$  sufficiently large. We then conclude by the previous display and a union bound.

*Step 3.* We prove both (6.24) and (6.25) with minimal scale  $\mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{Y}_1 \vee \mathcal{Y}_2 \vee \mathcal{Y}' \vee \mathcal{X}$ , where  $\mathcal{Y}'$  is the minimal scale from Lemma 4.11. Also assume  $K$  is large enough so that Lemma 4.11 may be applied. Let  $\bar{\mathbf{k}} := (\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{a}} := \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell + \bar{\mathbf{k}}$ . Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m - 2h \leq n \leq m$ . By (6.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z + \square_n} (\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z + \square_n))| + 2|(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.29)$$

The second term above is bounded by Proposition 6.1. We estimate the first term by rewriting

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{a}})| \leq |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n)\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)|^{1/2} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{a}})|.$$

and then estimating

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n)\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)|^{1/2} \\ & \leq |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n)|^{1/2} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m)|^{1/2} \\ & \leq (2 + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2)^{1/2} (2 + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{-1/2}|^2)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C(2 + |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(z + \square_n) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell)|^2)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that by Proposition 6.1 and Lemma 4.7 we have

$$|\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{a}})| \leq C\delta \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m.$$

Therefore, by Hölder's inequality and the assumption  $\nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 = 1$ , the above implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=-\infty}^m s 3^{sn} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z + \square_n} (\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C\delta \sum_{n=-\infty}^m s 3^{sn} \left( 2 + \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(\square_m)(\mathbf{s}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m \\ & \leq C\delta 3^{sm} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m. \end{aligned}$$

By a similar computation, we also get

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^m s 3^{sn} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z + \square_n} (\mathbf{a}_L - \bar{\mathbf{a}}) \nabla u \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C\delta 3^{sm} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m.$$

Furthermore, by (2.60), (2.28), Lemma 4.7 and the fact  $3^m \geq \mathcal{Y}_1$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} [(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m}) \nabla u]_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)} & \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} (|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_\ell - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m| + |(\mathbf{k}_\ell)_{\square_m}|) \\ & \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} \log^3(\nu^{-1}m) + C\delta m^\rho \log^{1/2} m) \\ & \leq C\delta \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above with (6.27) shows (6.24).

We turn to the proof of (6.25). First, by (2.28), the assumption  $\nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}^2 = 1$  and Lemma 4.7,

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^m s3^{sn} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} \nabla u \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \bar{s}_m^{-1/2} \sum_{n=-\infty}^m s3^{sn} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} |\bar{s}_m \mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1}(z + \square_n)|^{1/2}.$$

By (4.60) this implies

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^m s3^{sn} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} \nabla u \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C 3^{sm} \bar{s}_m^{-1/2}.$$

By (6.27) we deduce (6.25).

*Step 4.* We show (6.26). First, proceeding as in Step 3 above, applying this time Proposition 6.4 with  $\sigma = 1/3$  and  $\theta = 1/2$ , and using also  $m \geq \hat{L}_2$ , we get for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m - h \leq n \leq m$  that

$$\max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z + \square_n))| + 2|(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{1/2} \right) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(C).$$

For  $n \leq m - h$ , we use Lemma 2.7 and (4.40),

$$\max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left( |\mathbf{s}_{L,*}^{-1/2}(z + \square_n)(\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{a}_{L,*}(z + \square_n))| + 2|(\mathbf{s}_L - \mathbf{s}_{L,*})(z + \square_n)|^{1/2} \right) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/6}}(C 3^{\frac{1}{2}s(m-n)}).$$

Therefore, by (6.29), by a similar argument as in (6.15), we deduce that, for every  $t \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^m s3^{s(n-m)} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\mathbf{a}_{L,*}(\square_m) - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{y > 3^m\}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\frac{t}{6+t}}}(C(\hat{L}_2 m^{-1})^{1/t}).$$

Now (6.26) follows by setting  $\sigma = \frac{t}{t+6}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We also present an explicit improvement of Proposition 6.2. Below the parameters  $\hat{L}_0$  and  $\hat{L}_1$  are as in Proposition 6.1.

**Proposition 6.6.** *Let  $s \in (0, 1]$ . There exists a constant  $C(s, d) \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\delta_0(d)$  such that, for every  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and every  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$  and  $L, L', m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with*

$$L, L', m \geq \hat{L}_1, \quad L, L' \geq m + C \log(\nu^{-1} m) \quad \text{and} \quad n \leq m - Cs^{-1} \log((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1} m), \quad (6.30)$$

*we have, for every  $\sigma \in (0, 1/6]$  and  $u \in \mathcal{A}_{L'}(\square_m) \setminus \mathbb{R}$ , the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3^{-sm} \|(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)}}{\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}} \\ & \leq \delta^{1/2} \bar{s}_n^{-3/2} n^{2\rho} \log^2 n + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(m^{-300}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}((C \hat{L}_0 n^{-1})^{(1/\sigma - 4\rho)} \log^{1/4}(\nu^{-1} n)). \end{aligned} \quad (6.31)$$

*Proof.* We first observe that by the Sobolev embedding theorem there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that for every  $f \in H_0^s(\square_m)$ ,

$$3^{s'm} \|f\|_{\underline{W}^{s',p'}(\square_m)} \leq C 3^{sm} \|f\|_{\underline{H}^s(\square_m)} \quad \text{with} \quad s' = \frac{s}{2}, \quad p' = \frac{2d}{d-s} \quad \text{and} \quad p := \frac{2d}{d+s}.$$

This implies that, for every  $g \in W^{-s',p}(\square_m)$ ,

$$3^{-sm} \|g\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(\square_m)} \leq C 3^{-s'm} \|g\|_{\underline{W}^{-s',p}(\square_m)}.$$

Consequently, it suffices to prove the claim for the  $\underline{W}^{-s',p}(\square_m)$  norm.

By the same argument as in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 6.5, we may assume that  $L' = L$ . Using Proposition 6.1 we have the validity of Assumption H with  $\omega_m$  given by (6.3). Thus, by Proposition 6.2, we find that there exists a constant  $C(s, d) < \infty$  such that

$$\frac{3^{-s'm} \|(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{L,n} - \mathbf{a}_L) \nabla u\|_{\underline{W}^{-s',p}(\square_m)}}{\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)}} \leq C \delta^{5/8} \omega_n^{3/2} + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2/3}}(m^{-400}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}((C \hat{L}_0 n^{-1})^{(1/\sigma-4\rho)} \log^{1/4}(\nu^{-1}n)).$$

This implies (6.31) after decreasing  $\delta_0$ , if necessary.  $\square$

## 7. Sharp asymptotics for the renormalized diffusivities

In this section, we identify the sharp asymptotic rate of growth of the renormalized diffusivities by showing that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m}{\sqrt{2c_*(\log 3)m}} = 1.$$

Indeed, we prove a rate of convergence for this limit which is given in the following statement.

**Theorem 7.1** (Asymptotics for the renormalized diffusivities). *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8)$ , there exist constants  $C(\varepsilon, c_*, A, \nu, d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq 2$ ,*

$$|\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m - (2c_*(\log 3)m)^{1/2}| \leq Cm^\varepsilon. \quad (7.1)$$

Theorem 7.1 is a consequence of the following proposition which gives an approximate recurrence formula for the sequence of renormalized diffusivities.

**Proposition 7.2** (Approximate recurrence). *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8)$ , there exist  $C(\varepsilon, c_*, \nu, d) > 0$  and  $M(\varepsilon, c_*, A, \nu, d) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq M$  and  $h \in \mathbb{N} \cap [n^\varepsilon, n^{-\varepsilon}\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n]$ ,*

$$|\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+h} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n - c_*(\log 3)\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1}h| \leq C(1 + \check{A})n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}. \quad (7.2)$$

We first give the proof of Theorem 7.1 from Proposition 7.2.

*Proof of Theorem 7.1 assuming Proposition 7.2.* We will use Proposition 7.2 to prove the following claim: for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq \max\{M, \exp(\check{A})\}$  and  $h \in \mathbb{N} \cap [n^\varepsilon, n^{-\varepsilon}\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n]$ ,

$$|\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+h}^2 - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^2 - 2c_*(\log 3)h| \leq Cn^{2\varepsilon}. \quad (7.3)$$

To prove (7.3), we apply the elementary inequality

$$|x^2 - y^2| \leq |x^2 - y^2 + 2y(x - y)| + |2y(x - y)| = |x - y|^2 + 2y|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y > 0$$

with  $x = \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n + c_*(\log 3)h\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1}$  and  $y = \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+h}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+h}^2 - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^2 (1 + c_*(\log 3)h\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-2})^2| \\ & \leq |\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+h} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n - c_*(\log 3)h\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1}|^2 + 2\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+h} |\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n+h} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n - c_*(\log 3)h\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{-1}|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 7.2 and using also Lemma 4.7 and (4.40), we obtain

$$|\bar{s}_{n+h}^2 - \bar{s}_n^2(1 + c_*(\log 3)h\bar{s}_n^{-2})^2| \leq C(1 + \check{A})^2 n^{-1+2\varepsilon} + C(1 + \check{A})n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}\bar{s}_{n+h} \leq Cn^{2\varepsilon}.$$

Expanding the left side of this inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{s}_{n+h}^2 - \bar{s}_n^2(1 + c_*(\log 3)h\bar{s}_n^{-2})^2| &= |\bar{s}_{n+h}^2 - \bar{s}_n^2 - 2c_*(\log 3)h + c_*^2(\log 3)^2 h^2 \bar{s}_n^{-2}| \\ &\geq |\bar{s}_{n+h}^2 - \bar{s}_n^2 - 2c_*(\log 3)h| - c_*^2(\log 3)^2 h^2 \bar{s}_n^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together and using that  $c_* \leq 1$  and  $h \leq \bar{s}_n$ , we obtain (7.3).

The statement of the theorem now follows from a simple iteration of (7.3). We first demonstrate that, for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\bar{s}_n \geq c_* n^{1/2}. \quad (7.4)$$

By Proposition 3.1, for all sufficiently large  $n$  we have that  $h := \lceil n^{1/4} \rceil \in \mathbb{N} \cap [n^\varepsilon, n^{-\varepsilon}\bar{s}_n]$ . It then follows after iteration of (7.3) that

$$|\bar{s}_n^2 - 2c_*(\log 3)n| \leq Cn^{3/4+2\varepsilon}.$$

As  $2 \log 3 \geq 2 > 1$ , this implies (7.4).

Using (7.4), we may now perform another iteration of (7.3) with the choice of step size  $h := \lfloor c_* n^{1/2-\varepsilon} \rfloor$  to obtain

$$|\bar{s}_n^2 - 2c_*(\log 3)n| \leq Cc_*^{-2}n^{1/2+2\varepsilon}.$$

This inequality implies (7.1) with  $m^{2\varepsilon}$  instead of  $m^\varepsilon$  on the right side. This completes the proof.  $\square$

The rest of this section is focused on the proof of Proposition 7.2. Throughout, we fix the following parameters and objects:

- A small exponent  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8)$ , as in the statement of the proposition and, to give us some room,  $\eta := 2^{-8\varepsilon}$ .
- A small parameter  $\tau \in (0, 2^{-8})$ , depending only on dimension, which will be selected later in the proof.
- Nonnegative integers  $K, l, n_0, h \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $100 \leq h \leq \frac{1}{10}n_0$  and

$$\max\{M, n_0 - h - M \log n_0\} \leq l \leq n_0 - h \leq n_0 \leq K, \quad (7.5)$$

where  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  is a sufficiently large constant that the lower bounds required for the validity of Propositions 3.1, 4.1, 4.5, 4.10, 6.1, 6.5 and 6.6 are satisfied with parameters  $s := \rho := \sigma := \eta$ ,  $\alpha := 1 - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{10}$  and  $\delta := \delta_0(d)$  is as in Proposition 6.6: that is, we take

$$\hat{L}_3 := L_0(M_0 2^4 \eta^{-10} \delta^{-10}, 1 - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{10}, c_*, \nu),$$

and

$$M := \max\left\{\hat{L}_3, c_*^{-3} \log^3(\nu^{-1}), \nu^{-9\eta^{-1}}, \tau^{-100}\right\}, \quad (7.6)$$

where  $L_0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  is as in (4.4) and  $M_0 \geq 10^4 d$  is a constant depending only on dimension to be selected below. In particular we have, using Proposition 3.1 and (4.40), that

$$(n_0 - h)^{1/2-\eta} \leq \bar{s}_{n_0-h} \leq (n_0 - h)^{1/2+\eta}. \quad (7.7)$$

We also require the following constraints on the separation between the scales

$$M \log(\nu^{-1}n_0) \leq K - n_0 \leq 2M \log((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1}n_0), \quad (7.8)$$

$$M \log(\nu^{-1}n_0) \leq n_0 - h - l \leq 2M \log((\delta \wedge \nu)^{-1}n_0). \quad (7.9)$$

We also suppose that the (large) scale separation parameter  $h \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfies

$$n^\eta \leq h \leq n^{-10\eta} \bar{s}_n. \quad (7.10)$$

- We let  $\delta(x) := \bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_{n_0} - \mathbf{k}_{n_0-h})(x)$ , where the sequence  $\{\mathbf{k}_j\}$  is as in (1.46).
- We let  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x)$  be the coarse-grained field defined above in (2.69).
- We introduce a truncated field  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  defined by

$$\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) := \mathbf{I}_d + ((\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \mathbf{I}_d) + \delta^t(x)) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \mathbf{I}_d + \delta^t(x)| \leq 2\tau\}}. \quad (7.11)$$

Observe that  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  is uniformly elliptic with ellipticity constants  $1 - 2\tau$  and  $1 + 2\tau$  and is  $3^l \mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary.

- A “good event” defined by

$$G_\tau := \left\{ 3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla \delta\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} + \|\delta\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} + \|\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} \leq \tau \right\}. \quad (7.12)$$

Observe that, on the good event  $G_\tau$ , the truncation does nothing in the cube  $\square_K$ :

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{s}_{n_0-h} \delta^t \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} = \bar{s}_{n_0-h} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \quad \text{in } \square_K. \quad (7.13)$$

The approximate recurrence (7.2) is broken into the following two statements.

**Lemma 7.3.** *There exists  $C(\varepsilon, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  such that for  $n_0 \geq M$ ,*

$$|\bar{s}_{n_0} - \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\bar{s}_{n_0-h} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}]| \leq C n_0^{-1/2+\varepsilon}. \quad (7.14)$$

**Lemma 7.4.** *There exist  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n_0 \geq M$*

$$|\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\bar{s}_{n_0-h} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] - (\bar{s}_{n_0-h} + c_*(\log 3) \bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} h)| \leq (\check{A} + C \log n_0) \bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1}. \quad (7.15)$$

Proposition 7.2 is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4 and the lower bound in (3.2). Lemma 7.3 compares the original problem to the coarse-grained problem, and demonstrates that these are essentially the same on large scales. Its proof, which is presented below in Section 7.2, makes use of the large-scale regularity theory and in particular the coarse-graining estimates in Section 6. The coarse-grained problem can be analyzed by perturbation arguments, leading to the statement of Lemma 7.4; this appears in Section 7.3 below.

Throughout this section for convenience we omit the argument when taking expected values of stationary functions; that is, for a stationary function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we denote

$$\mathbb{E}[f] := \mathbb{E}[f(0)].$$

**7.1. Estimates for the coarse-grained field.** In this subsection we collect some preliminary estimates on the coarse-grained field  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  which are needed in the proofs of Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4. According to the homogenization results in Sections 4 and 6, this field is a small perturbation of the constant  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}$  except on an event of very small probability. In the next lemma we give a quantitative statement.

**Lemma 7.5.** *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id}] \right| \leq C \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}, \quad (7.16)$$

$$\left\| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id} \right\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/5}}(Cp \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}), \quad (7.17)$$

and

$$\left\| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id} \right\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/9}}(Ch^{1/2} \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}). \quad (7.18)$$

*Proof.* By Remark 4.9 and Proposition 4.10 (with  $\alpha = 1/2$ ) we obtain, for all  $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{n_0-h,*}(\square_l) - \text{Id} \right| &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma/(1+\sigma)}}(C\nu^{-2}(n_0-h)(C \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2})^{1/\sigma}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.19)$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id} \right\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} &= \max_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{n_0-h,*}(z + \square_l) - \text{Id} \right| \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch^{1/2} \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma/(1+\sigma)}}(Ch\nu^{-2}(n_0-h)(Ch \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2})^{1/\sigma}). \end{aligned}$$

Selecting  $\sigma = 1/8$  in the above display and using (7.7) together with (7.10) yields

$$\left\| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id} \right\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/9}}(Ch^{1/2} \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}),$$

which is (7.18). Similarly, selecting  $\sigma = 1/4$  in (7.19) and using the triangle inequality for the Orlicz norm  $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/5p}}$  from Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id} \right\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}^p &= \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{n_0-h,*}(z + \square_l) - \text{Id} \right|^p \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/5p}}((Cp)^p \log^p(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-p}), \end{aligned}$$

which is (7.17).

We turn to proof of (7.16). We have that

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h,*}(\square_l) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^{-1}]^{-1},$$

and that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^{-1}]^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] \right| \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h,*}^{-1}(\square_l) \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h,*}(\square_l)|^2] \leq C \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}(\square_l).$$

Here we have used that the difference between the harmonic mean and mean is bounded by the sample variance (see for instance [AK24a, (4.31)]). Combining this with (4.39) yields (7.16).  $\square$

We next estimate the probability that the good event  $G_\tau$  is not valid.

**Lemma 7.6** (Estimate of the bad event). *There exists  $c(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $s \in (0, \infty)$ ,*

$$\mathbf{1}_{G_\tau^c} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_s} \left( (c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h})^{-1/s} \right). \quad (7.20)$$

*Proof.* By a union bound, (2.54) and (2.62), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau] &\leq 3^{d(K-n_0+h)} \mathbb{P}[\|\mathbf{k}_{n_0} - \mathbf{k}_{n_0-h}\|_{L^\infty(\square_{n_0-h})} > \tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}] \\ &\leq \exp(-c\tau^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2 h^{-1} + (d \log 3)(K - n_0 + h)) \\ &\leq \exp(-c\tau^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2 h^{-1} + 2(d \log 3)h). \end{aligned}$$

Using also (7.10) and (7.7), increasing  $M_0$  if necessary, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}c\tau^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2 h^{-1}\right) \leq \exp(-c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}).$$

Similarly, we use a union bound and (2.51) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau] &= \mathbb{P}[3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_{n_0} - \mathbf{k}_{n_0-h})\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}] \\ &\leq 3^{d(K-n_0+h)} \mathbb{P}[3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla(\mathbf{k}_{n_0} - \mathbf{k}_{n_0-h})\|_{L^\infty(\square_{n_0-h})} > \tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}] \\ &\leq \exp(-\tau^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2 + (d \log 3)(K - n_0 + h)) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\tau^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Again, similarly, selecting  $\sigma = \eta/8$  in (7.19), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau\right] &\leq 3^{d(K-l)} \mathbb{P}\left[\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{n_0-h,*}(\square_l) - \mathbf{I}_d\| > \tau\right] \\ &\leq \exp(-c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \log^{-1}(\nu^{-1}n_0))^2 + (d \log 3)(K - l) \\ &\quad + \exp\left(-\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{\frac{-(1+\eta/2)}{1+\sigma}} + (d \log 3)(K - l)\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-c\tau^2 \log^{-2}(\nu^{-1}n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2) \\ &\leq \exp(-c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (2.44), we find that, for every  $s \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau^c} &\leq \mathbf{1}_{\{\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} > \tau\}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_s} \left( (c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h})^{-1/s} \right) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_s} \left( (c\tau^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2)^{-1/s} \right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_s} \left( (c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h})^{-1/s} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.21)$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**7.2. Coarse-graining estimates.** This subsection is devoted to the proof of Lemma 7.3. That is, we show that there exists a constant  $C(\varepsilon, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  such that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0}(\square_K) - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}| \leq C n_0^{-1/2+9\eta}, \quad (7.22)$$

where to shorten the notation, we denote

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}} := \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}]. \quad (7.23)$$



Notice that this implies the bound (7.14) since, by Proposition 4.5, (7.7) and (7.5), we have that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0,*}(\square_K) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0}| \leq n_0^{-800}. \quad (7.24)$$

By the dihedral symmetry assumption, we have that  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  is a scalar matrix. By a slight abuse of notation, we also let  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  denote a positive constant.

We begin by reducing the desired estimate (7.22) into an equivalent estimate for the expectation of  $J(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)$ .

**Lemma 7.7.** *For every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0}^{-1} |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0}(\square_K) - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}|^2 \leq 4\mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)]. \quad (7.25)$$

*Proof.* Taking the expectation of (2.23), using that  $\bar{\mathbf{k}}_{n_0}(\square_K) = 0$  by the dihedral symmetry assumption, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) + J_{n_0}^*(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)] \\ &= e \cdot (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0,*})(\square_K)e + (\tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0,*})(\square_K)e \cdot \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0,*}^{-1}(\square_K)(\tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0,*})(\square_K)e. \end{aligned} \quad (7.26)$$

The assumption (J4) that the joint law of the fields  $\{\mathbf{j}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is invariant under negation implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)] = \mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}^*(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)], \quad (7.27)$$

The lemma follows from the previous two displays and  $|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0,*}(\square_K)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0}^{-1}| \leq 2$ , which is a consequence of (7.24).  $\square$

Lemma 7.7 reduces the estimate (7.22) to the bound

$$\mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)] \leq C|e|^2 n_0^{-1/2+9\eta} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}. \quad (7.28)$$

The rest of this subsection is focused on the proof of (7.28).

The first step is to bound the left side of (7.28) in terms of the solutions  $f_e^D, f_e^N \in H^1(\square_K)$  of the Dirichlet and Neumann problems

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla f_e^D = 0 & \text{in } \square_K, \\ f_e^D = \ell_e & \text{on } \partial \square_K, \end{cases} \quad (7.29)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla f_e^N = 0 & \text{in } \square_K, \\ \mathbf{n} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla f_e^N = \mathbf{n} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e & \text{on } \partial \square_K. \end{cases} \quad (7.30)$$

We also let  $\xi_e \in H_0^1(\square_K)$  to solve

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \xi_e = \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}^t e & \text{in } \square_K, \\ \xi_e = 0 & \text{on } \partial \square_K. \end{cases} \quad (7.31)$$

**Lemma 7.8.** *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for each  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\square_K} \nabla f_e^D \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \right| \right] \\ &\quad + C\nu^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D \right\|_{L^2(\square_K)}^4 \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.32)$$

*Proof.* We begin by establishing the identity

$$\begin{aligned} J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\square_K} \nabla f_e^D \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\square_K} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) (\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D) \cdot \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e). \end{aligned} \quad (7.33)$$

First, use (2.22) to write  $J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)$  in the form

$$J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\square_K} (-e \cdot \mathbf{a}_{n_0} \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e \cdot \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)). \quad (7.34)$$

We next use that  $\nabla f_e^D - e \in L_{\text{pot},0}^2(\square_K)$  and  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla f_e^N - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e \in L_{\text{sol},0}^2(\square_K)$ , combined with the fact that  $\mathbf{a}_{n_0} \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \in L_{\text{sol}}^2(\square_K)$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\square_K} (-\nabla f_e^D \cdot \mathbf{a}_{n_0} \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\square_K} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla f_e^N \cdot \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)). \end{aligned} \quad (7.35)$$

Using the identity  $\mathbf{a}_{n_0} = \mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}$  and rearranging the right side again, we obtain (7.33).

The second term in (7.33) is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\square_K} (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) (\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D) \cdot \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \\ &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} \|\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)} \|\nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)} \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{4} \|\nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)}^2 + \frac{C}{\nu} \|\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)}^2 \|\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) + \frac{C}{\nu} \|\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)}^2 \|\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

According to (2.54), (7.18), the triangle inequality and the lower bound (7.7) we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}^t + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)}^4 \right]^{1/2} \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2 \left( 1 + Ch \log^2(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} + Ch^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} \right) \leq 2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^2. \quad (7.36)$$

We combine the previous two displays with (7.33), reabsorb the factor of  $\frac{1}{2} J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)$  and then take expectations to obtain (7.32).  $\square$

The estimate (7.28) is an immediate consequence of (7.32) and the following three estimates:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\square_K} \nabla f_e^D \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \right| \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)] + |e|^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} n_0^{-1+9\eta}, \quad (7.37)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)}^4 \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \right]^{1/2} \leq |e|^2 n_0^{-10} \quad (7.38)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau^c}] \leq |e|^2 n_0^{-10}. \quad (7.39)$$

The proof of (7.37) uses the homogenization theory developed in the previous three sections, and in particular relies heavily on the improved coarse-graining estimates in Proposition 6.2. The estimate (7.38) on the difference of the Dirichlet and Neumann solutions is a consequence of standard

quantitative homogenization estimates for the coarse-grained field  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t$ . We will obtain the estimate by quoting results from [AK24a, Chapter 5]. Finally, we will show that (7.39) is a consequence of Lemma 7.6.

Before we give the proofs of these bounds, we establish some basic estimates on the solutions  $f_e^D$  of (7.29) and  $\xi_e$  of (7.31) which are consequences of standard Calderón-Zygmund estimates.

**Lemma 7.9** (Estimates for  $f_e^D$  and  $\xi_e$ ). *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $p \in [2, \infty)$ ,  $s \in [0, 1/4p]$  and  $\tau \in (0, (Cp)^{-1}]$ , we have*

$$\|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} + 3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} \leq Cp|e| (3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} + p \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}). \quad (7.40)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla f_e^D + \nabla \xi_e - e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} + 3^{sl} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\nabla f_e^D + \nabla \xi_e - e\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(z+\square_l)}^p \right)^{1/p} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ & \leq Cp|e| (\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{4p}(\square_K)} + p \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^{4p}(\square_K)} + \tau 3^{-s(n_0-h-l)}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.41)$$

*Proof. Step 1.* We prove (7.40). For each exponent  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , we may apply the Calderón-Zygmund gradient  $L^p$  estimates for the Laplacian in a cube (see [Ste70, Section II.6.2] for the interior estimate, and then use a reflection argument) to obtain, for a constant  $C(d) < \infty$ ,

$$\|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} \leq Cp|e| \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}. \quad (7.42)$$

Similarly, we also have that, for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $z \in 3^{n_0-h} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K$ ,

$$\|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(z+\square_{n_0-h})} \leq Cp|e| \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{n_0-h+1}) \cap \square_K)} + Cp 3^{-(n_0-h)} \|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{n_0-h+1}) \cap \square_K)}.$$

Summing over  $z$  in the previous display and then applying (7.42) yields

$$\|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} \leq Cp|e| \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} + (Cp)^2 |e| 3^{-(n_0-h)} \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}. \quad (7.43)$$

*Step 2.* We next show the estimate for the first term on the left in (7.41). For this, we rewrite the equation for  $f_e^D \in \ell_e + H_0^1(\square_K)$  as

$$-\Delta f_e^D = \nabla \cdot (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla f_e^D \quad \text{in } \square_K. \quad (7.44)$$

The function  $w \in H_0^1(\square_K)$  defined by  $w := f_e^D + \xi_e - \ell_e$  solves

$$-\Delta w = \nabla \cdot (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla w - \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}^t \nabla \xi_e - \nabla \cdot ((\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) (\nabla \xi_e - e)).$$

By the Calderón-Zygmund gradient  $L^p$  estimates and (7.42),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} & \leq Cp \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} + (Cp)^2 |e| \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^2 \\ & \quad + Cp|e| \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} (1 + Cp \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.45)$$

By taking  $\tau$  so small that  $\tau C_{(7.45)} p \leq 1/8$ , we can reabsorb the first term on the right in the above and deduce that

$$\|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq Cp|e| (\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} + p \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq 2|e|. \quad (7.46)$$

This establishes the estimate for the first term on the left in (7.41).

*Step 3.* In this step we start to estimate the second term on the left in (7.41) by showing that

$$3^{sl} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq Cp|e| (\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} + \tau 3^{-s(n_0-h-l)}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \quad (7.47)$$

For this, we first apply the fractional Calderón-Zygmund estimates<sup>12</sup>. Noting that  $w$  has zero Dirichlet boundary on  $\partial\square_K$ , these yield the existence of  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $p \in [2, \infty)$  and  $s \in (0, 1/2p]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} &\leq Cp \left\| (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla w \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \\ &\quad + Cp \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^t \nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} + Cp \left\| (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) (\nabla \xi_e - e) \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.48)$$

We split the estimates of the three terms on the right side into substeps.

*Step 3(a).* In this step we estimate the first term on the right side of (7.48) and show

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla w \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\leq Cp\tau \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\quad + Cp \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} 3^{-sl} (\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} + \tau 3^{-s(n_0-h-l)}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.49)$$

We first write

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla w \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)}^p \\ &\leq C \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)}^p \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)}^p \\ &\quad + Cs \int_{\square_K} \int_{\square_K} \frac{|\nabla w(x)|^p |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(y) + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t(x) - \boldsymbol{\delta}^t(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{d+sp}} dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

For the term involving  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  and  $x, y \in \square_K$ , we use the estimate

$$|\boldsymbol{\delta}(x) - \boldsymbol{\delta}(y)| \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq \tau \min\{3^{h-n_0}|x-y|, 2\}.$$

This leads to the bound

$$s \int_{\square_K} \int_{\square_K} \frac{|\nabla w(x)|^p |\boldsymbol{\delta}(x) - \boldsymbol{\delta}(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{d+sp}} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} dy dx \leq \frac{C}{1-s} \tau^p 3^{-sp(n_0-h)} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}^p \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}.$$

Next, using the fact that  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) = \mathbf{a}_{n_0-h,*}(z + \square_l)$  for  $x \in z + \square_l$  for every  $z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d$ , we have

---

<sup>12</sup>These estimates can be obtained, for instance, by interpolating between the standard  $W^{1,p}(\square_K)$  and  $W^{2,p}(\square_K)$  estimates for the Poisson equation in a cube.

that, for every  $p \in [2, \infty)$  and  $s \in [0, 1/p)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\square_K} \int_{\square_K} \frac{|\nabla w(x)|^p |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{d+sp}} dy dx \\
& \leq \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \int_{z+\square_l} |\nabla w(x)|^p \left( \int_{\square_K} \frac{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{d+sp}} dy \right) dx \\
& \leq C \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_l) \cap \square_K)}^p \underbrace{\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{l+1}) \cap \square_K)}^p}_{\leq C \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{l+1}) \cap \square_K)}^p} \underbrace{\int_{\square_l} \int_{\square_{l+1} \setminus \square_l} \frac{dx dy}{|x-y|^{d+sp}}}_{\leq C(1-sp)^{-1} 3^{-sp l}} \\
& \quad + C \sum_{j=l+1}^{K+1} 3^{-spj} \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_j) \cap \square_K)}^p \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_j) \cap \square_K)}^p \\
& \leq \frac{C}{sp \wedge (1-sp)} 3^{-sp l} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^p \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \text{Id}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last four displays yields (7.49)

*Step 3(b).* In this step we estimate the second term on the right side of (7.48) and show that there exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that

$$\|\delta^t \nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq C 3^{-s(n_0-h)} \tau (3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} + \|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \quad (7.50)$$

Note that by (7.42), (7.43) the above display implies

$$\|\delta^t \nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq C 3^{-s(n_0-h)} p^2 \tau^2 |e|. \quad (7.51)$$

We first observe a general inequality: there exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that for all  $g \in L_p(\square_K)$ ,

$$[g]_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)}^p \leq C^p s \sum_{j=-\infty}^K 3^{-spj} \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g - (g)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^p \quad (7.52)$$

This yields, for  $g := \delta^t \nabla \xi_e$ ,

$$[\delta^t \nabla \xi_e]_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)}^p \leq C^p s \sum_{j=-\infty}^K 3^{-spj} \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\delta^t \nabla \xi_e - (\delta^t \nabla \xi_e)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^p$$

For the terms with  $j \leq n_0 - h$ , we have by the Poincaré inequality that

$$\sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\delta^t \nabla \xi_e - (\delta^t \nabla \xi_e)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^p \leq C^p 3^{pj} \|\nabla(\delta^t \nabla \xi_e)\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}^p.$$

For  $j \geq n_0 - h$  we similarly estimate,

$$\sum_{j=n_0-h+1}^K 3^{-spj} s \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\delta^t \nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^p \leq \frac{C^p}{p} 3^{-sp(n_0-h)} \|\delta^t \nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}^p.$$

Combining the previous three displays and the product rule yields (7.50).

*Step 3(c).* In this step we estimate the third term on the right side of (7.48) and show that there exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d)(\nabla \xi_e - e)\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ & \leq C\tau 3^{-s(n_0-h)} (3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} + \|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ & \quad + C3^{-sl} \|\nabla \xi_e - e\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.53)$$

Note that by (7.46), (7.42) this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d)(\nabla \xi_e - e)\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ & \leq C|e|3^{-sl} \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} + Cp\tau^2|e|3^{-s(n_0-h)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.54)$$

For convenience we denote

$$g_1 := \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d \quad \text{and} \quad g_2 := \nabla \xi_e - e.$$

First, we plug in  $g := g_1 g_2$  into (7.52) to see

$$[g_1 g_2]_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)}^p \leq C^p s \sum_{j=-\infty}^K 3^{-spj} \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g_1 g_2 - (g_1 g_2)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^p.$$

For each such cube  $\square$ , we can use the triangle inequality to bound the right side as

$$\|g_1 g_2 - (g_1 g_2)_\square\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square)} \leq 2\|g_1\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square)} \|g_2 - (g_2)_\square\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square)} + 2\|g_2\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square)} \|g_1 - (g_1)_\square\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square)}.$$

By the above two displays and Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [g_1 g_2]_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)}^p \\ & \leq C^p s \|g_1\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^p \sum_{j=-\infty}^K 3^{-spj} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g_2 - (g_2)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^{2p} \right)^{1/2} \\ & \quad + C^p s \|g_2\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^p \sum_{j=-\infty}^K 3^{-spj} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g_1 - (g_1)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^{2p} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We have that

$$\|g_1\|_{\underline{L}^\infty(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq \tau$$

for sufficiently small  $\tau$ . By a nearly identical computation to Step 3 (b), we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & s \sum_{j=-\infty}^K 3^{-spj} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g_2 - (g_2)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^{2p} \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C^p 3^{-sp(n_0-h)} (3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)} + \|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_K)})^p. \end{aligned} \quad (7.55)$$

The final term is estimated similarly. For the terms with  $j \leq l$ , we use the fact that  $g_1$  is piecewise constant at scale  $3^l$  to see

$$\sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g_1 - (g_1)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^{2p} \leq C^p 3^{-(1-\frac{1}{2p})(l-j)} \|g_1\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^{2p}.$$

Using this, we have

$$\sum_{j=-\infty}^l 3^{-spj} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g_1 - (g_1)_{(z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K}\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^{2p} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C^p 3^{-spl}}{(1-2sp-1/2p)} \|g_1\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^p.$$

For  $j \geq l$  we similarly estimate,

$$s \sum_{j=l+1}^K 3^{-spj} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^j \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|g_1\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{j+1}) \cap \square_K)}^{2p} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C^p}{p} 3^{-spl} \|g_1\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}(\square_K)}^p.$$

Combining the above displays yields (7.53).

Combining (7.49), (7.51), (7.54) and reabsorbing by taking  $\tau \leq (4C_{(7.49)}p)^{-1}$  yields (7.47).

*Step 4.* We finally estimate the second term on the right of (7.41) by localizing (7.47). We begin by using the interior Calderón-Zygmund estimate to obtain, for each  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [l, K]$  and  $z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_k) \cap \square_K)} &\leq Cp \left\| (\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla w \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} \\ &\quad + Cp \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^t \nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} \\ &\quad + Cp \left\| (\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) (\nabla \xi_e - e) \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} \\ &\quad + Cp \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.56)$$

By identical arguments leading to (7.49), (7.50) and (7.53) we have for each  $k \in [l, K] \cap \mathbb{Z}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \nabla w \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_k) \cap \square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\leq Cp\tau \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\quad + Cp \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} 3^{-sl} \left( \|\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} + \tau 3^{-s(n_0-h-l)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.57)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) (\nabla \xi_e - e) \right\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_k) \cap \square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} + \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^t \nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_k) \cap \square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\leq C\tau 3^{-s(n_0-h)} \left( 3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} + \|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\quad + C 3^{-sl} \|\nabla \xi_e - e\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} \|\bar{s}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_{k+1}) \cap \square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming  $\tau$  is even smaller so that  $C_{(7.57)}p\tau \leq 1/9$ , and iterating the above two inequalities, we

deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3^{sl} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}((z+\square_l)\cap\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\
& \leq 9^{-(K-l)} 3^{sl} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p}(\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\
& \quad + Cp \sum_{k=l}^{K+1} 9^{-(k-l)} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_k)\cap\square_K)} \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_k)\cap\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\
& \quad + Cp\tau 3^{-s(n_0-h-l)} \sum_{k=l}^{K+1} 9^{-(k-l)} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_k)\cap\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\
& \quad + Cp\tau 3^{-s(n_0-h-l)} \sum_{k=l}^{K+1} 9^{-(k-l)} (3^{n_0-h} \|\nabla^2 \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_k)\cap\square_K)} + \|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^p((z+\square_k)\cap\square_K)}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\
& \quad + Cp \sum_{k=l}^{K+1} 9^{-(k-l)} \|\nabla \xi_e - e\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_k)\cap\square_K)} \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{2p}((z+\square_k)\cap\square_K)} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \quad (7.58)
\end{aligned}$$

Raising this inequality to the power of  $p$ , summing over  $z$ , and applying the inequalities (7.47), (7.46), (7.42) and (7.43), we obtain (7.41). This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We now turn to the proof of (7.37).

*Proof of (7.37).* Throughout we write  $v_{n_0} = v_{n_0}(\cdot, \square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)$ , for short. We fix another scale  $k$  with  $l < k < n_0 - h$  to be determined below,  $p := 3/2$ ,  $p' := 3$  and compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\square_K} \nabla f_e^D \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \int_{\square_K} (\nabla \xi_e - e) \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right| + \left| \int_{\square_K} (\nabla f_e^D + \nabla \xi_e - e) \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\square_K} (\nabla \xi_e - e) \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right| \\
& \leq (\|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)} + |e|) \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad + \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} [\nabla \xi_e]_{\underline{W}^{1,p'}(z+\square_k)}^{p'} \right)^{1/p'} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|(\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(z+\square_k)}^p \right)^{1/p},
\end{aligned}$$

and the second term similarly, with  $w := f_e^D + \xi_e - \ell_e$ , as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\square_K} \nabla w \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right| \\
& \leq \left( \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p'}(z+\square_l)}^{p'} \right)^{1/p'} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|(\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{W}^{-s,p}(z+\square_l)}^p \right)^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the different terms above using Propositions 6.5 and 6.6, with parameter selections  $s := t := 2^{-8}$ , by assuming that

$$|l - k| + |k - n_0 + h| \geq \max\{C_{(6.30)}(3/2, d), 2^{32}\} \log(\nu^{-1} n_0), \quad (7.59)$$



increasing  $M_0$  in (7.6) if necessary. This yields, together with Young's inequality, that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right| &\leq \frac{\nu}{100|e|} \|\nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_k)}^2 + C\delta|e|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} n_0^{-(2-\eta)} \log^{24} n_0 \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma/2}}(C|e|\nu^{-1} n_0 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{1/2} (\hat{L}_3 n_0^{-1})^{2/\sigma}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(|e| n_0^{-200}) \end{aligned}$$

with  $C(d) < \infty$ ,  $\sigma \in (0, 1/6]$  to be selected below. By (7.40) and the definition of  $G_\tau$ , with smaller  $\tau$  if necessary, we have  $\|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)} \leq |e|$ . This and the previous display imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\|\nabla \xi_e\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)} + |e|) \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \left| \int_{z+\square_k} (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{50} \|\nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_k)}^2 + C\delta|e|^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} n_0^{-(2-\eta)} \log^{24} n_0 \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma/2}}(C|e|^2 \nu^{-1} n_0 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{1/2} (\hat{L}_3 n_0^{-1})^{2/\sigma}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/3}}(|e|^2 n_0^{-100}). \end{aligned}$$

Again, by (7.40),

$$3^k \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} [\nabla \xi_e]_{\underline{W}^{1,p'}(z+\square_k)}^{p'} \right)^{1/p'} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq C|e| 3^{-(n_0-h-k)}.$$

Using the constraint on  $k$  from (7.59), the above displays imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} [\nabla \xi_e]_{\underline{W}^{1,p'}(z+\square_k)}^{p'} \right)^{1/p'} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|(\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(z+\square_k)}^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{50} \|\nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_k)}^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/4}}(|e|^2 n_0^{-300}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we have, by (7.41) and Proposition 6.5, together with Young's inequality, the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|\nabla w\|_{\underline{W}^{s,p'}(z+\square_l)}^{p'} \right)^{1/p'} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^l \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K} \|(\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{W}^{-s,p}(z+\square_l)}^p \right)^{1/p} \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{100} \|\nabla v_{n_0}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)}^2 + C|e|^2 \delta^2 n_0^{-(1-\eta)} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} (\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{12}(\square_K)}^2 + \|\delta\|_{\underline{L}^{12}(\square_K)}^4) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma/2}}(C|e|^2 \nu^{-2} n_0^2 (\hat{L}_3 n_0^{-1})^{2/\sigma}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/4}}(|e|^2 n_0^{-300}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above displays with (2.21) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\square_K} \nabla f_e^D \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{50} J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) + C\delta|e|^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} n_0^{-(2-\eta)} \log^{24} n_0 \\ &\quad + C\delta^2 |e|^2 n_0^{-(1-\eta)} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \left( \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{12}(\square_K)}^2 + \|\delta\|_{\underline{L}^{12}(\square_K)}^4 \right) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\sigma/2}}(C|e|^2 \nu^{-2} n_0^2 (\hat{L}_3 n_0^{-1})^{2/\sigma}) + \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/4}}(|e|^2 n_0^{-200}). \end{aligned} \tag{7.60}$$

By (2.53), (7.8) and (7.17) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{\underline{L}^{12}(\square_K)}^2 + \|\delta\|_{\underline{L}^{12}(\square_K)}^4 \right] \leq C \log^2(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} + C h^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-4}.$$

Combining the previous display with (7.60), taking the expected value and choosing  $\sigma = 10^{-2}$  yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\square_K} \nabla f_e^D \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{n_0-h} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \nabla v_{n_0} \right| \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \right] \leq \frac{1}{10} \mathbb{E} [J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e)] + |e|^2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} n_0^{-(1-9\eta)}. \quad (7.61)$$

This completes the proof of (7.37).  $\square$

*Proof of (7.38).* According to [AK24a, Lemma 5.4], we have the deterministic estimate

$$\|\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq C J^*(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e; \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}.$$

Since  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  on the good event  $G_\tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e; \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \boldsymbol{\delta}^t) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} &= J^*(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e; \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} J^*(\square_K, e, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e; \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the field  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  is uniformly elliptic, is  $3^l \mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary and has range of dependence at most  $3^{n_0}$ , by applying the results of [AK24a, Proposition 5.15], we obtain  $C(d) < \infty$  and  $\alpha(d) > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} [J(\square_K, e, \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}]e; \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l})] \leq C 3^{-\alpha(K-n_0)} |e|^2.$$

Since  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  by (7.23), the combination of the above and (7.8) (increasing  $M_0$  in (7.6) depending on  $\alpha$  if necessary) yields

$$\|\nabla f_e^N - \nabla f_e^D\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_K)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau} \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} 3^{-\alpha(K-n_0)} |e|^2 \leq C |e|^2 n_0^{-1000}.$$

The proof of (7.38) is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of (7.39).* We crudely bound the size of  $|\tilde{\mathbf{a}}|$  by observing that

$$|\tilde{\mathbf{a}}| \leq 2 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h} \leq C n_0.$$

Using this estimate, (2.9) and Lemma 2.7, we obtain

$$J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C |e|^2 \nu^{-1} n_0^3).$$

Combining this with the estimate (7.20) for the bad event and using (2.41) and the lower bound in (7.7), we obtain, for any  $s > 0$ ,

$$J_{n_0}(\square_K, e, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}e) \mathbf{1}_{G_\tau^c} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_1}(C |e|^2 \nu^{-1} n_0^3) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_s}((c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h})^{-1/s}) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{s/(1+s)}}(|e|^2 n_0^{3-1/4s}), \quad (7.62)$$

possibly increasing  $M_0$  so that, since  $n \geq M_0$ , the last inequality holds. Taking  $s$  sufficiently small, for instance  $s = 10^{-2}$ , and then taking the expectation of the result, we obtain (7.39).  $\square$

The proof of Lemma 7.3 is now complete.

**7.3. Perturbative analysis of the coarse-grained equation.** In this subsection we prove Lemma 7.4. We first give a brief summary of the main ideas in the argument. Using the lower bound (7.7), the desired estimate (7.15) is equivalent to

$$|\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] - (\mathbf{I}_d + c_*(\log 3)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}h)| \leq (\check{A} + C \log n_0)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}. \quad (7.63)$$

Recall that the truncated field  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  was defined above in (7.11) by

$$\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) := \mathbf{I}_d + ((\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \mathbf{I}_d) + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t(x))\mathbf{1}_{\{ |(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \mathbf{I}_d) + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t(x)| \leq 2\tau \}}. \quad (7.64)$$

The event in the indicator in (7.64) ensures that  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  is uniformly elliptic and is a small perturbation of the identity. There are two perturbative terms, namely  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d$  and  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ . As these have (close to) zero mean, we should expect their presence to perturb the homogenized matrix of the field *quadratically*—by the square of their size. The size of  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  is of order  $h^{1/2}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}$ , and the size of  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d$  is estimated by Lemma 7.5: we have that

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_{L^\infty(\square_K)} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/9}}(Ch^{1/2} \log(\nu^{-1}n_0)\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}).$$

Since we are able to take  $h$  nearly as large as  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}$ , it will be much larger than a power of  $\log n_0$ . Therefore, the  $\boldsymbol{\delta}^t$  term in the definition of  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  should contribute the leading order correction to  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}]$ , and this correction should be of order  $h\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}$ , with further corrections of order  $(\log n_0)^2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}$ . By a careful perturbative analysis we are able to identify the leading order constant, which turns out to be  $c_*(\log 3)$ , and this leads to the estimate (7.63).

The first step in formalizing this proof outline is to compute, at leading order, the homogenized matrix for the field  $\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ , where  $\check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$  denotes the truncation of  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  given by

$$\check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(x) := \boldsymbol{\delta}(x)\mathbf{1}_{\{ |(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \mathbf{I}_d) + \boldsymbol{\delta}^t(x)| \leq 2\tau \}}. \quad (7.65)$$

Note that the difference of  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  and  $\check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$  is negligible, since by (2.54) and (7.20) we have that, for every  $s \in (0, 1/8]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\delta} - \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\|_{L^\infty(\square_{n_0-h})} &\leq \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\square_{n_0-h})}\mathbf{1}_{G_\tau^c} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(Ch\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1}) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_s}((c\tau\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h})^{-1/s}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\frac{2s}{2+s}}}(C^{1+1/s}h\tau^{-1/s}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1-1/s}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\frac{2s}{2+s}}}(C^{1+1/s}\tau^{-1/s}n_0^{-1/4s}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used (7.7). Taking  $s = 8^{-1}$  yields

$$\|\boldsymbol{\delta} - \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\|_{L^\infty(\square_{n_0-h})} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1/10}}(C\tau^8 n_0^{-2}). \quad (7.66)$$

The homogenized matrix for  $\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$  is a scalar matrix, due to the symmetry assumption (J4). We will therefore abuse notation by allowing  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}]$  to denote a scalar and a matrix, whichever is more convenient. It is characterized by the formula, which is valid for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|e| = 1$ ,

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}] = 1 + \mathbb{E}[|\nabla\phi_e(0)|^2], \quad (7.67)$$

where  $\{\nabla\phi_e : e \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$  denotes the space of first-order gradient corrector fields for the coefficient field  $\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ . That is,  $\nabla\phi_e$  is the unique  $3^l\mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary gradient field with zero mean,  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla\phi_e(0)] = 0$ , that satisfies the equation

$$-\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}})(e + \nabla\phi_e) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7.68)$$

In the next lemma, we show that  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}]$  is equal to  $1 + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}hc_*(\log 3)$ , up to lower-order corrections.

**Lemma 7.10.** *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that*

$$|\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}] - (1 + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} hc_*(\log 3))\mathbf{I}_d| \leq \check{A}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} + Ch^2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-4} + C\tau^8 n_0^{-2}. \quad (7.69)$$

*Proof.* Fix  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|e| = 1$ . By (7.67) it suffices to show that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[|\nabla\phi_e|^2] - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} hc_*(\log 3) \right| \leq \check{A}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} + Ch^2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-4} + C\tau^8 n_0^{-2}. \quad (7.70)$$

We do so by showing  $\nabla\phi_e \approx \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} + \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}$  and  $\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} \approx \nabla\chi_e^{(1)}$ , where  $\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}$ ,  $\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}$  and  $\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}$  are the  $3^l\mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary random potential fields satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}] = \mathbb{E}[\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}] = \mathbb{E}[\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}] = 0$  and the equations

$$-\Delta\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} = \nabla \cdot (\check{\delta}e) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (7.71)$$

$$-\Delta\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} = \nabla \cdot (\delta e) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (7.72)$$

and

$$-\Delta\check{\chi}_e^{(2)} = \nabla \cdot (\check{\delta}\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7.73)$$

The assumption **(J5)** asserts precisely that

$$|\mathbb{E}[|\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}|^2] - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} hc_*(\log 3)| \leq \check{A}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}. \quad (7.74)$$

Subtracting the equations (7.71) and (7.72) and using the estimate (7.66), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}|^2] \leq C\mathbb{E}[|\delta - \check{\delta}|^2] \leq C\tau^8 n_0^{-2}. \quad (7.75)$$

To see that  $\nabla\phi_e \approx \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} + \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}$  we observe that the difference  $\nabla\phi_e - (\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} + \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)})$  satisfies the equation

$$-\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta})(\nabla\phi_e - (\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} + \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)})) = \nabla \cdot (\check{\delta}\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

If  $\tau$  is taken sufficiently small, depending only on  $d$ , then the Calderón-Zygmund estimates imply that

$$\mathbb{E}[|(\nabla\phi_e - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)})|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\check{\delta}\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\check{\delta}|^4]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[|\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}|^4]^{1/2}.$$

We also have that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}|^8]^{1/8} \leq C\mathbb{E}[|\check{\delta}|^8]^{1/8} \leq Ch^{1/2}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}|^4]^{1/4} \leq C\mathbb{E}[|\check{\delta}\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}|^4]^{1/4} \leq C\mathbb{E}[|\check{\delta}|^8]^{1/8} \mathbb{E}[|\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}|^8]^{1/8} \leq Ch\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}.$$

Combining these, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[|(\nabla\phi_e - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)})|^2] \leq Ch^3\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-6}.$$

Testing the equation for  $\phi_e$  with itself, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla\phi_e|^2] = \mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\delta}\nabla\phi_e]. \quad (7.76)$$

Combining the above estimates, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[|\nabla\phi_e|^2] - \mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\delta}(\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} + \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)})]| &= |\mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\delta}(\nabla\phi_e - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)})]| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\check{\delta}|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[|(\nabla\phi_e - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)} - \nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)})|^2]^{1/2} \\ &\leq Ch^2\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-4}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.77)$$

By the equation for  $\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}$ , we also have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}|^2] = \mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\delta}\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(1)}]. \quad (7.78)$$

Lastly, we have that, since the quantity  $e \cdot \check{\delta}\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}$  is odd with respect to negation (replacing the matrices  $\{\mathbf{j}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  by  $\{-\mathbf{j}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ), the symmetry assumption **(J4)** implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\delta}\nabla\check{\chi}_e^{(2)}] = 0. \quad (7.79)$$

We now obtain (7.70) from the triangle inequality and the displays (7.77), (7.78), (7.79), (7.74) and (7.75). This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

In view of Lemma 7.10, the proof of (7.63) will be complete once we have an estimate for the difference of the homogenized matrix of the field  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  and the homogenized matrix of  $\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t$ . This is the purpose of the next lemma. Before giving the statement, we introduce the space of first-order gradient corrector fields for the coefficient field  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$ . These are denoted by  $\{\nabla\psi_e : e \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ , and are characterized as unique  $3^l\mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary gradient fields with zero mean,  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla\psi_e] = 0$ , which satisfy the equation

$$-\nabla \cdot \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(e + \nabla\psi_e) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7.80)$$

The homogenized matrix for  $\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  is the scalar matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}]$  satisfying, for every  $|e| = 1$ ,

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] = \mathbb{E}[(e + \nabla\psi_e) \cdot \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(e + \nabla\psi_e)]\mathbf{I}_d. \quad (7.81)$$

Observe that from (7.64) and (7.65) that

$$\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t) = (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \mathbf{I}_d) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(x) - \mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t(x)| \leq 2\tau\}}. \quad (7.82)$$

It follows from (7.82) and the estimates (4.53) and (4.55) that, for every  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , there exists  $C(p, d) < \infty$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t)|^p]^{1/p} \leq \mathbb{E}[|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d|^p]^{1/p} \leq C \log(\nu^{-1}n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0}^{-1}. \quad (7.83)$$

Note also that, by the assumed symmetry in law with respect to negation in **(J4)**, we have

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}] = \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t]. \quad (7.84)$$

The main step remaining in the proof of Lemma 7.4 is therefore to obtain the following estimate.

**Lemma 7.11.** *There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that*

$$|\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] - \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t]| \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} \log(\nu^{-1}n_0). \quad (7.85)$$

*Proof.* By (7.67) and (7.76), we have that

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t] = 1 + \mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\delta}\nabla\phi_e].$$

By testing the equation for  $\psi_e$  with itself, we obtain, for every  $|e| = 1$ ,

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] = e \cdot \mathbb{E}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}(e + \nabla\psi_e)] = 1 + e \cdot \mathbb{E}[(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d)(e + \nabla\psi_e)].$$

Combining these and using (7.16), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] - \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t]| \\
& \leq |\mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} \nabla \psi_e] - \mathbb{E}[e \cdot \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t \nabla \phi_e]| + C \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} \\
& \leq |\mathbb{E}[(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d)(\nabla \psi_e - \nabla \phi_e)]| + |\mathbb{E}[(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t)) \nabla \phi_e]| + C \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2}. \quad (7.86)
\end{aligned}$$

We next approximate the difference between  $\nabla \psi_e$  and  $\nabla \phi_e$ . For this purpose, we let  $\nabla \xi_e^{(1)}$  be the  $3^l \mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary random potential field satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla \xi_e^{(1)}] = 0$  and

$$-\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t) \nabla \xi_e^{(1)} = \nabla \cdot (\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t))(e + \nabla \phi_e) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7.87)$$

If  $\tau$  is taken sufficiently small, depending only on  $d$ , then we can apply the interior Calderón-Zygmund estimates to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla \xi_e^{(1)}|^8]^{1/8} \leq C \mathbb{E}[|(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t))(e + \nabla \phi_e)|^8]^{1/8}.$$

Similarly, if  $\tau$  is taken sufficiently small, depending only on  $d$ , then the interior Calderón-Zygmund estimates also yield

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla \phi_e|^{16}]^{1/16} \leq C \mathbb{E}[|\nabla \phi_e|^2]^{1/2} \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} h^{1/2}.$$

Combining the previous displays and using also (7.83), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nabla \xi_e^{(1)}|^8]^{1/8} \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} (\log(\nu^{-1} n_0)) h^{1/2}.$$

We next observe that  $\nabla \psi_e - \nabla \phi_e - \nabla \xi_e^{(1)}$  satisfies

$$-\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t)(\nabla \psi_e - \nabla \phi_e - \nabla \xi_e^{(1)}) = -\nabla \cdot (\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t)) \nabla \xi_e^{(1)} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7.88)$$

Using the interior Calderón-Zygmund estimate again under the assumption that  $\tau$  is small, and applying also (7.83), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|\nabla \psi_e - \nabla \phi_e - \nabla \xi_e^{(1)}|^4]^{1/4} & \leq C \mathbb{E}[|(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t)) \nabla \xi_e^{(1)}|^4]^{1/4} \\
& \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-3} (\log(\nu^{-1} n_0))^2 h^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore get, by the triangle inequality, (7.83), and the fact that  $h \leq \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}$ , we obtain an estimate for the first term on the right side of (7.86):

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbb{E}[(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d)(\nabla \psi_e - \nabla \phi_e)]| \\
& \leq |\mathbb{E}[(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}) \nabla \xi_e^{(1)}]| \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}[|\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d + \boldsymbol{\delta}| |(\nabla \psi_e - \nabla \phi_e - \nabla \xi_e^{(1)})|] \\
& \leq C(h^{1/2} + (\log n_0)) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-3} (\log n_0) + C(h^{1/2} + (\log n_0)) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-4} (\log n_0)^3 h^{1/2} \\
& = C(h^{1/2} + (\log n_0)) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-3} (\log n_0) (1 + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} (\log n_0) h^{1/2}) \\
& \leq C(h^{1/2} + (\log n_0)) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-3} (\log n_0). \quad (7.89)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show that

$$|\mathbb{E}[(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^t)) \nabla \phi_e]| \leq n_0^{-1000}. \quad (7.90)$$

To prove this, we observe that, since  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}$  depends only on  $\{\mathbf{j}_0, \dots, \mathbf{j}_{n_0-h}\}$ , and both  $\check{\delta}^t$  and  $\nabla\phi_e$  depend only on  $\{\mathbf{j}_{n_0-h+1}, \dots, \mathbf{j}_{n_0}\}$ , these fields are independent by assumption **(J2)**. We deduce that, since  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla\phi_e] = 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) \nabla\phi_e] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d] \mathbb{E}[\nabla\phi_e] = 0.$$

We next observe that

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d = (\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t)) + (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) \mathbf{1}_{\{ |(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) + \check{\delta}^t| > 2\tau \}}.$$

The previous two displays, (7.19), (7.21) and the Hölder inequality yield that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[(\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - (\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t)) \nabla\phi_e]| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) \mathbf{1}_{\{ |(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) + \check{\delta}^t| > 2\tau \}} \nabla\phi_e \right] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ |\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{ |(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l} - \mathbf{I}_d) + \check{\delta}^t| > 2\tau \}} \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [ |\nabla\phi_e|^2 ]^{1/2} \\ &\leq Ch \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} \exp(-c\tau \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}) \cdot Ch \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} \\ &\leq n_0^{-1000}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the lower bound bound (7.7), (7.5), and increased  $M_0$  if necessary. This completes the proof of (7.90).

Combining (7.86), (7.89) and (7.90), we get

$$|\bar{\mathbf{a}}[\check{\mathbf{a}}_{n_0-h,l}] - \bar{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{I}_d + \check{\delta}^t]| \leq C(h^{1/2} + \log(\nu^{-1} n_0)) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-3} \log(\nu^{-1} n_0) + C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}^{-2} \log(\nu^{-1} n_0).$$

Using that  $h \leq \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n_0-h}$ , we obtain the result.  $\square$

The combination of Lemmas 7.10, 7.11, (7.84) and the triangle inequality give us (7.63). This completes the proof of Lemma 7.4, and therefore of Proposition 7.2 and Theorem 7.1.

## 8. Homogenization of the Dirichlet problem

In this section we complete the proofs of Theorems B and C by obtaining pointwise homogenization estimates and allowing for nonzero right-hand sides. Much of the work here is technical in nature, and amounts to a post-processing of the results in Section 6.

We begin by extending some of the coarse-graining estimates to equations with right-hand side (Lemma 8.3) and then use these to establish  $L^2$  estimates for the homogenization error for the Dirichlet problem (Proposition 8.4). We then obtain superdiffusive Caccioppoli estimates, both in interior (Lemma 8.6) and global (Lemma 8.5) forms. These together with the homogenization error estimate and an excess decay iteration yield a large-scale Lipschitz-type bounds valid across a logarithmic number of scales (Lemmas 8.7 and 8.9). Roughly, these statements assert that a solution on a large ball  $B_R$  will have  $L^2$  oscillation decay on smaller balls  $B_r$ , for  $r \in [R(\log R)^{-1/2-\delta}, R]$ , like that of a Lipschitz function. Combined with an application of the De Giorgi-Nash  $L^\infty$ - $L^2$  estimate to take care of small scales (as explained in Step 6 of Section 1.5), we consequently upgrade the  $L^2$  homogenization estimates to  $L^\infty$ . This then allows us to improve the large-scale Lipschitz estimate from  $L^2$  to  $L^\infty$  in Proposition 8.12, which is then iterated to yield Theorem C.

Theorem B is a consequence of the following statement, which is proved at the end of the section. Here and throughout we define, for a smooth bounded domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , the dilation of  $U$  by  $U_K := 3^K U$  for every  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Proposition 8.1.** *Suppose that  $U$  is a smooth, bounded domain. There exists  $C(d, U) < \infty$  and, for every  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ , a minimal scale  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\mathcal{X} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho}}(L_1) \quad \text{with} \quad L_1 := L_0(C\rho^{-1}(1-2\rho)^{-1}, 1 - \frac{1}{8}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu) \quad (8.1)$$

*such that, if  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfies  $K \geq L_1$  and  $3^K \geq \mathcal{X}$ ,  $g \in W^{1,\infty}(U_K)$ ,  $f \in L^\infty(U_K)$  and  $u, u_{\text{hom}}$  denote the solutions of*

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial U_K \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = g & \text{on } \partial U_K, \end{cases} \quad (8.2)$$

*then we have the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \|\nabla u - \nabla u_{\text{hom}}\|_{\hat{H}^{-1}(U_K)} + \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1}(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K})\nabla u - \nabla u_{\text{hom}}\|_{\hat{H}^{-1}(U_K)} \\ & \leq C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1}K^\rho \log K \left( \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1}3^{2K} \|f\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \log(\nu^{-1}K)3^K \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

*Proof of Theorem B assuming Proposition 8.1.* For every  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$  with  $\beta + 2\alpha < 1$ , we take  $\rho := \beta/2$  and deduce by (7.1) that  $C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1}K^\rho \log^2(\nu^{-1}K) \leq K^{-\alpha}$  provided  $K \geq C(U, p, \beta, \alpha, c_*, \nu, d)$ . We may now apply Proposition 8.1 to obtain Theorem B after rescaling and using (7.1) to replace  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K$  by  $(2c_*(\log 3)K)^{1/2}$ .  $\square$

**8.1. Homogenization estimates in  $L^2$ .** We begin by finding a minimal scale above which the coarse-graining errors and the behavior of the stream matrix  $\mathbf{k}$  are well behaved across a logarithmic number of scales. This uses the results already obtained in Proposition 6.5 and Lemma 2.6 and a routine union bound argument. The free parameter  $M$  can be enlarged to handle further union bounds—for instance, we will need to find another minimal scale such that each of the  $\mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}$ 's centered on a grid are not large—which is what (8.7) asserts.

**Lemma 8.2** (Minimal scale). *For every  $s \in (0, 1]$  there exists a constant  $C(s, d) < \infty$  and for every  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $M \in [1, \infty)$  a random minimal scale  $\mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho}}(L_1) \quad \text{where} \quad L_1[M] := L_0(CM\rho^{-1}(1-2\rho)^{-1}, 1 - \frac{1}{8}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu)$$

*such that, for every  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq L_1[M]$  and*

$$3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M} \quad \text{and} \quad m - [M \log(\nu^{-1}m)] \leq n \leq m, \quad (8.4)$$

*and, for every  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m$  and  $v \in \mathcal{A}(z + \square_n)$ , we have*

$$\begin{cases} 3^{-ns} \|(\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_n - (\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n})\nabla v\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z+\square_n)} \leq C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_n^{-1/2}n^\rho \log n)\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}, \\ 3^{-ns} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z+\square_n)} \leq C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_n^{-1/2}\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}, \\ n^{-1} \|\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n}\|_{L^\infty(z+\square_n)} + 3^n \|\nabla \mathbf{k} - \nabla \mathbf{k}_n\|_{L^\infty(z+\square_n)} + 3^{-\frac{n}{4}} [\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n}]_{\hat{H}^{-1/4}(z+\square_n)} \leq n^\rho. \end{cases} \quad (8.5)$$

*and, for every  $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \geq k' \geq n$  and  $z \in 3^k \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m$ ,  $z' \in 3^{k'} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m$  with  $(z' + \square_{k'}) \subseteq (z + \square_k) \subseteq \square_m$  we have*

$$|(\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_k} - (\mathbf{k})_{z'+\square_{k'}}| \leq k^\rho \log k. \quad (8.6)$$

*Moreover, for each  $M_1 \geq 1$  and  $k_1 := [M_1 \log(\nu^{-1}m)]$ , if  $m \geq L_1[M + M_1]$  and*

$$3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M+M_1} \implies \max_{z \in 3^{m-k_1} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}(z) \leq 3^{m-k_1}. \quad (8.7)$$



*Proof.* Fix a constant  $K(d) < \infty$  to be determined below and let

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &:= L_0(K^2 M \rho^{-4} (1-2\rho)^{-4} s^{-4}, 1 - \frac{1}{8}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu), \\ L_2 &:= L_0(K M \rho^{-4} (1-2\rho)^{-4} s^{-4}, 1 - \frac{1}{8}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

We define the minimal scale  $\mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}$  to be the smallest power of three such that, if  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $m \geq L_1$  and (8.4) holds, then we have both (8.5) and (8.6). Observe that the implication (8.7) is immediate.

Turning to the estimate of the stochastic integrability of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}$ , we define constants

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &:= L_0(K^2 M \rho^{-1} (1-2\rho)^{-1}, 1 - \frac{1}{8}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu), \\ L_2 &:= L_0(K M \rho^{-1} (1-2\rho)^{-1}, 1 - \frac{1}{8}(\rho \wedge (1-2\rho)), c_*, \nu), \end{aligned}$$

where  $K(s, d) < \infty$  is a large constant to be selected below. Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq L_2$ . By Proposition 6.5 (with selection  $\delta = 1$ ) and (2.56), (2.57) (with selection  $\sigma = \rho$  and  $\delta := M^{-1} \log^{-1}(\nu^{-1})$ ) for sufficiently large  $K$  there exists, for every  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , a minimal scale  $\mathcal{Y}(z)$  satisfying the bound

$$\log \mathcal{Y}(z) = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{2\rho}}(L_2)$$

such that, if  $3^n \geq \mathcal{Y}(z)$  and  $n \geq L_2$ , we have for every  $v \in \mathcal{A}(z + \square_n)$

$$\begin{cases} 3^{-sn} \|(\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_n - (\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n}) \nabla v\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z+\square_n)} \leq C_{(6.24)} (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}, \\ 3^{-sn} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z+\square_n)} \leq C_{(6.25)} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_n^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}, \\ n^{-1} \|\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n}\|_{L^\infty(z+\square_n)} + 3^n \|\nabla \mathbf{k} - \nabla \mathbf{k}_n\|_{L^\infty(z+\square_n)} + 3^{-\frac{n}{4}} [\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n}]_{\hat{H}^{-1/4}(z+\square_n)} \leq n^\rho. \end{cases} \quad (8.8)$$

and for every  $n' \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n - [M \log(\nu^{-1}n)] \leq n' \leq n$  and  $z' \in 3^{n'} \mathbb{Z}^d \cap z + \square_n$

$$|(\mathbf{k})_{z+\square_n} - (\mathbf{k})_{z'+\square_{n'}}| \leq n^\rho \log n. \quad (8.9)$$

Write  $h := [M \log(\nu^{-1}m)]$  and let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_m := \max_{n \in [m-h, m] \cap \mathbb{N}} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m} \mathcal{Y}(z).$$

Observe that if  $3^{m-h} \geq \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_m$  then (8.5) and (8.6) hold in  $\square_m$ , after possibly enlarging  $K$ . We compute, by a union bound

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_m > 3^{m-h} \right] \leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4} (L_2^{-1} m)^{2\rho} \right),$$

provided that  $m \geq (CM \log(\nu^{-1}m))^{1/2\rho} L_2$ . By another union bound, it follows that, after further enlarging  $K$  if necessary,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M} > 3^k \right] \leq \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_m > 3^{m-[M \log(\nu^{-1}m)]} \right] \leq \exp \left( -(L_1^{-1} k)^{2\rho} \right).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Throughout the rest of this section, we let  $\mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}(z)$  denote the random variable  $\mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}$  from Lemma 8.2 for the environment centered at  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $L_1[M]$  the lower bound. We denote the Sobolev conjugates of 2 by

$$2^* := \begin{cases} \frac{2d}{d-2} & \text{if } d > 2, \\ 3 & \text{if } d = 2, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad 2_* := \frac{2^*}{2^* - 1} = \begin{cases} \frac{2d}{d+2} & \text{if } d > 2, \\ 3/2 & \text{if } d = 2. \end{cases} \quad (8.10)$$

**Lemma 8.3.** *For every  $s \in (0, 1]$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  there exists a constant  $C(s, d) < \infty$  such that, if  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy*

$$3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}, \quad m \geq L_1[M] \quad \text{and} \quad n := m - \lceil M \log(\nu^{-1}m) \rceil \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C, \quad (8.11)$$

and  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d$  with  $z + \square_n \subseteq \square_m$  and  $u \in H^1(z + \square_n)$  solving, for  $f \in L^{2^*}(z + \square_n)$ , the equation

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f \quad \text{in } z + \square_n,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{-ns} \|(\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z + \square_n)} \\ \leq C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)} + Cn^{1+\rho} 3^n \nu^{-1} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_n)} \end{aligned} \quad (8.12)$$

and

$$3^{-ns} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z + \square_n)} \leq C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)} + C3^n \nu^{-1} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_n)}. \quad (8.13)$$

*Proof.* Let  $u_z$  denote the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u_z = 0 & \text{in } z + \square_n, \\ u_z = u & \text{on } \partial(z + \square_n). \end{cases} \quad (8.14)$$

By testing the equation of  $u - u_z$  with itself and applying the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality (see for instance [Maz11, Section 6.3.4]) we obtain

$$\nu \|\nabla u - \nabla u_z\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)}^2 \leq \|u - u_z\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_n)} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_n)} \leq C3^n \|\nabla u - \nabla u_z\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_n)}.$$

We deduce that

$$\|\nabla u - \nabla u_z\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)} \leq C3^n \nu^{-1} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_n)}. \quad (8.15)$$

By the second line of (8.5) and (4.39)

$$3^{-ns} \|\nabla u_z\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z + \square_n)} \leq C\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u_z\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)}. \quad (8.16)$$

The previous two displays and (6.27) imply (8.13).

By the third line of (8.5) together with the second line of (8.5), (4.39) and (8.6) we have

$$3^{-ns} \|(\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u_z\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z + \square_n)} \leq C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho \log m) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u_z\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)}.$$

and by the last line of (8.5) and (6.27) together with (8.15) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{-ns} \|(\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla(u_z - u)\|_{\underline{H}^{-s}(z + \square_n)} &\leq Cn^{1+\rho} \|\nabla u - \nabla u_z\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)} \\ &\leq Cn^{1+\rho} 3^n \nu^{-1} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

The previous two displays imply (8.13). □

We use the previous lemma to prove a homogenization result for the Dirichlet problem with  $L^2$  error bounds.

**Proposition 8.4** (Homogenization estimates in  $L^2$ ). *Let  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and let  $U$  be a smooth bounded domain. There exist  $C(d, U) < \infty$  such that, if  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $3^K \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, 1, M}$  and  $K \geq L_1[M]$  with  $M \geq C$ , then, for every  $f \in L^p(U_K)$  and  $g \in H^1(U_K)$ , if we denote by  $u, u_{\text{hom}} \in H^1(U_K)$  the solutions of the boundary value problems*

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial U_K \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = g & \text{on } \partial U_K, \end{cases} \quad (8.17)$$

then we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & 3^{-K} \|u - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \\ & \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-3/2} K^\rho \log K \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} (\|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + 3^K \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(U_K)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.18)$$

*Proof.* We collect some preliminary objects, notation, and assumptions. By dilating  $U$ , if necessary, we may assume that  $U \subseteq \square_0$ . Let  $M \geq H(U, d)$  where  $H(U, d) < \infty$  is a constant to be determined below and let

$$n := K - \lceil H \log(\nu^{-1}K) \rceil.$$

We also assume, after possibly enlarging  $H$ , that  $n \geq K/2$ . Let  $\zeta$  be a smooth cut-off function satisfying  $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ ,  $\|\nabla \zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 3^{-n}$  and

$$\zeta \equiv 1 \text{ on } \{x \in U_K : \text{dist}(x, \partial U_K) \leq 3^{n+d}\}, \quad \zeta \equiv 0 \text{ on } \{x \in U_K : \text{dist}(x, \partial U_K) \geq 3^{n+d-3}\}.$$

Denote the interior of  $U_K$  by  $U_K^\circ := \{x \in U : \text{dist}(x, \partial U_K) \geq 3^{n+d}\}$  and the boundary layer by  $Z_{b,n} := \{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap (U_K \setminus U_K^\circ) : z + \square_{n+1} \subseteq U_K\}$ . Observe that

$$\{\nabla \zeta \neq 0\} \subseteq \bigcup_{z \in Z_{b,n}} (z + \square_n).$$

and, by the assumed smoothness of  $\partial U$ ,

$$|Z_{b,n}| \leq C 3^{n-K} |U_K| \quad (8.19)$$

Let  $\eta = \eta_{3^n}$  be the standard mollifier on scale  $3^n$ .

We prove (8.18) by passing through the function

$$w := \zeta \eta * u + (1 - \zeta)g, \quad (8.20)$$

which is close to  $u$ . Indeed, we have, using (8.19) and the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality that

$$3^{-K} \|\zeta(u * \eta - u)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C 3^{n-K} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}$$

and

$$3^{-K} \|(1 - \zeta)(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} \|\nabla(u - g)\|_{L^2(U_K)},$$

after again enlarging  $H$  if necessary. The above two displays imply that

$$3^{-K} \|w - u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(U_K)} + \|g\|_{L^2(U_K)}).$$

Consequently, the desired statement (8.18) will follow once we establish the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla w - \nabla u_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K)} \\ & \leq \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-3/2} K^\rho \log K \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + C(\nu^{-1} K)^{-200} (\|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + 3^K \|f\|_{\underline{L}^q(U_K)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.21)$$

This is our goal for the rest of the proof (recall that  $2_* < 2$  is defined in (8.10) and that its Hölder conjugate is  $2^* > 2$ ). We will establish this bound by showing that  $w$  and  $u_{\text{hom}}$  solve almost the same equation in  $U_K$  and are equal on the boundary  $\partial U_K$ .

By direct calculation, we observe that  $w$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} -\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \Delta w - f &= (\zeta \eta * f - f) - \nabla \cdot (\zeta \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K) \nabla u)) \\ & \quad + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \nabla \cdot (\nabla \zeta (\eta * u - g) + (1 - \zeta) \nabla g) + \nabla \zeta \cdot \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K}) \nabla u). \end{aligned} \quad (8.22)$$

We apply the classical divergence-form, global Calderón-Zygmund estimates for the Laplace operator in smooth, bounded domains (see for instance [AKM19, Exercise 7.10]) to obtain, for every exponent  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , the existence of  $C(p, d) < \infty$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \|\nabla w - \nabla u_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^p(U_K)} \\ & \leq C \|\zeta \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{L}^p(U_K)} + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \|\nabla \zeta (\eta * u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^p(U_K)} + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \|(1 - \zeta) \nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^p(U_K)} \\ & \quad + C \|\zeta \eta * f - f\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(U_K)} + C \|\nabla \zeta \cdot \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(U_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.23)$$

We apply this for  $p = 2_*$ . The first term on the right is the leading order, coarse-graining error which is estimated using Lemma 8.3. The second, third, and last terms are boundary layer errors which will be estimated brutally using the smoothness of the domain (8.19). The fourth term on the right is a mollification error which will be shown to be small.

By Lemma 8.3 applied with  $m := K$  and  $s := 1$ , we have, for every  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K$  such that  $z + \square_n \subseteq U_K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K) \nabla u)\|_{L^\infty(z + \square_n)} \\ & \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1/2} K^\rho \log K) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_{n+1})} + C \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_{n+1})} \end{aligned} \quad (8.24)$$

and

$$\|\eta * (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K \nabla u)\|_{L^\infty(z + \square_n)} \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_{n+1})} + C \nu^{-1} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_{n+1})}. \quad (8.25)$$

By the previous two displays, the triangle inequality and (7.1), we obtain, for every  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_K$  such that  $z + \square_n \subseteq U_K$ ,

$$\|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u)\|_{L^\infty(z + \square_n)} \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n^{1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_{n+1})} + C \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z + \square_{n+1})}. \quad (8.26)$$

Furthermore, using the Sobolev extension theorem, we may extend  $g$  outside of  $U_K$  so that it belongs to  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and satisfies  $\|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|g\|_{H^1(U_K)}$ . We also extend both  $u$  and  $u_{\text{hom}}$  outside of  $U_K$  by defining them to be equal to  $g$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus U_K$ .

By (8.24), we have that, for every  $q \in (1, \infty)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\zeta \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{L}^q(U_K)} \\ & \leq C \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap U_K} \|\zeta \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K) \nabla u)\|_{L^\infty(z + \square_n)}^q \right)^{1/q} \\ & \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1/2} K^\rho \log K) \nu^{1/2} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap U_K^\circ} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)}^q \right)^{1/q} + C K^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^q(U_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.27)$$

To estimate the last term on the right side of (8.23), let  $q \in [2_*, \infty)$  and test with  $\psi \in W_0^{1,q'}(U_K)$  with  $\|\psi\|_{\underline{W}^{1,q'}(U_K)} \leq 1$ , using the Hölder inequality and the Poincaré inequality in the boundary layer to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{U_K} \psi \nabla \zeta \cdot \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u) \\ & \leq |U_K|^{-1} \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u)\|_{L^q(U_K \cap \{\nabla \zeta \neq 0\})} \|\nabla \zeta\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \|\psi\|_{L^{q'}(U_K \cap \{\nabla \zeta \neq 0\})} \\ & \leq |U_K|^{-1/q} \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u)\|_{L^q(U_K \cap \{\nabla \zeta \neq 0\})} \underbrace{3^{-n} \|\psi\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)}}_{\leq C \|\nabla \psi\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)} \leq C}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all such  $\psi$  and using the last line of (8.5) yields that for all  $q \in [q, \infty)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \zeta \cdot \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,q}(U_K)} & \leq C |U_K|^{-1/q} \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u)\|_{L^q(U_K \cap \{\nabla \zeta \neq 0\})} \\ & \leq C \left( |U_K|^{-1} \sum_{z \in Z_{b,n}} \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K}) \nabla u)\|_{L^\infty(z + \square_n)}^q \right)^{1/q} \\ & \leq C \nu^{-1} K^2 \left( |U_K|^{-1} \sum_{z \in Z_{b,n}} (\|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_{n+1})})^q \right)^{1/q}. \quad (8.28) \end{aligned}$$

It follows, by the above display for  $q = 2_*$  and (8.19), that for sufficiently large  $H$

$$\|\nabla \zeta \cdot \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K}) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,2_*}(U_K)} \leq C (\nu^{-1} K)^{-300} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}. \quad (8.29)$$

We next turn to the estimate for the fourth term on the right side of (8.23), which we estimate in  $W^{-1,q}(U_K)$  for general exponent  $q \in [1, \infty]$ . With  $\psi \in W_0^{1,q'}(U_K)$  with  $\|\psi\|_{\underline{W}^{1,q'}(U_K)} \leq 1$ , we compute, using the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{U_K} \psi (f - \zeta \eta * f) \right| & = \left| \int_{U_K} (\psi - \eta * \psi) f + \int_{U_K} \eta * (\psi(1 - \zeta)) f \right| \\ & \leq \|f\|_{\underline{L}^q(U_K)} (\|\psi - \eta * \psi\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)} + \|\psi(1 - \zeta)\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)}). \quad (8.30) \end{aligned}$$

By the Poincaré inequality, we find that

$$\|\psi - \eta * \psi\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)} \leq C 3^n \|\nabla \psi\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)} \leq C 3^n.$$

For the second term in (8.30), we use the Poincaré inequality in the boundary layer to obtain

$$\|\psi(1 - \zeta)\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)} \leq \|\psi\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K \cap \{\zeta \neq 1\})} \leq C 3^n \|\nabla \psi\|_{\underline{L}^{q'}(U_K)} \leq C 3^n.$$

By the previous three displays, we obtain, for any  $q \in [1, \infty]$ ,

$$\|\zeta \eta * f - f\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,q}(U_K)} \leq C 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^q(U_K)} \leq C (\nu^{-1} K)^{-300} 3^K \|f\|_{\underline{L}^q(U_K)}. \quad (8.31)$$

Turning to the estimate for the third term on the right side of (8.23), we use Hölder's inequality and (8.19) to get

$$\|(1 - \zeta) \nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^{2_*}(U_K)} \leq C (3^{-(K-n)})^{\frac{2-2_*}{2-2_*}} \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C (\nu^{-1} K)^{-300} \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}. \quad (8.32)$$

It remains to estimate the second term on the right side of (8.23). We first split it using the triangle inequality,

$$\|\nabla\zeta(\eta * u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K)} \leq \|\nabla\zeta(\eta * u - u)\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K)} + \|\nabla\zeta(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K)}$$

and estimate the first term as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\zeta(\eta * u - u)\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K)} &\leq \|\nabla\zeta\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \|\eta * u - u\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K \cap \{\nabla\zeta \neq 0\})} \\ &\leq C\mathfrak{3}^{-(K-n) \cdot \frac{2-2*}{2 \cdot 2*}} \mathfrak{3}^{-n} \|\eta * u - u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K \cap \{\nabla\zeta \neq 0\})} \\ &\leq C\mathfrak{3}^{-(K-n) \cdot \frac{2-2*}{2 \cdot 2*}} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-300} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly, the second term, using also Poincaré's inequality in the boundary layer (using that  $(u - g) \equiv 0$  outside of  $U_K$ )

$$\|\nabla\zeta(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K)} \leq \mathfrak{3}^{-n} \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K \cap \{\nabla\zeta \neq 0\})} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-300} (\|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}).$$

The above three displays yield

$$\|\nabla\zeta(u * \eta - g)\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-300} (\|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}). \quad (8.33)$$

Combining (8.27) with  $q = 2^*$ , (8.29), (8.31) with  $q = 2^*$ , (8.33) and (8.32) with (8.23) and using also (7.1) yields (8.21) and thus the result.  $\square$

**8.2. Superdiffusive Caccioppoli and  $C^{0,1}$  estimates.** Throughout the rest of this section, we denote, for  $y \in U_K$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\widehat{\square}_m(y) := (y + \square_m) \cap U_K.$$

We also set  $\widehat{\square}_m := \widehat{\square}_m(0)$ .

**Lemma 8.5** (Caccioppoli estimate up to the boundary). *Assume  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is a smooth, bounded domain. There exist  $C(d, U) < \infty$  such that, if  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $m, K \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy*

$$3^K \wedge 3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, 1, M}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad K \wedge m \geq L_1[M] \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C,$$

then, for every  $f \in L^2(U_K)$ ,  $g \in H^2(U_K)$  and solution  $u \in H^1(U_K)$  of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial U_K, \end{cases} \quad (8.34)$$

we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{m-1}(y))}^2 &\leq C\mathfrak{3}^{-2m} \overline{\mathfrak{s}}_m \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_m(y))}^2 + C\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} \mathfrak{3}^{2m} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_m(y))}^2 \\ &\quad + C\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_m \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_m(y))}^2 + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-1000} \mathfrak{3}^{2m} \|\nabla^2 g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_m(y))}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8.35)$$

Under these same assumptions we also have the global Caccioppoli estimate

$$\nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2 \leq C\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1} \mathfrak{3}^{2K} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2 + C\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_K \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2 + C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-1000} \mathfrak{3}^{2K} \|\nabla^2 g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2. \quad (8.36)$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $y = 0$ . Fix  $m, n, M \in \mathbb{N}$  as in (8.11) with parameter  $s = 1$  and suppose  $3^K \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,1,M}$  and  $K \geq L_1[M]$ . We use the fact that the ellipticity ratio in  $U_K \cap \square_m$  is  $(\nu^{-1}m)^2$  (by the last row of (8.5)) to obtain, by the usual Caccioppoli argument, the crude estimate,

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\frac{1}{2}\square_m \cap U_K)} \leq \frac{Cm^2}{\nu^2} \left( 3^{-m} \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} + \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} + 3^m \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} \right). \quad (8.37)$$

Note that we can also write this inequality as

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\frac{1}{2}\square_m \cap U_K)} \leq \frac{Cm^2}{\nu^2} \left( 3^{-m} \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} + \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} + 3^m \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} \right). \quad (8.38)$$

We next fix a smooth cutoff function  $\varphi$  with  $\mathbf{1}_{\square_{m-1}} \leq \varphi \leq \mathbf{1}_{\frac{1}{2}\square_m}$ ,  $3^m \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C$  and

$$\sup_{z+\square_n} \varphi \leq C \inf_{z+\square_n} \varphi \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \quad \text{with } z + \square_{n+1} \subseteq \frac{1}{2}\square_m, \quad (8.39)$$

and

$$|\tilde{\square}_m \setminus \tilde{\square}_m^\circ| \leq C \quad \text{where } \tilde{\square}_m := U_K \cap \{\varphi > 0\} \quad \text{and } \tilde{\square}_m^\circ := \{x \in \tilde{\square}_m : x + \square_{n+3} \subseteq \tilde{\square}_m\}.$$

We test the equation (8.2) of  $u$  with  $(u - g)\varphi^2 \in H_0^1(U_K)$  and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{\square}_m} f(u - g)\varphi^2 &= \int_{\tilde{\square}_m} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot \nabla((u - g)\varphi^2) \\ &= \nu \int_{\tilde{\square}_m} |\nabla u|^2 \varphi^2 + \int_{\tilde{\square}_m} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot (-\nabla g)\varphi^2 + (\nabla \varphi^2)(u - g). \end{aligned}$$

The left side can be estimated using Young's inequality as

$$\int_{\tilde{\square}_m} f(u - g)\varphi^2 \leq 3^{-2m} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + C 3^{2m} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2.$$

Combining the previous two displays yields

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)} &\leq 3^{-2m} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + C 3^{2m} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\tilde{\square}_m} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot (\varphi^2 \nabla g) \right| + \left| \int_{\tilde{\square}_m} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot ((u - g) \nabla \varphi^2) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (8.40)$$

Our goal for the remainder of the proof is to estimate the last two terms on the right, for which we split the estimate into that of boundary cubes

$$Z_b := \{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d : (z + \square_n) \cap (\tilde{\square}_m \setminus \tilde{\square}_m^\circ) \neq \emptyset\}$$

and interior cubes. If  $z + \square_n \subseteq \tilde{\square}_m^\circ$ , we have by Hölder's inequality, (8.12) and (8.13) with  $(s = 1)$  and (7.1) that, for every  $\eta \in H^1(z + \square_n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \eta \nabla u \right| \\ &\leq \left| \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \int_{z+\square_n} \eta \nabla u \right| + \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \eta \nabla u \right| \\ &\leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{1/2} (|\eta|_{z+\square_n} + 3^n \|\nabla \eta\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}) (\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} + \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z+\square_n)}). \end{aligned}$$

We apply the previous display with  $\eta = (\partial_i \varphi^2)(u - g) = 2\varphi(u - g)\partial_i \varphi$  for each  $i$ , and then sum over  $i$ , using also that  $3^m \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot (\nabla \varphi^2)(u - g) \right| &\leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} (\|(u - g) \nabla \varphi^2\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} + 3^n \|\nabla((u - g) \nabla \varphi^2)\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}) \\ &\quad \times (\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} + \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z+\square_n)}) \\ &\leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-m} (\|\varphi(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} + 3^n \|\varphi \nabla(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z+\square_n)}) \\ &\quad \times (\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} + \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z+\square_n)}) \\ &\leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-m} (\|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} + 3^n \|\nabla(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}) \\ &\quad \times (\nu^{1/2} \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} + \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|\varphi f\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(z+\square_n)}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used (8.39). We then deduce, after summing over  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \tilde{\square}_m^\circ$  using Cauchy-Schwarz across the sum and that  $\varphi \leq 1$  followed by an application of Young's inequality together with (8.38),

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \tilde{\square}_m^\circ} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot (\nabla \varphi^2)(u - g) \right| \\ &\leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-m} (\|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)} + 3^n \|\nabla(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}) (\nu^{1/2} \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)} + \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{100} \nu \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m 3^{-2m} \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + C(\nu^{-1} m)^{-2000} (\|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + 3^{2m} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use the assumed scale separation between  $n$  and  $m$  in (8.11) and increased  $M$ , if necessary. Using instead  $\eta := \varphi^2(\partial_i g)$  and repeating the above argument we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \tilde{\square}_m^\circ} \left| \int_{z+\square_n} (\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot \varphi^2 \nabla g \right| \\ &\leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-m} (\|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)} + 3^n \|\nabla(u - g)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}) (\nu^{1/2} \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)} + \nu^{-1} n^2 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{100} \nu \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + C(\nu^{-1} m)^{-2000} 3^{2m} (\|\nabla^2 g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2 + \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\tilde{\square}_m)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

We next estimate the contribution of cubes in the boundary layer  $Z_b$ , for which we use the fact that  $|Z_b| \leq C 3^{n-m} |\square_m|$ , which is a consequence of the assumed smoothness of  $\partial U$ . By Hölder's inequality and the last row of (8.5) we deduce that, for every  $\eta \in H^1(\tilde{\square}_m)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\square_m|} \sum_{z \in Z_b} \int_{(z+\square_n) \cap U_K} |(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot \eta| &\leq \frac{C m^2}{|\square_m|} \sum_{z \in Z_b} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2((z+\square_n) \cap U_K)} \|\eta\|_{L^2((z+\square_n) \cap U_K)} \\ &\leq C m^2 (3^{-(m-n)})^{\frac{2^*-2}{2 \cdot 2^*}} \|\eta\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(\hat{\square}_m)} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} \\ &\leq C m^2 (3^{-(m-n)})^{\frac{1}{d\sqrt{6}}} 3^m \|\nabla \eta\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality. Applying the above display with the choices  $\eta = (u - g) \nabla \varphi^2$  and  $\eta = \varphi^2 \nabla g$  and estimating the terms as above, taking advantage of the additional factor of  $(3^{-(m-n)})^{\frac{1}{d\sqrt{6}}} \leq (\nu^{-1} m)^{-4000}$  (which holds for  $M$  large enough), we obtain,



respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|\square_m|} \sum_{z \in Z_b} \int_{(z+\square_n) \cap U_K} |(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot (u - g) \nabla \varphi^2| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{100} \nu \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2 + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-2000} (\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m 3^{-2m} \|u - g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2 + \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2 + 3^{2m} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|\square_m|} \sum_{z \in Z_b} \int_{(z+\square_n) \cap U_K} |(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m}) \nabla u \cdot \varphi^2 \nabla g| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{100} \nu \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2 + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-2000} (C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2 + 3^{2m} \|\nabla^2 g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2 + 3^{2m} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous two displays with the two corresponding interior estimates proved above, and then inserting the result into (8.40), we obtain, after reabsorbing the term  $\frac{1}{25} \nu \|\varphi \nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)}^2$ , the desired bound (8.35).

To prove (8.36), we instead take  $\varphi \equiv 1$  and repeat the above computations (which are in fact simpler because  $\nabla \varphi \equiv 0$ ), using the assumption  $3^K \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,1,M}$  and  $K \geq L_1[M]$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We next present an interior version of the coarse-grained Caccioppoli estimate. The idea is that, if  $y + \square_m \subseteq U_K$ , then we may test the equation instead with  $(u - (u)_{y+\square_m}) \varphi^2$  and follow a simplified version of the prior argument to obtain the following statement. Since the proof is similar to that of the previous lemma, it is omitted.

**Lemma 8.6.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 8.5, with the relaxed assumption  $g \in H^1(U_K)$ , there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, if  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $K, n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  are such*

$$y + \square_m \subseteq U_K \quad \text{and} \quad 3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,1,M}(y) \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C,$$

then we have the estimate

$$\nu \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(y+\square_{m-1})}^2 \leq C 3^{-2m} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m \|u - (u)_{y+\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(y+\square_m)}^2 + C 3^{2m} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(y+\square_m)}^2. \quad (8.41)$$

We can also prove a Lipschitz type estimate across many scales.

**Lemma 8.7.** *There exist  $C(d) < \infty$  and  $c(d) \in (0, 1)$ , such that, if  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  satisfy*

$$n < m \leq n + c \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m m^{-\rho} \log^{-1} m \quad \text{and} \quad 3^n \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,s,M}, \quad n \geq L_1[M] \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C, \quad (8.42)$$

and  $u \in H^1(\square_m)$  and  $f \in L^\infty(\square_m)$  satisfy

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f \quad \text{in} \quad \square_m,$$

then we have the estimate

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} + 3^{-n} \|u - (u)_{\square_n}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} \leq C 3^{-m} \|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}. \quad (8.43)$$

*Proof.* Fix a smooth domain  $V_0$  such that  $\square_{-2} \subseteq V_0 \subseteq \square_0$  and for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \leq m$  let  $V_k = 3^k V_0$  and let  $u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)}$  be the solution of the Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases} -\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k \Delta u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)} = f & \text{in } V_k, \\ u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)} = u & \text{on } \partial V_k. \end{cases} \quad (8.44)$$

By Proposition 8.4 (with  $g := u$ ) we have that for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \leq k \leq m$ ,

$$3^{-k} \|u - u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(V_k)} \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k^{-3/2} k^\rho \log k) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)} + C(\nu^{-1} k)^{-200} 3^k \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_k)}. \quad (8.45)$$

By comparing  $u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)}$  to harmonic  $v_{\text{hom}}^{(k)} \in u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)} + H_0^1(V_k)$  and using then the interior regularity of  $v_{\text{hom}}^{(k)}$  (see for instance [AKM19, Exercise 3.7] for details), for every  $k, k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \in [n, m]$ ,

$$\inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)} - \ell\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k-k_0})} \leq C 3^{-2k_0} \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|u_{\text{hom}}^{(k)} - \ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(V_k)} + C(\log k_0) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k^{-1} 3^{2k} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_k)}.$$

and so, by the previous two displays and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{-(k-k_0)} \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|u - \ell\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k-k_0})} &\leq C 3^{-k_0} 3^{-k} \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|u - \ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)} + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k^{-1} 3^{k+2k_0} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_k)} \\ &\quad + C 3^{(1+d/2)k_0} (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k^{-3/2} k^\rho \log k) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the Caccioppoli inequality (8.41) gives us

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)} \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k^{-1/2} 3^{-k} \|u - (u)_{\square_k}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{k+1})} + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k^{-1/2} 3^k \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k+1})}.$$

The above two displays and (4.39) yield

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{-(k-k_0)} \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|u - \ell\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k-k_0})} &\leq C 3^{-k_0} 3^{-k} \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|u - \ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{k+1})} + C 3^{2k_0} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^k \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k+1})} \\ &\quad + C 3^{(1+d/2)k_0} (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} k^\rho \log k) 3^{-k} \|u - (u)_{\square_{k+1}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{k+1})}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.46)$$

Using the previous display, we may perform an excess decay iteration. Define the excess

$$E_k := \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} 3^{-k} \|u - \ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)},$$

and let  $\ell^{(k)}$  be the affine function achieving the minimum in the above display, but for  $k = m$  we select  $\ell^{(m)} = (u)_{\square_m}$ . By the triangle inequality and since  $\ell^{(k+1)}$  is an affine function, we have

$$\|u - (u)_{\square_{k+1}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{k+1})} \leq E_{k+1} + C 3^k |\nabla \ell^{(k+1)}|. \quad (8.47)$$

Taking  $C_{(8.42)}$  be so large that

$$C_{(8.46)} 3^{(1+d/2)k_0} (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m) \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

and  $k_0(d) \in \mathbb{N}$  small enough so that  $3^{1-k_0} C_{(8.46)} \leq 1/4$ , we have, by the triangle inequality,

$$E_{k-k_0} \leq \frac{1}{2} E_{k+1} + C 3^k \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k+1})} + C (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m) |\nabla \ell^{(k+1)}|.$$

Iterating this yields that, for every  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [n, m]$ ,

$$E_k \leq C 2^{-(m-k)} \left( E_m + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} \right) + C (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m) \sum_{j=k}^m 2^{-(j-k)} |\nabla \ell^{(j)}|.$$

Since  $\ell^{(m)}$  is a constant we have, after summing the previous estimate over  $k$

$$\sum_{k=n}^m E_k \leq C \left( E_m + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} \right) + C \left( \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m \right) \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} |\nabla \ell^{(k)}|.$$

By telescoping, the fact that  $\nabla \ell^{(m)} = 0$  and the triangle inequality, we get

$$|\nabla \ell^{(k)}| \leq \sum_{j=k}^{m-1} |\nabla \ell^{(j+1)} - \nabla \ell^{(j)}| \leq C \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} 3^{-j} \|\ell^{(j+1)} - \ell^{(j)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_j)} \leq C \sum_{k=n}^m E_k.$$

Using the first condition in (8.42) and  $\nabla \ell^{(m)} = 0$ , we obtain

$$\left( \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m \right) \sum_{k=n}^m |\nabla \ell^{(k)}| \leq (m-n) \left( \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m \right) \max_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [k, m-1]} |\nabla \ell^{(k)}| \leq c_{(8.42)} \sum_{k=n}^m E_k.$$

Using the previous three displays and reabsorbing the last term on the right by taking  $c_{(8.42)}$  small enough by means of  $d$ , we deduce by (8.47) that

$$\max_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [k, m-1]} 3^{-k} \|u - (u)_{\square_k}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_k)} \leq C \left( E_m + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)} \right).$$

This, together with an application of the Caccioppoli inequality (8.41), concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 8.8.** *There exist  $C(d) < \infty$  and  $c(d) \in (0, 1)$ , such that, for every  $M \geq C$  and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  satisfying*

$$3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, s, M+C} \quad \text{and} \quad m - \lceil M \log(\nu^{-1} m) \rceil \leq n \leq m - 1, \quad (8.48)$$

and every  $f \in L^\infty(\square_m)$  and solution  $u \in H^1(\square_m)$  of the equation

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f \quad \text{in } \square_m,$$

we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{m-1}} \left( \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)} + 3^{-n} \|u - (u)_{z + \square_n}\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)} \right) \\ \leq C 3^{-m} \|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.49)$$

*Proof.* We apply the previous lemma (with  $m-1$  in place of  $m$ ) centered at every grid point  $z \in z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{m-1}$ , noting that  $z + \square_{m-1} \subseteq \square_m$ , and obtain the result after appealing to (8.7).  $\square$

We next prove a global counterpart of Lemma 8.7. The estimate is Lipschitz type, other than the terms containing the derivatives of  $g$ , which are due to boundary effects.

**Lemma 8.9** ( $C^{0,1}$ -estimate). *For every smooth bounded domain  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists  $C(d, U) < \infty$ , such that, for every  $M \geq C$  and  $n, m, K \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $K \geq m$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  satisfying*

$$n < m \leq n + c \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m m^{-\rho} \log^{-1} m \quad \text{and} \quad 3^n \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, s, M}, \quad n \geq L_1[M] \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C, \quad (8.50)$$

and for every  $f \in L^\infty(U_K)$ ,  $g \in W^{2,\infty}(U_K)$  and  $u \in H^1(U_K)$  which solves the equation,

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial U_K, \end{cases}$$

we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_n)} \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-m} \|u - (u)_{\hat{\square}_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\square}_m)} \\ + C(m-n) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + C(\nu^{-1} m)^{-200} 3^m \|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.51)$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may assume that  $U \subseteq \square_0$ . Furthermore, by the Whitney extension theorem there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, we may extend  $g$  outside of  $U_K$  so that it belongs to  $W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and satisfies  $\|g\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\|g\|_{W^{2,\infty}(U_K)}$ . We also extend both  $u$  and  $u_{\text{hom}}$  outside of  $U_K$  by defining them to be equal to  $g$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus U_K$ .

If the origin is a boundary point of  $U$ , let  $n_0 = -\infty$ . Otherwise, let  $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$  be such that  $\square_{n_0-2} \cap \partial U_K = \emptyset$ , but  $\square_{n_0-1} \cap \partial U_K \neq \emptyset$ . Then, there exists a constant  $c(d, U)$  such that for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $k \in [n_0, K]$ , we have the lower bound  $|\widehat{\square}_k| \geq c|\square_k|$ .

Since  $U \subseteq \square_0$ , we must have  $n_0 \leq K$ . If  $m \leq n_0$ , then (8.51) follows by (8.43). So suppose that  $m > n_0$ . We consider two cases,  $n \leq n_0 - 3$  and  $n \geq n_0 - 2$ . In the case  $n \leq n_0 - 3$ , by (8.43) and (4.39) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_n)} &\leq C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-n_0} \|u - (u)_{\square_{n_0-2}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_{n_0-2})} + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} 3^{n_0} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_{n_0-2})} \\ &\leq C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-n_0} \|u - (u)_{\widehat{\square}_{n_0}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{n_0})} + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} 3^{n_0} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\square}_{n_0})}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.52)$$

In the case  $n \geq n_0 - 2$ , we have, by (8.35) and an application of the Poincaré inequality in the boundary layer that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_n)} &\leq C3^{-n} \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} \|u - (u)_{\widehat{\square}_{n+1}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{n+1})} + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{n+1})} \\ &\quad + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} \|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{n+1})} + C(\nu^{-1}n)^{-500} 3^n \|\nabla^2 g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{n+1})}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.53)$$

Our goal is to iterate these estimates from scale  $n_0 \wedge n$  to scale  $m$ .

Fix  $k \in [n_0 \wedge n, m] \cap \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\eta_k$  be the standard mollifier on scale  $3^k$ , and let  $\zeta_k \in C_0^\infty(\square_{k+2})$  be a cut-off function which satisfies  $\mathbf{1}_{\square_{k+1}} \leq \zeta_k \leq \mathbf{1}_{\square_{k+2}}$  and  $\|\nabla \zeta_k\|_{L^\infty(\square_{k+2})} \leq C3^{-k}$  and let  $g_k := \zeta_k(\eta_k * g) + (1 - \zeta_k)g$ . Fix a smooth domain  $\widehat{V}_k$  such that  $\widehat{\square}_{k-1} \subseteq \widehat{V}_k \subseteq \widehat{\square}_k$ . We denote by  $u_k \in H^1(\widehat{\square}_{k+2})$  and  $\bar{u}_k \in H^1(\widehat{V}_k)$  the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u_k = f & \text{in } \widehat{\square}_{k+2}, \\ u_k = g_k & \text{on } (\partial U_K) \cap \square_{k+2}, \\ u_k = u & \text{on } (\partial \square_{k+2}) \cap U_K, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k \Delta \bar{u}_k = f & \text{in } \widehat{V}_k, \\ \bar{u}_k = u_k & \text{on } \partial \widehat{V}_k. \end{cases}$$

Observe that by the maximum principle together with  $\zeta_k \leq 1$

$$3^{-k} \|u - u_k\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\square}_{k+2})} \leq 3^{-k} \|\zeta_k(\eta_k * g - g)\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\square}_{k+2})} \leq C\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \quad (8.54)$$

Moreover, by (8.35) and the above display, we have, for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \leq k \leq m - 2$ ,

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla(u - u_k)\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_k)} \leq C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\square}_{k+2})} + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} 3^k \|\nabla^2 g\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{k+2})}. \quad (8.55)$$

By (8.18),

$$3^{-k} \|u_k - \bar{u}_k\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{V}_k)} \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-3/2} m^\rho \log m) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u_k\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{V}_k)} + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} 3^k \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2*}(\widehat{V}_k)}. \quad (8.56)$$

Next, by the global  $C^{1,1}$  estimate for the Laplacian, since  $\partial U$  is smooth, we find a constant  $C(d, U) < \infty$  such that for every  $k, k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|\bar{u}_k - \ell\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\square}_{k-k_0-1})} &\leq C3^{-2k_0} \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} \|\bar{u}_k - \ell\|_{\underline{L}^2(\widehat{\square}_{k-1})} \\ &\quad + C3^{k_0} (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k^{-1} 3^{2k} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\square}_{k-1})} + 3^{2k} \|\nabla^2 g_k\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.57)$$

For each  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [n \vee n_0, m]$  define

$$E_k := \inf_{\ell \text{ affine}} 3^{-k} \|u - \ell\|_{L^2(\hat{\Omega}_k)}$$

and denote by  $\ell^{(k)}$  the affine achieving the infimum above but define  $\ell^{(m)} \equiv (u)_{\hat{\Omega}_m}$ . By taking  $k_0$  to be the smallest integer with  $3^{2d-k_0} C_{(8.57)} \leq 1/4$  we get, by (8.54), (8.55), (8.56), the above estimate and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{k-k_0} &\leq \frac{1}{4} E_{k+1} + C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-3/2} m^\rho \log m) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\Omega}_k)} \\ &\quad + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^k \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\Omega}_k)} + C\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} 3^k \|\nabla^2 g\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}. \end{aligned}$$

By (8.35) and the Poincaré inequality we see that, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \vee n_0 \leq k < m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\hat{\Omega}_k)} &\leq C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-k} \|u - (u)_{\hat{\Omega}_{k+1}}\|_{L^2(\hat{\Omega}_{k+1})} + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \\ &\quad + C3^k (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\Omega}_m)} + (\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} \|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.58)$$

Taking  $C_{(8.50)}$  large enough and combining the previous two displays with the triangle inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{k-k_0} &\leq \frac{1}{2} E_{k+1} + 3^{-(k+1)} \|u - \ell^{(k+1)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\Omega}_{k+1})} + C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m) |\nabla \ell^{(k+1)}| \\ &\quad + C\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + C3^k (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\Omega}_m)} + (\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} \|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}). \end{aligned}$$

Iterating this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=n \vee n_0}^m E_k &\leq C3^{-m} \|u - (u)_{\hat{\Omega}_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\Omega}_m)} \\ &\quad + C(m-n) \left( \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m) \max_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [k, m-1]} |\nabla \ell^{(k+1)}| \right) \\ &\quad + C3^m (\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\Omega}_m)} + (\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} \|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the above display and then arguing identically to the end of the proof of Lemma 8.7 leads to the bound, which holds for all  $k \in [n \vee n_0, m] \cap \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{-k} \|u - (u)_{\hat{\Omega}_k}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\Omega}_k)} &\leq C3^{-m} \|u - (u)_{\hat{\Omega}_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\Omega}_m)} + C3^m \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\Omega}_m)} \\ &\quad + C(m-n) \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} 3^m \|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (8.52) and (8.53) yields (8.51), completing the proof.  $\square$

Arguing like in Corollary 8.8, we obtain the following version of the prior result valid up to the boundary.

**Corollary 8.10.** *For every smooth bounded domain  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists  $C(d, U) < \infty$ , such that, for every  $M \geq C$  and  $n, m, K \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  satisfying*

$$K \geq m \geq L_1[M], \quad 3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, s, M+C} \quad \text{and} \quad m - [M \log(\nu^{-1}m)] \leq n \leq m, \quad (8.59)$$

and for every  $f \in L^\infty(U_K)$ ,  $g \in W^{2,\infty}(U_K)$  and  $u \in H^1(U_K)$  which solves the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial U_K, \end{cases} \quad (8.60)$$

we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_{m-1}} \left( \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_n(z))} + 3^{-n} \|u - (u)_{\hat{\square}_n(z)}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_n(z))} \right) \\
& \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} 3^{-m} \|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} + C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1/2} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\square}_m)} \\
& \quad + C(m-n) \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{1/2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} 3^m \|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \tag{8.61}
\end{aligned}$$

**8.3. Homogenization estimates in  $L^\infty$ .** Lemma 8.7 allows us to upgrade the  $L^2$ -bound in Proposition 8.4 to an  $L^\infty$ -estimate.

**Lemma 8.11** (Harmonic approximation in  $L^\infty$ ). *There exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, if  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $M$  satisfy*

$$3^m \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho,1,M} \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C, \tag{8.62}$$

and  $u \in H^1(\square_m)$  and  $f \in L^\infty(\square_m)$  are such that

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f \quad \text{in } \square_m,$$

then there exists a function  $u_{\text{hom}} \in H^1(\square_{m-1})$  satisfying

$$-\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = f \quad \text{in } \square_{m-1},$$

such that

$$\|u - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(\square_{m-2})} \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} m^\rho \log m) (\|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^{2m} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}). \tag{8.63}$$

*Proof.* Let  $n := m - \lceil K \log(\nu^{-1}m) \rceil$ , where  $K$  is a constant to be determined below and let  $\eta$  be the standard mollifier at scale  $3^n$ . Choose a smooth domain  $V_m$  such that  $\square_{m-1} \subseteq V_m \subseteq \frac{1}{2}\square_m$ , and let  $\bar{u}, u_{\text{hom}}$  be the solutions of the Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases} -\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m \Delta \bar{u} = f * \eta & \text{in } V_m, \\ \bar{u} = u * \eta & \text{on } \partial V_m \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = f & \text{in } V_m, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = u * \eta & \text{on } \partial V_m, \end{cases} \tag{8.64}$$

respectively. Similarly to (8.31), we have, for every  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , that

$$\|\eta * f - f\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,p}(V_m)} \leq C 3^n \|f\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_m)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-300} 3^m \|f\|_{\underline{L}^p(\square_m)}. \tag{8.65}$$

Therefore, by Morrey's inequality and the Calderón-Zygmund estimate, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_{\text{hom}} - \bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(V_m)} & \leq C 3^m \|\nabla u_{\text{hom}} - \nabla \bar{u}\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(V_m)} \leq C 3^m \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} \|\eta * f - f\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,2d}(V_m)} \\
& \leq C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-300} 3^{2m} \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(\square_m)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, in order to compare  $\bar{u}$  to  $u * \eta$ , we observe that the latter function solves the equation

$$-\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m \Delta(u * \eta) = \nabla \cdot (\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m) \nabla u)) + f * \eta.$$

By Morrey's inequality and the Calderón-Zygmund estimate we obtain,

$$\|u * \eta - \bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(V_m)} \leq C 3^m \|\nabla(u * \eta) - \nabla \bar{u}\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(V_m)} \leq C \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m} - \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_m) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(V_m)}.$$

To estimate the term on the right, we follow the computation leading to (8.27) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(V_m)} \\ & \leq C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1/2} m^\rho (\log m) \nu^{1/2} \left( \sum_{z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \frac{1}{2} \square_m} \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{L}^2(z + \square_n)}^{2d} \right)^{1/2d} + C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} 3^m \|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(\square_m)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.66)$$

Applying Corollary 8.8, which we may do after picking  $C_{(8.63)} \geq K + C_{(8.48)}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_m} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m) \nabla u)\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(V_m)} \\ & \leq C m^\rho (\log m) (3^{-m} \|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + C \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.67)$$

Finally, to control the difference  $u - u * \eta$  in  $L^\infty$ , we use the De Giorgi-Nash  $L^\infty$ - $L^2$  estimate with explicit dependence in ellipticity (see for instance [BS21]). Here the ellipticity ratio is  $(\nu^{-1}m)^2$ , by (8.5), and so we obtain by Corollary 8.8, for every  $y \in \square_{m-2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |(u - u * \eta)(y)| & \leq C(\nu^{-1}m)^{d/2} \|u - (u)_{y + \square_n}\|_{\underline{L}^2(y + \square_n)} \\ & \leq C(\nu^{-1}m)^{d/2} 3^{-(m-n)} (\|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^{2m} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}) \\ & \leq C(\nu^{-1}m)^{-200} (\|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^{2m} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}), \end{aligned}$$

for  $K(d)$  large enough. Combining the above displays proves (8.63).  $\square$

We then use the previous result to upgrade Lemma 8.7 to a pointwise bound.

**Proposition 8.12.** *There exists constants  $C(d) < \infty$  and  $c(d) \in (0, 1)$ , such that, if  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  satisfy*

$$n < m \leq n + c \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m m^{-\rho} \log^{-1} m \quad \text{and} \quad 3^n \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, 1, M}, \quad n \geq L_1[M] \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C, \quad (8.68)$$

and if  $u$  solves  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f$  in  $\square_m$ , then we have the estimate

$$\|u - (u)_{\square_n}\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} \leq C 3^{-(m-n)} (\|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^{2m} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}). \quad (8.69)$$

*Proof.* After replacing (8.45) with (8.63), repeat the proof of Lemma 8.7.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem C.

*Proof Theorem C.* Note that (1.27) implies (1.25), so it suffices to prove (1.27). In order to prove (1.27) we need to remove the first constraint in (8.68) in the statement of Proposition 8.12. Fix  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and let  $\gamma' := \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma)$ . Take  $N_\gamma(d) \in \mathbb{N}$  to be the smallest integer satisfying

$$3^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma)N_\gamma} C_{(8.69)} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Set  $M := N_\gamma \vee C_{(8.68)}$  and define  $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, 1, M}$ . Note that for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  which satisfies

$$c_{(8.68)} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m m^{-\rho} \log^{-1} m \geq N_\gamma, \quad 3^{m-N_\gamma} \geq \mathcal{X} \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq N_\gamma + L_1[M] \quad (8.70)$$

we have

$$\|u - (u)_{\square_{m-N_\gamma}}\|_{L^\infty(\square_{m-N_\gamma})} \leq \frac{1}{2} 3^{\gamma N_\gamma} (\|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^{2m} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}).$$

Iterating the above display yields, for every such  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \leq m$  with  $n$  (in place of  $m$ ) satisfying (8.70) the bound

$$\|u - (u)_{\square_n}\|_{L^\infty(\square_n)} \leq C 3^{-\gamma(m-n)} (\|u - (u)_{\square_m}\|_{\underline{L}^2(\square_m)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^{2m} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\square_m)}).$$

This completes the proof of (1.27).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 8.1.* We will adapt the proof of Proposition 8.4, and let  $\zeta, \eta$  be as in that proof. Let  $n := K - \lceil N \log(\nu^{-1}K) \rceil$  for a large constant  $N(d, U)$  to be determined and define  $M := N + C_{(8.59)}$  and  $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, 1, M}$ . For these choices of parameters, if  $g \in W^{2, \infty}(U_k)$ , then we have (8.61). Our first task is thus to reduce to the case where the boundary data  $g \in W^{2\infty}(U_k)$ .

By the Whitney extension theorem, there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that, we may extend  $g$  outside of  $U_K$  so that it belongs to  $W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and satisfies  $\|g\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\|g\|_{W^{1, \infty}(U_K)}$ . Let  $\tilde{\eta}$  be the standard mollifier at scale  $(\nu^{-1}K)^{-50}3^K$  and set  $\tilde{g} := \tilde{\eta} * g$ . Then

$$\|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + (\nu^{-1}K)^{-50}3^K \|\nabla^2 \tilde{g}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \quad (8.71)$$

Consider the solutions  $v, v_{\text{hom}} \in H^1(U_K)$  of the Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla v = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ v = \tilde{g} & \text{on } \partial U_K \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \Delta v_{\text{hom}} = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ v_{\text{hom}} = \tilde{g} & \text{on } \partial U_K. \end{cases} \quad (8.72)$$

We argue that  $u, u_{\text{hom}}$  are close to  $v, v_{\text{hom}}$ , respectively. Since  $u - v \in \mathcal{A}(U_K)$ , we have by the maximum principle

$$\|u - v\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq \|\tilde{\eta} * g - g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-50}3^K \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \quad (8.73)$$

To show that the energies are close, fix  $r > 0$  to be determined below and consider a smooth cutoff function  $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^\infty(U_K)$  such that  $\tilde{\zeta} \equiv 1$  in  $\{x \in U_K : \text{dist}(x, \partial U_K) \geq r\}$  and  $\|\nabla \tilde{\zeta}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq Cr^{-1}$ . Testing the equation of  $u - v$  with  $u - v - (1 - \tilde{\zeta})(\tilde{g} - g) \in H_0^1(U_K)$ , using the last row of (8.5) and applying Young's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|\nabla(u - v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2 \\ & \leq \int_{U_K} (1 - \tilde{\zeta})(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K}) \nabla(u - v) \cdot \nabla(\tilde{g} - g) - \int_{U_K} (\tilde{g} - g)(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K}) \nabla(u - v) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\zeta} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \nu \|\nabla(u - v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2 + C(\nu^{-1}K)^4 (\|(1 - \tilde{\zeta}) \nabla(\tilde{g} - g)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2 + \|(\tilde{g} - g) \nabla \tilde{\zeta}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \nu \|\nabla(u - v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}^2 + C(\nu^{-1}K)^4 (r3^{-K} + 3^K r^{-1} (\nu^{-1}K)^{-100}) \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The above display, upon reabsorbing the first term and selecting  $r = (\nu^{-1}K)^{-50}3^K$ , implies

$$\|\nabla(u - v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-20} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}.$$

The above display and (8.73) show that

$$3^{-K} \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \|\nabla(u - v)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-20} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \quad (8.74)$$

A similar argument shows that

$$3^{-K} \|u_{\text{hom}} - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \|\nabla(u_{\text{hom}} - v_{\text{hom}})\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-20} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \quad (8.75)$$

By the previous two displays, it suffices to prove the desired estimates for  $v$  and  $v_{\text{hom}}$ .

Next, to shorten the notation, we define  $w := \zeta(\eta * v) + (1 - \zeta)\tilde{g}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} H_K & := \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{1/2} (\|v - (v)_{U_K}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|v - \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}) \\ & \quad + N \log(\nu^{-1}K) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{1/2} 3^K \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1/2} 3^{2K} \|f\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.76)$$



We first show that  $w$  is close to  $v$ . By (8.61) and (8.71), we have, for every  $z \in 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m$ ,

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2((z+\square_n) \cap U_K)} \leq C 3^{-K} H_K. \quad (8.77)$$

We define  $v$  and  $v_{\text{hom}}$  to be equal to  $\tilde{g}$  outside of  $U_K$ . Using the De Giorgi-Nash  $L^\infty$ - $L^2$  estimate with explicit dependence in ellipticity (here the ellipticity ratio is  $(\nu^{-1}K)^2$ , by (8.5)) we deduce that, for every  $y \in z + \square_n$ ,  $z + \square_{n+1} \subseteq U_K$  and for large enough  $N \geq C(d, U)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |v(y) - \eta * v(y)| &\leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{d/2} \|v - \eta * v(y)\|_{\underline{L}^2(y+\square_n)} \\ &\leq C 3^n (\nu^{-1}K)^{d/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_{n+1})} \leq (\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} H_K \end{aligned} \quad (8.78)$$

and if  $(z + \square_{n+d+3}) \cap \partial U_K \neq \emptyset$ , then, for  $y \in z + \square_{n+d+3}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{g}(y) - v(y)| &\leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{d/2} \|v - \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2((z+\square_{n+d+5}) \cap U_K)} + C 3^n \|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \\ &\leq C 3^n (\nu^{-1}K)^{d/2} \left( \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2((z+\square_{n+d+5}) \cap U_K)} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \right) \\ &\leq (\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} H_K. \end{aligned} \quad (8.79)$$

By the previous two displays we obtain

$$\|v - \eta * v\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \|v - w\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} H_K. \quad (8.80)$$

In view of the above estimate, it remains to show that  $w - v_{\text{hom}}$  is small in  $L^\infty$ . To do this, notice first that, by Morrey's inequality,

$$\|w - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C 3^K \|\nabla(w - v_{\text{hom}})\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)}. \quad (8.81)$$

To bound the right side, we use the Calderón-Zygmund estimate as in (8.23) and get

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{s}_K \|\nabla w - \nabla v_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \\ &\leq C \|\zeta \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{\square_K} - \bar{s}_K) \nabla v)\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \\ &\quad + C \bar{s}_K \|\nabla \zeta(\eta * v - \tilde{g})\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} + C \bar{s}_K \|(1 - \zeta) \nabla \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \\ &\quad + C \|\zeta \eta * f - f\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,2d}(U_K)} + C \|\nabla \zeta \cdot \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K}) \nabla v)\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,2d}(U_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.82)$$

We will estimate the five terms on the right. First, by (8.27) applied to  $v$  with  $q := 2d$  and using (8.77) we get

$$\|\zeta \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K} - \bar{s}_m) \nabla v)\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \leq C(\bar{s}_K^{-1/2} K^\rho \log K) 3^{-K} H_K. \quad (8.83)$$

Second, by (8.77) and the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\|\nabla \zeta(v - \tilde{g}) * \eta\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \leq C 3^{-\frac{1}{2d}(K-n)} \|\nabla(v - \tilde{g}) * \eta\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} 3^{-K} H_K \quad (8.84)$$

and, similarly,

$$\|\nabla \zeta(\tilde{g} * \eta - \tilde{g})\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \leq C 3^{-\frac{1}{2d}(K-n)} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} 3^{-K} H_K. \quad (8.85)$$

By the previous two displays we have

$$\|\nabla \zeta(v * \eta - \tilde{g})\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \leq (\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} 3^{-K} H_K. \quad (8.86)$$

Third, we obtain, by (8.71),

$$\|(1 - \zeta)\nabla\tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \leq C3^{-\frac{1}{2d}(K-n)}\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200}3^{-K}H_K. \quad (8.87)$$

Fourth, by (8.31) with  $q := 2d$ ,

$$\|\zeta\eta * f - f\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,2d}(U_K)} \leq C3^n\|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-300}3^K\|f\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)}. \quad (8.88)$$

Fifth, the last term we need to estimate is the counterpart of (8.29). To estimate it, we use (8.28) with  $q = 2d$  and (8.77):

$$\|\nabla\zeta \cdot \eta * ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K})\nabla v)\|_{\underline{W}^{-1,2d}(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-100}3^{-K}H_K. \quad (8.89)$$

By combining the above estimates with (8.82) and (8.81), we arrive at

$$\|w - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \leq C3^K\|\nabla w - \nabla v_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-3/2}K^\rho \log K)H_K. \quad (8.90)$$

We now estimate  $H_K$ . By the Poincaré inequality and the equation of  $v_{\text{hom}}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v - (v)_{U_K}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|v - \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \\ & \leq 2\|v - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|v_{\text{hom}} - (v_{\text{hom}})_{U_K}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|v_{\text{hom}} - \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \\ & \leq 2\|v - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + C3^K\|\nabla v_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + C3^K\|\nabla\tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \\ & \leq 2\|v - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + C3^K\|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^\infty(U_K)} + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1}3^{2K}\|f\|_{\underline{L}^\infty(U_K)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the definition (8.76),

$$H_K \leq 2\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{1/2}\|v - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + CN \log(\nu^{-1}K)\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{1/2}3^K\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + C\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1/2}3^{2K}\|f\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}. \quad (8.91)$$

Combining (8.90), (8.80) and (8.91) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} & \leq \|w - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \|w - v\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \\ & \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-3/2}K^\rho \log K)H_K + C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200}H_K \\ & \leq C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1}K^\rho \log K)\|v - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} \\ & \quad + C(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1}K^\rho \log K)(N \log(\nu^{-1}K)3^K\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1}3^{2K}\|f\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}). \end{aligned}$$

We may reabsorb the first term on the right above, if

$$\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1}K^\rho \log K \leq c(d, U) \ll 1,$$

which is valid for  $C_{(8.1)}$  selected large enough and (8.90)

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + 3^K\|\nabla w - \nabla v_{\text{hom}}\|_{\underline{L}^{2d}(U_K)} \\ & \leq CN(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1}K^\rho \log K)(\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_K^{-1}3^{2K}\|f\|_{\underline{L}^\infty(U_K)} + \log(\nu^{-1}K)3^K\|\nabla g\|_{\underline{L}^\infty(U_K)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.92)$$

This, together with (8.74) and (8.75), proves the desired  $L^\infty$ -estimate in (8.3).

We then estimate the weak norms. Observe that  $w - v_{\text{hom}}$  is already bounded in  $W^{1,2d}(U_K)$  by (8.92), and  $u - v$  and  $u_{\text{hom}} - v_{\text{hom}}$  are bounded using (8.74) and (8.75), respectively. To

bound  $\nabla v - \nabla w$  in  $\hat{H}^{-1}(U_K)$ , we fix  $\psi \in H^1(U_K)$  with  $\|\psi\|_{\underline{H}^1(U_K)} \leq 1$ . Since  $v = w$  on  $\partial U_K$ , we may subtract the mean of  $\psi$  from itself and thus assume that  $(\psi)_{U_K} = 0$ . We compute

$$\int_{U_K} (\nabla w - \nabla v)\psi = \int_{U_K} (\nabla \tilde{g} - \nabla v)(1 - \zeta)\psi + \int_{U_K} \nabla \zeta(v * \eta - \tilde{g})\psi + \int_{U_K} (\nabla v * \eta - \nabla v)\zeta\psi.$$

The middle term on the right has already been estimated in (8.86). The first term we estimate as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U_K} (\nabla \tilde{g} - \nabla v)(1 - \zeta)\psi &\leq \|\nabla \tilde{g} - \nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \|(1 - \zeta)\psi\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \\ &\leq C3^{-(\frac{1}{d} \wedge \frac{1}{6})(K-n)} (\|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}) \|\psi\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(U_K)} \\ &\leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} (\|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + 3^K \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last display we used the crude Caccioppoli estimate (8.37) and the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality. The last term we estimate as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U_K} \zeta\psi(\nabla v - \nabla v * \eta) &= \int_{U_K} \nabla v(\zeta\psi - (\zeta\psi) * \eta) \leq \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \|\zeta\psi - \eta * (\zeta\psi)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \\ &\leq C3^n \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \|\nabla(\zeta\psi)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have by Hölder's inequality that

$$3^{-n} \|\nabla(\zeta\psi)\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C \|\psi \mathbf{1}_{\{\nabla \zeta \neq 0\}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + C3^n \|\nabla \psi\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-200} 3^K$$

and thus by (8.37)

$$\int_{U_K} \zeta\psi(\nabla v - \nabla v * \eta) \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-100} (\|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + 3^K \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}). \quad (8.93)$$

By the above five displays we deduce that

$$3^{-K} [\nabla v - \nabla w]_{\hat{H}^{-1}(U_K)} \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-100} (\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + 3^K \|f\|_{L^\infty(U_K)}).$$

This, together with (8.92), (8.74) and (8.75), establishes the gradient estimate in (8.3).

To estimate the flux term, we subtract  $(\mathbf{k})_{U_K}$  from  $\mathbf{a}$ , fix  $\psi \in H^1(U_K)$  with  $\|\psi\|_{\underline{H}^1(U_K)} \leq 1$  and compute:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{U_K} ((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K})\nabla v - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \nabla w)\psi \\ &= \int_{U_K} \zeta\psi((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K)\nabla v) + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \int_{U_K} \nabla(v - v * \eta)\zeta\psi \\ &\quad + \int_{U_K} (1 - \zeta)((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K})\nabla v - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \nabla \tilde{g})\psi + \int_{U_K} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \nabla \zeta(v * \eta - \tilde{g})\psi. \end{aligned} \quad (8.94)$$

The last three terms are again very small using the quenched bound  $\|\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K}\|_{L^\infty(U_K)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \leq CK^2$  provided by the last estimate in (8.5). Indeed, the second term has been estimated in (8.93), and

the last term is estimated using (8.86), (8.91) and (8.92). The second to last term we bound, by Hölder's inequality, (8.37) and also (8.92), as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{U_K} (1 - \zeta)((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K})\nabla v - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K \nabla \tilde{g})\psi \\ & \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^2 3^{-(\frac{1}{d} \wedge \frac{1}{6})(K-n)} (\|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + \|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}) \|\psi\|_{\underline{L}^{2^*}(U_K)} \\ & \leq C(\nu^{-1}K)^{-100} 3^K (\|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)} + 3^K \|f\|_{\underline{L}^2(U_K)}). \end{aligned}$$

The first term in (8.94) is the leading order, coarse-graining error. As in the proof of Proposition 8.4, the integral can be split into a sum over boundary cubes and interior cubes, on which  $\zeta = 1$ . The contribution of the boundary layer can be again estimated crudely as before, and so the computation is omitted. The interior cubes satisfy, by Lemma 8.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{z+\square_n} \psi(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K)\nabla v \\ & \leq |((\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K)\nabla v)_{z+\square_n}| |(\psi)_{z+\square_n}| + C3^n(\nu^{-1}K)^2 \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} [(\psi)]_{\underline{H}^s(z+\square_n)} \\ & \leq C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1/2} K^\rho \log K) \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} |(\psi)_{z+\square_n}| \\ & \quad + C3^n(\nu^{-1}K)^2 (\|f\|_{L^{2^*}(z+\square_n)} |(\psi)_{z+\square_n}| + \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)} \|\nabla \psi\|_{\underline{L}^2(z+\square_n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Summing over interior cubes, indexed by  $z$ , then yields that

$$\frac{|\square_n|}{|U_K|} \sum_z \int_{z+\square_n} \psi(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K)\nabla v \leq C(K^\rho \log K) \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1/2} H_K.$$

We hence obtain

$$3^{-K} [\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1}(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{k})_{U_K})\nabla v - \nabla w]_{\hat{H}^{-s}(U_K)} \leq C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1} K^\rho \log K) 3^{-K} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_K^{-1/2} H_K,$$

from which the desired estimate for the fluxes in (8.3) follows by (8.91) and (8.92). The proof is complete.  $\square$

Analogously to how we upgraded Lemma 8.7 using Lemma 8.11, we may upgrade Lemma 8.9 using Proposition 8.1, and a similar smoothing of the boundary data as in its proof, to obtain the following pointwise oscillation estimate. The proof is omitted.

**Proposition 8.13.** *Suppose that  $U$  is a smooth domain. There exist constants  $C(d, U) < \infty$  and  $c(d, U) \in (0, 1)$ , such that, if  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $n, m, K \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m \leq K$  are such that*

$$n < m \leq n + c\bar{\mathbf{s}}_m m^{-\rho} \log^{-1} m \quad \text{and} \quad 3^n \geq \mathcal{Z}_{\rho, 1, M}, \quad n \geq L_1[M] \quad \text{with} \quad M \geq C, \quad (8.95)$$

then for every  $f \in L^\infty(U_K)$ ,  $g \in W^{1, \infty}(U_K)$  and  $u \in H^1(U_K)$  which solves the equation,

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = f & \text{in } U_K, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial U_K, \end{cases}$$

we have the estimate

$$\|u - (u)_{\hat{\square}_n}\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\square}_n)} \leq C3^{-(m-n)} \left( \|u\|_{\underline{L}^2(\hat{\square}_m)} + \bar{\mathbf{s}}_m^{-1} 3^m \|f\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\square}_m)} + (m-n) \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(\hat{\square}_m)} \right). \quad (8.96)$$

## 9. The invariance principle

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem A by proving the invariance principle (1.4) as well as the quenched (1.5) and annealed asymptotics (1.6) for the diffusivity of the process  $X_t$ . We recall the definition of the rescaled process  $X_t^\varepsilon$  given in (1.19):

$$X_t^\varepsilon := \varepsilon X_{\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2 (8c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{1/2}}}, \quad (9.1)$$

The convergence asserted in (1.4) is equivalent to the statement that, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every realization of the environment,

$$X_t^\varepsilon \Rightarrow W_t \quad \text{in law as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (9.2)$$

with respect to the uniform topology on paths, where  $\{W_t\}_{t>0}$  is a standard Brownian motion.

**9.1. Quantitative homogenization of the resolvents.** We show next that Theorem B implies a quenched estimate on the resolvent. This asserts roughly that, for  $0 < \lambda \ll |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha}$  with  $\alpha < 1/2$ , the inverse of the operator  $\lambda - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$ , with respect to Dirichlet boundary conditions, is close to that of the operator  $\lambda - \Delta$  in the  $L^\infty$  norm.

**Lemma 9.1** (Resolvent estimates). *Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a smooth bounded domain and  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$  with  $\beta + 2\alpha < 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be the random variable in the statement of Theorem B. There exists a constant  $C(U, \alpha, \beta, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$  with  $\varepsilon^{-1} \geq \mathcal{Z}$ , and functions  $f \in L^\infty(U)$  and  $g \in W^{1,\infty}(U)$ , if we let  $u^\varepsilon, u_{\text{hom}} \in H^1(U)$  denote the solutions of the boundary value problems*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda u^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = f & \text{in } U, \\ u^\varepsilon = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \lambda u_{\text{hom}} - \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = f & \text{in } U, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad (9.3)$$

then we have the estimate

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|f - \lambda u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \quad (9.4)$$

*Proof.* We decompose  $u_{\text{hom}} = u_1 + u_2$  where  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are the solutions of the Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 = f - \lambda u^\varepsilon & \text{in } U, \\ u_1 = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \lambda u_2 - \Delta u_2 = \lambda(u^\varepsilon - u_1) & \text{in } U, \\ u_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases}$$

The maximum principle gives  $\|u_2\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \|u^\varepsilon - u_1\|_{L^\infty(U)}$ . An application of Theorem B yields

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u_1\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|f - \lambda u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)}).$$

The triangle inequality and these estimates give us (9.4). □

We next post-process the result of the previous lemma, putting it into a form that is convenient for our applications below.

**Lemma 9.2.** *Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a smooth bounded domain and  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$  with  $\beta + 2\alpha < 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be the random variable in the statement of Theorem B. There exists a constant  $C(U, \alpha, \beta, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$*

such that, for every  $f \in W^{2,\infty}(U)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$  with  $\varepsilon^{-1} \geq \mathcal{Z}$  and  $\lambda \in [0, |\log \varepsilon|^\alpha]$ , if we let  $u^\varepsilon, u_{\text{hom}} \in H^1(U)$  denote the solutions of the boundary value problems

$$\begin{cases} \lambda u^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = \lambda f & \text{in } U, \\ u^\varepsilon = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \lambda u_{\text{hom}} - \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = \lambda f & \text{in } U, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad (9.5)$$

then we have the estimate

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \lambda \|f - g\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \quad (9.6)$$

*Proof.* Let  $w^\varepsilon$  and  $\tilde{w}$  be respectively the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon w^\varepsilon = -\Delta g & \text{in } U, \\ w^\varepsilon = g & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \lambda \tilde{w} - \Delta \tilde{w} = \lambda(g - w^\varepsilon) & \text{in } U, \\ \tilde{w} = 0 & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases}$$

Then we can compare  $w^\varepsilon$  to  $g$  using Theorem B, and then compare  $u^\varepsilon - w^\varepsilon$  to  $u_{\text{hom}} - g + \tilde{w}$  using Lemma 9.1, to obtain, respectively,

$$\|w^\varepsilon - g\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty(U)})$$

and

$$\|(u^\varepsilon - w^\varepsilon) - (u_{\text{hom}} - g + \tilde{w})\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} \|\lambda(f - w^\varepsilon) + \Delta g\|_{L^\infty(U)}.$$

The previous two displays, the triangle inequality and the restriction  $\lambda |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} \leq 1$  yield

$$\|(u^\varepsilon - w^\varepsilon) - (u_{\text{hom}} - g + \tilde{w})\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \lambda \|f - g\|_{L^\infty(U)}).$$

By the maximum principle, the function  $\tilde{w}$  satisfies

$$\|\tilde{w}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \|w^\varepsilon - g\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty(U)}).$$

Combining the previous displays, using the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^\varepsilon - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty(U)} &\leq \|(u^\varepsilon - w^\varepsilon) - (u_{\text{hom}} - g + \tilde{w})\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|w^\varepsilon - g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ &\leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \lambda \|f - g\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

The implicit Euler numerical scheme for a parabolic equation is equivalent to iterating the inverse of the resolvent operator. Therefore, we can expect to obtain homogenization estimates for parabolic boundary value problems as a consequence of Lemma 9.2. This idea leads to the following statement. In what follows, we denote the parabolic boundary of a cylinder  $(0, T) \times U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$  by

$$\partial_{\text{par}}((0, T) \times U) := (\{0\} \times U) \cup ((0, T) \times \partial U).$$

**Lemma 9.3** (Homogenization estimates for parabolic problems). *Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a smooth bounded domain and  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$  with  $\beta + 2\alpha < 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be the random variable in the statement of Theorem B. There exists a constant  $C(U, \alpha, \beta, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $T \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$  with  $\varepsilon^{-1} \geq \mathcal{Z}$ , and  $h \in C^\infty(U)$  and  $g \in C^\infty((0, \infty) \times U)$ , if we let  $u^\varepsilon$  and  $u_{\text{hom}}$  denote the solutions of the Cauchy-Dirichlet problems*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times U, \\ u^\varepsilon = g & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial U, \\ u^\varepsilon = h & \text{on } \{0\} \times U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u_{\text{hom}} - \Delta u_{\text{hom}} = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times U, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = g & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial U, \\ u_{\text{hom}} = h & \text{on } \{0\} \times U, \end{cases} \quad (9.7)$$

then we have the estimate

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times U)} \leq CT |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha/3} (\|g\|_{W^{2,\infty}((0, \infty) \times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \quad (9.8)$$

*Proof.* Since  $h$  is qualitatively smooth, then we have that the function  $\partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon$  is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t(\partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon) - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon(\partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times U, \\ \partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon = \partial_t^2 g & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial U, \\ \partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon = (\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^2 h & \text{on } \{0\} \times U. \end{cases} \quad (9.9)$$

By the maximum principle, we obtain the bound

$$\|\partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0, \infty) \times U)} \leq \|\partial_t^2 g\|_{L^\infty((0, \infty) \times U)} + \|(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \quad (9.10)$$

Similarly, we have the bound

$$\|\partial_t^2 u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty((0, \infty) \times U)} \leq \|\partial_t^2 g\|_{L^\infty((0, \infty) \times U)} + \|\Delta^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \quad (9.11)$$

However, since the operator  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  has fast oscillations in space, the function  $(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^2 h$  may be very large even if the initial condition  $h$  is smooth. Therefore our first goal is to replace  $h$  by “well-prepared” initial data  $h^\varepsilon$  which is close to  $h$  in  $L^\infty$  but for which we have good effective bounds on  $(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^2 h^\varepsilon$ .

Throughout we let  $\lambda > 0$  be a parameter which will eventually be taken to be  $c|\log \varepsilon|^\alpha$  for a small constant  $c$  depending on the appropriate parameters.

*Step 1.* We modify the initial data so that it is well-prepared for the operator  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$ . The claim is that, for given  $\mu > 0$ , there exists  $h^\varepsilon \in C^\infty(U) \cap L^\infty(U)$  satisfying

$$\mu \|h^\varepsilon - h\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon h^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \mu^{-1} \|(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^2 h^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \quad (9.12)$$

By enlarging the domain  $U$ , if necessary, we may suppose that  $h$  has compact support in  $U$ . We consider the functions  $h_1^\varepsilon$  and  $h_2^\varepsilon$  defined recursively as the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} \mu h_1^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon = \mu h & \text{in } U, \\ h_1^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \mu h_2^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon h_2^\varepsilon = \mu(h_1^\varepsilon - h) & \text{in } U, \\ h_2^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases} \quad (9.13)$$

We compare  $h_1^\varepsilon$  to the solution  $\bar{h}_1$  of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \mu \bar{h}_1 - \Delta \bar{h}_1 = \mu h & \text{in } U, \\ \bar{h}_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases} \quad (9.14)$$

An application of Lemma 9.1 yields

$$\|h_1^\varepsilon - \bar{h}_1\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} \mu \|h - h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)}.$$

Observe that  $h - \bar{h}_1$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mu(h - \bar{h}_1) - \Delta(h - \bar{h}_1) = -\Delta h & \text{in } U, \\ h - \bar{h}_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases}$$

By the maximum principle,

$$\|h - \bar{h}_1\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C \mu^{-1} \|\Delta h\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C \mu^{-1} \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}.$$

Thus, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|h - h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} \mu \|h - h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} + C \mu^{-1} \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}.$$

For  $\mu \leq c|\log \varepsilon|^\alpha$ , we can reabsorb the first term on the right side to obtain

$$\|h - h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C\mu^{-1}\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}.$$

By the maximum principle, we have

$$\|h_2^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \|h - h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C\mu^{-1}\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}.$$

Define  $h^\varepsilon := h_1^\varepsilon + h_2^\varepsilon$  and observe that the above estimates and the triangle inequality yield the estimate for the first term on the left side of (9.12). Since  $-\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon h^\varepsilon = -\mu h_2^\varepsilon$  and  $-\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon h^\varepsilon) = \mu^2(h_1^\varepsilon - h - h_2^\varepsilon)$ , the above estimates and the triangle inequality also give us the estimate for the other term in (9.12).

*Step 2.* We may also modify  $h$  so that it is well-prepared for the Laplace operator. The claim is that there exists  $h' \in C^\infty(U) \cap L^\infty(U)$  satisfying

$$\mu\|h' - h\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\Delta h'\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \mu^{-1}\|\Delta^2 h'\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \quad (9.15)$$

We omit the argument, as it follows from the one given in Step 1, just replacing  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  with  $\Delta$ .

*Step 3.* We let  $v^\varepsilon$  and  $v_{\text{hom}}$  be, respectively, the solution of the first and second initial-boundary value problems in (9.7) with  $h^\varepsilon$  and  $h'$  in place of  $h$ , respectively, at the initial boundary  $\{0\} \times U$ . In view of (9.10), (9.11), (9.12) and (9.15) we have the estimates

$$\|\partial_t^2 v^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times U)} + \|\partial_t^2 v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times U)} \leq \|\partial_t^2 g\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times U)} + C\mu\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)} \quad (9.16)$$

and, using also the maximum principle,

$$\|v^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times U)} + \|v_{\text{hom}} - u_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times U)} \leq C\mu^{-1}\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \quad (9.17)$$

Moreover, by Taylor's theorem, (9.16) and the triangle inequality, we have, for every  $t, t_0 \in [0, \infty)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v^\varepsilon(t + t_0, \cdot) - v^\varepsilon(t_0, \cdot) - t\partial_t v^\varepsilon(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|v_{\text{hom}}(t + t_0, \cdot) - v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, \cdot) - t\partial_t v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq Ct^2(\|\partial_t^2 g\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times U)} + \mu\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned} \quad (9.18)$$

Define now, for every  $t_0 \in [0, \infty)$ ,

$$w_{\lambda, t_0}^\varepsilon(x) := \int_0^\infty \lambda \exp(-\lambda t) v^\varepsilon(t + t_0, x) dt, \quad w_{\text{hom}, \lambda, t_0}(x) := \int_0^\infty \lambda \exp(-\lambda t) v_{\text{hom}}(t + t_0, x) dt$$

and

$$g_{\lambda, t_0}(x) := \int_0^\infty \lambda \exp(-\lambda t) g(t + t_0, x) dt.$$

Notice that, by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\lambda, t_0}^\varepsilon(x) &= v^\varepsilon(t_0, x) + \lambda^{-1}\partial_t v^\varepsilon(t_0, x) + \lambda^{-1} \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda t) \partial_t^2 v^\varepsilon(t_0 + t, x) dt \\ w_{\text{hom}, \lambda, t_0} &= v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, x) + \lambda^{-1}\partial_t v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, x) + \lambda^{-1} \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda t) \partial_t^2 v_{\text{hom}}(t_0 + t, x) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we deduce by (9.18) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v^\varepsilon(t_0 + \lambda^{-1}, \cdot) - v_{\text{hom}}(t_0 + \lambda^{-1}, \cdot) - (w_{\lambda, t_0}^\varepsilon - w_{\text{hom}, \lambda, t_0})\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq C\lambda^{-2}(\|\partial_t^2 g\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times U)} + \mu\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned} \quad (9.19)$$



Thus our goal is to estimate the term  $w_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon - w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}$ .

Observe next that  $w_\lambda^\varepsilon$  and  $w_{\text{hom},\lambda}$  are respectively the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} \lambda w_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon w_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon = \lambda v^\varepsilon(t_0, \cdot) & \text{in } U, \\ w_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon = g_{\lambda,t_0} & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \lambda w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0} - \Delta w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0} = \lambda v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, \cdot) & \text{in } U, \\ w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0} = g_{\lambda,t_0} & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases}$$

In order to apply Lemma 9.2, we also consider the auxiliary solution

$$\begin{cases} \lambda \tilde{w}_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon \tilde{w}_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon = \lambda v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, \cdot) & \text{in } U, \\ \tilde{w}_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon = g_{\lambda,t_0} & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 9.2 and the equation of  $w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{w}_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon - w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\nabla w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty((t_0,\infty)\times U)} + \lambda \|w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0} - v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned}$$

By the maximum principle,

$$\|w_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon - \tilde{w}_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \|(v^\varepsilon - v_{\text{hom}})(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)}.$$

Furthermore, using the formula for  $w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}$ , we get by integration by parts, the maximum principle, and (9.15)

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0} - v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} &= \left| \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda t) \partial_t v_{\text{hom}}(t_0 + t, \cdot) dt \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \|\partial_t v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty((t_0,\infty)\times U)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} (\|\partial_t g\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times U)} + \|\Delta h'\|_{L^\infty(U)}) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\lambda} (\|\partial_t g\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}), \end{aligned}$$

and, by the equation of  $w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}\|_{L^\infty(U)} &\leq C \lambda \|w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0} - v_{\text{hom}}(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} + C \|\nabla g_{\lambda,t_0}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)} \\ &\leq C (\|\partial_t g\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty((t_0,\infty)\times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned}$$

The above four displays and the triangle inequality yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{\lambda,t_0}^\varepsilon - w_{\text{hom},\lambda,t_0}\|_{L^\infty(U)} &\leq \|(v^\varepsilon - v_{\text{hom}})(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ &\quad + C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} (\|\partial_t g\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times U)} + \|\Delta g\|_{L^\infty((t_0,\infty)\times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned}$$

The previous display and (9.19) together yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(v^\varepsilon - u_{\text{hom}})(t_0 + \lambda^{-1}, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} - \|(v^\varepsilon - v_{\text{hom}})(t_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq C (\lambda^{-2} \mu + |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha}) (\|g\|_{W^{2,\infty}((0,\infty)\times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned}$$

Iterating this estimate and using (9.12) and (9.15) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{k \in \{0, \dots, N\}} \|(v^\varepsilon - v_{\text{hom}})(k\lambda^{-1}, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ & \leq \|h^\varepsilon - h'\|_{L^\infty(U)} + CN(\lambda^{-2}\mu + |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha})(\|g\|_{W^{2,\infty}((0,\infty) \times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}) \\ & \leq C(\mu^{-1} + N\lambda^{-2}\mu + N|\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha})(\|g\|_{W^{2,\infty}((0,\infty) \times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}). \end{aligned}$$

By the maximum principle,

$$\|\partial_t v^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times U)} + \|\partial_t v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times U)} \leq C(\|\partial_t g\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times U)} + C\|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}).$$

From the above two displays with the change of variables  $T = N\lambda^{-1}$  we obtain

$$\|v^\varepsilon - v_{\text{hom}}\|_{L^\infty((0,T) \times U)} \leq C(\mu^{-1} + \lambda^{-1} + T\lambda^{-1}\mu + T\lambda|\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha})(\|g\|_{W^{2,\infty}((0,\infty) \times U)} + \|\nabla^2 h\|_{L^\infty(U)}).$$

The previous inequality, (9.17), the choices  $\mu = \lambda^{1/2}$  and  $\lambda := |\log \varepsilon|^{2\alpha/3}$  and the triangle inequality imply (9.8). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**9.2. Estimates on the first exit time of the process.** Given a domain  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , we define

$$T_U := \inf\{s > 0 : X_s \notin U\}$$

to be the first exit time from  $U$  of the diffusion process  $X_t$  given in (1.1). Similarly we let  $T_U^\varepsilon$  be the first exit time from  $U$  of the rescaled process  $\{X_t^\varepsilon\}$  defined in (9.1). For convenience, we define the time scale  $\tau_\varepsilon$  by

$$\tau_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{-2}(8c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2}. \quad (9.20)$$

It is immediate from the definitions that

$$X_t^\varepsilon = \varepsilon X_{t\tau_\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad T_U^\varepsilon = \tau_\varepsilon^{-1} T_{\varepsilon^{-1}U}. \quad (9.21)$$

The probability that these processes starting at  $x \in U$  have exited  $U$  before  $t > 0$  is denoted by

$$p_U(t, x) := \mathbf{P}^x[T_U \leq t] \quad \text{and} \quad p_U^\varepsilon(t, x) := \mathbf{P}^{x/\varepsilon}[T_U^\varepsilon \leq t].$$

The function  $(t, x) \mapsto p_U^\varepsilon(t, x)$  is the unique solution of the parabolic Cauchy-Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t p_U^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon p_U^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } (0, \infty) \times U, \\ p_U^\varepsilon = 1 & \text{on } (0, \infty) \times \partial U, \\ p_U^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times U. \end{cases} \quad (9.22)$$

In the next lemma, we obtain an upper bound on  $p_{B_1}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)$  for small times  $t$ .

**Lemma 9.4.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$  with  $\beta + 2\alpha < 1$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$  be the random variable in the statement of Theorem B with  $U = B_{1/2}$ . There exists a constant  $C(\alpha, \beta, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  such that, for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$  with  $\varepsilon^{-1} \geq \mathcal{Z}$  and every  $t_0 \in (0, 1]$ ,*

$$\|p_{B_{1/2}}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{1/2})} \leq 2 \exp(-c \min\{t_0^{-1/2}, |\log \varepsilon|^{\alpha/6}\}). \quad (9.23)$$

*Proof.* Define  $h := C(t_0^{1/2} + |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha/6})$ , where  $C$  is a large constant, depending only on  $(\alpha, \beta, c_*, \nu, d)$ , which will must be sufficiently large for the validity of two inequalities in the argument below. By restricting both  $\varepsilon$  and  $t_0$  to be sufficiently small, without loss of generality, we may assume that  $h \in (0, 1/8)$ .

For each  $r \in (1/2, 1 - 2h)$  we select a smooth function  $\zeta_r \in C^\infty(\overline{B}_{r+h})$  satisfying

$$0 \leq \zeta_r \leq 1, \quad \zeta_r \equiv 1 \text{ on } \partial B_{r+h}, \quad \zeta_r \equiv 0 \text{ on } B_{r+h/2}, \quad h \|\nabla \zeta_r\|_{L^\infty(B_{r+h})} + h^2 \|\nabla^2 \zeta_r\|_{L^\infty(B_{r+h})} \leq 10.$$

For each such  $r$ , we let  $u_r^\varepsilon$  and  $u_r$  be the solutions of the problems

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_r^\varepsilon - \mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u_r^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{and} \quad \partial_t u_r - \Delta u_r = 0 & \text{in } (0, t_0) \times B_{r+h}, \\ u_r^\varepsilon = u_r = \zeta_r \|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{r+h})} & & \text{on } \partial_{\text{par}}((0, t_0) \times B_{r+h}). \end{cases} \quad (9.24)$$

By an application of Lemma 9.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_r^\varepsilon - u_r\|_{L^\infty((0, t_0) \times B_{r+h})} &\leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha/3} \|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{r+h})} \|\nabla^2 \zeta_r\|_{L^\infty(B_{r+h})} \\ &\leq Ch^{-2} |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha/3} \|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{r+h})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{r+h})}, \end{aligned}$$

with the last line valid by the assumption  $h^{-2} |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha/3} \leq c$ , with  $c > 0$  sufficiently small. By a standard propagation estimate for the heat equation, since  $t_0 \leq ch^2$  for  $c(d) > 0$  sufficiently small, we have

$$\|u_r\|_{L^\infty((0, t_0) \times B_r)} \leq \frac{1}{4} \|u_r\|_{L^\infty((0, t_0) \times B_{r+h})} = \frac{1}{4} \|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{r+h})}.$$

The maximum principle implies that  $u_r^\varepsilon \geq p_{B_1}^\varepsilon$  in  $B_{r+h}$  and we therefore deduce, using the previous displays and the triangle inequality, that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_r)} &\leq \|u_r^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0, t_0) \times B_r)} \leq \|u_r^\varepsilon - u_r\|_{L^\infty((0, t_0) \times B_{r+h})} + \|u_r\|_{L^\infty((0, t_0) \times B_r)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{r+h})}. \end{aligned}$$

An iteration of this inequality yields

$$\|p_{B_1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0, t_0] \times B_{1/2})} \leq \exp(-ch^{-1}) \leq \exp(-c \min\{t_0^{-1/2}, |\log \varepsilon|^{\alpha/6}\}).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**9.3. Asymptotics for the diffusivity.** We next use Theorem B and Lemma 9.4 to obtain the quenched estimate (1.5) on the large-time asymptotic behavior of the diffusivity of the process  $\{X_t\}$  stated in Theorem A. The annealed estimate (1.6) will then be obtained from the quenched estimate, using the crude Nash-Aronson type upper bounds proved in Appendix B.

*Proof of (1.5).* Let  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$  with  $\beta + 2\alpha < 1$  and  $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{X} \vee \mathcal{K}_2$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is the minimal scale in the statement of Theorem B with  $U = B_{1/2}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_2$  in the statement of Lemma 2.6. Fix a time  $t_0 > 1$  with  $\sqrt{t_0} \geq \mathcal{Z}$  and define a length scale  $r[t_0]$  by

$$r[t_0] := (t_0 (\log t_0))^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha)}. \quad (9.25)$$

We will apply Theorem B and Lemma 9.4 with  $\varepsilon = r[t_0]^{-1}$ . We note that, with these choices, we have that  $\varepsilon^{-1} \geq \mathcal{Z}$  and  $\tau_\varepsilon$  defined in (9.20) satisfies

$$\tau_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-2}(8c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2} \geq ct_0(\log t_0)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

An application of Lemma 9.4 implies that  $T_{B_r[t_0]} > t_0$  with high probability; we have

$$\mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_r[t_0]} \leq t_0] = \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon \leq \tau_\varepsilon^{-1}t_0] \leq \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon \leq C(\log t_0)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}] \leq 2 \exp(-c(\log t_0)^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}}). \quad (9.26)$$

We will show next that

$$\left| \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{E}^0 \left[ |X_{t_0 \wedge T_{B_r[t_0]}}|^2 \right] - 2c_* (\log t_0)^{1/2} t_0 \right| \leq C(\log t_0)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2}} t_0. \quad (9.27)$$

Consider the solution  $u^\varepsilon$  of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = -1 & \text{in } B_1, \\ u^\varepsilon = Q & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases} \quad (9.28)$$

where the boundary data is the quadratic function  $Q(x) = \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2$ . Since  $-\Delta Q = -1$ , the solution of the corresponding homogenized problem is  $u_{\text{hom}} = Q$ . Since  $\varepsilon^{-1} \geq \mathcal{Z}$ , the estimate (1.23) from Theorem B yields

$$\|u^\varepsilon - Q\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha}. \quad (9.29)$$

We next compute that

$$\partial_t \mathbf{E}^0[u^\varepsilon(X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon})] = \mathbf{E}^0[-\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon(X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}_{\{T_{B_1}^\varepsilon > t\}}] = \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon > t].$$

Integrating this in  $t$ , we deduce that

$$\mathbf{E}^0[u^\varepsilon(X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon})] = u^\varepsilon(0) + \int_0^t \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon > s] ds = u^\varepsilon(0) + t - \int_0^t \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon \leq s] ds. \quad (9.30)$$

Using the triangle inequality and (9.29), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{2d} \mathbf{E}^0[|X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon}|^2] - t \right| &= \left| \mathbf{E}^0[Q(X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon})] - t \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbf{E}^0[u^\varepsilon(X_{t \wedge T_{B_1}^\varepsilon})] - t \right| + \|u^\varepsilon - Q\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \\ &\leq 2\|u^\varepsilon - Q\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + t \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon \leq t] \leq 2|\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} + t \mathbf{P}^0[T_{B_1}^\varepsilon \leq t]. \end{aligned} \quad (9.31)$$

Rescaling this estimate and taking  $t := \tau_\varepsilon^{-1}t_0$  and using (9.26), we obtain, in view of (9.21), (9.25) and  $\varepsilon = r[t_0]^{-1}$ , the estimate

$$\left| \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{E}^0 \left[ |X_{t_0 \wedge T_{B_r[t_0]}}|^2 \right] - (8c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{1/2} t_0 \right| \leq Ct_0 |\log t_0|^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha)} + Ct_0 |\log t_0|^{-1000} \leq Ct_0 |\log t_0|^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha)}.$$

Using that  $2|\log \varepsilon| = |\log \varepsilon^2| \log t_0 + O(\log \log t_0)$ , we obtain (9.27).

To conclude, we need to remove the stopping time from (9.27). According to (B.1), Proposition B.1 and (B.11), for each  $t$  we have the crude estimate

$$\mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^4]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Ct(\log(t \vee \mathcal{K}_2^2))^{2(d+4)}.$$

Therefore, using (9.26) and  $\sqrt{t_0} \geq \mathcal{Z} \geq \mathcal{K}_2$ , we find that

$$\mathbf{E}^0[|X_{t_0}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{T_{B_r[t_0]} \leq t_0}] \leq Ct_0(\log t_0)^{-1000}.$$

Combining this with (9.27) yields

$$\left| \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{E}^0[|X_{t_0}|^2] - (8c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{1/2} t_0 \right| \leq Ct_0 |\log t_0|^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha)}.$$

The previous inequality is valid on the event  $\{\mathcal{Z} \leq \sqrt{t_0}\}$ , and therefore by (1.21) we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{E}^0[|X_{t_0}|^2] - (8c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{1/2} t_0 \right| \leq Ct_0 |\log t_0|^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha)} \right] \leq \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{Z} > \sqrt{t_0}] \leq C \exp(-c(\log t)^\beta).$$

This gives (1.5) as in the statement of the theorem for  $\delta = \frac{1}{4}(1-2\alpha)$ . The proof is now complete.  $\square$

*Proof of (1.6).* Let  $B(t)$  be the event defined by

$$B(t) := \left\{ \left| t^{-1} \mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2] - 2dc_*(\log t)^{1/2} \right| > C(\log t)^{1/4+\delta} \right\}.$$

According to (1.5), for every finite exponent  $q < \infty$  we have that  $\mathbb{P}[B(t)] \leq C_q(\log t)^{-q}$ . According to Proposition B.1, we have that, for any  $q < \infty$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2]^q \right]^{1/q} \leq C_q t (\log t)^2.$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2] - 2dc_*(\log t)^{1/2} \right|^q \right]^{1/q} &\leq C(\log t)^{1/4+\delta} + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E}^0[|X_t|^2] - 2dc_*(\log t)^{1/2} \right|^q \mathbf{1}_{B(t)} \right]^{1/q} \\ &\leq C(\log t)^{1/4+\delta} + C_q t (\log t)^2 \mathbb{P}[B(t)]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C(\log t)^{1/4+\delta} + C_q t (\log t)^{2-q}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of a much stronger bound than (1.6).  $\square$

**9.4. Proof of the invariance principle.** To prove (9.2), we will use a very general criterion which states that the convergence of a sequence of Feller processes can be formulated equivalently in term of the convergence of the corresponding infinitesimal generators of the processes. Recall from (1.20) that the infinitesimal generator  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  of  $X_t^\varepsilon$  is given by

$$\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2} \nabla \cdot (\nu \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{k}(\cdot/\varepsilon)) \nabla. \quad (9.32)$$

The infinitesimal generator of Brownian motion is  $\frac{1}{2} \Delta$ , and thus by [Kal02, Theorem 19.25] the convergence in (9.2) is equivalent to the following statement concerning the convergence of  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  to  $\frac{1}{2} \Delta$  in the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

**Proposition 9.5** (Convergence of the generators). *For  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every realization of the field  $\mathbf{k}(\cdot)$  and every  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a sequence  $\{u^\varepsilon\} \subseteq C^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u^\varepsilon - u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = 0 \quad (9.33)$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2} \Delta u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = 0. \quad (9.34)$$

Proposition 9.5 is evidently a statement about qualitative homogenization. Indeed, for a fixed  $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we find  $u^\varepsilon$  by solving the problem

$$-\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u_\varepsilon = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (9.35)$$

For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the coefficients of  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  belong to  $C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by assumption **(J3)**, and therefore the solution of (9.35), assuming we can show it exists, must belong to  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The convergence in (9.34) is then trivially valid, and the limit in (9.33) says that  $u^\varepsilon$  converges in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to the solution  $u$  of

$$-\frac{1}{2}\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (9.36)$$

This is nearly a corollary of Theorem B, but the implication is not immediate because the homogenization estimate in Theorem B is for the Dirichlet problem in a bounded domain, rather than the whole space. We will argue that the full space problem in (9.35) can be approximated by the Dirichlet problem with zero boundary data in a large ball, and the desired limit thus follows from Theorem B. Our quantitative estimates make it relatively easy to interchange limits and gives us a lot of flexibility in the argument.

The following lemma provides the passage from finite to infinite volume. Since we use this lemma qualitatively we did not attempt to optimize the stochastic constant appearing on the right in (9.38).

**Lemma 9.6** (Decay estimate). *For every  $\gamma, \sigma \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a constant  $C(\gamma, \sigma, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  and a random variable  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(C)$$

*such that, for every  $1 \leq r \leq R$  and  $\mathbf{f} \in C_c^\infty(B_1; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , parameter  $\varepsilon^{-1} > \mathcal{X}$  and solution  $u \in H_0^1(B_R)$  of the Dirichlet problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{f} & \text{in } B_R, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R. \end{cases} \quad (9.37)$$

*we have the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R \setminus B_r)} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} r^{2-\gamma-d} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \quad (9.38)$$

The proof of Lemma 9.6 requires the following consequences of the analysis in Section 8.

**Lemma 9.7** (Superdiffusive Poincaré with RHS). *For every  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a constant  $C(\sigma, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  and a random variable  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(C)$$

*such that, for every  $\varepsilon^{-1} > \mathcal{X}$  and  $u \in H^1(\square_0)$  satisfying*

$$-\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u = 0 \quad \text{in } \square_0,$$

*we have the estimate*

$$\|u - (u)_{\square_0}\|_{L^2(\square_0)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square_0)} + C |\log \varepsilon|^{-1/2} \|f\|_{L^{2*}(\square_0)}. \quad (9.39)$$

*Proof.* The lemma follows immediately from the statement of Lemma 8.3 with  $s = 1$  after rescaling. We also use the bound  $\|u - (u)_{\square_n}\|_{L^2(\square_n)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{\underline{H}^{-1}(\square_n)}$ , which is dual to the standard Poincaré inequality.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.8** (Global  $L^\infty$ -to- $L^2$  estimate). *Let  $U, V, W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be smooth, bounded domains satisfying*

$$V \subseteq W \subseteq U \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{V} \setminus \partial U \subseteq W$$

*and let  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ . There exists a constant  $C(U, V, W, \sigma, c_*, \nu, d) < \infty$  and a random variable  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying*

$$\log \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_\sigma}(C)$$

*such that, for every  $\varepsilon^{-1} > \mathcal{X}$  and  $u \in H^1(U)$  satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } (\partial U) \cap (\partial W), \end{cases}$$

*we have the estimate*

$$\|u - (u)_V\|_{L^\infty(V)} \leq C \|u - (u)_W\|_{\underline{L}^2(W)}.$$

*Proof.* The statement of the lemma is immediate from Propositions 8.12, 8.13 and a standard covering argument, using also (8.7).  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 9.6.* Define the adjoint  $(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^*$  of  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  by

$$(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^* := \frac{1}{2} (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2} \nabla \cdot (\nu \mathbf{I}_d - \mathbf{k}(\cdot/\varepsilon)) \nabla \quad (9.40)$$

Observe that  $(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^*$  has the same law as  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  by the assumption of negation symmetry in (J4). We let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the maximum of the random variables appearing in Lemmas 8.2, 9.7, 9.8 and Theorem C with  $-\mathbf{k}$  in place of  $\mathbf{k}$ , which has the same law. We also denote  $\theta := 9\sqrt{d}$ .

Denote  $A_r := B_r \setminus B_{r/2}$ . Fix  $g \in L^2(A_r)$  with  $\int_{A_r} g = 0$  and extend  $g$  to be zero outside of  $A_r$ . Let  $v \in H_0^1(B_r)$  be the solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^* v = g & \text{in } B_R, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R. \end{cases} \quad (9.41)$$

Testing the equation for  $v$  with itself, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2} \nu \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 = \int_{B_R} gv = \int_{B_r} gv \leq \|v - (v)_{B_r}\|_{L^2(B_r)} \|g\|_{L^2(A_r)}.$$

Applying Lemma 9.7, using that  $B_r \subseteq \square_{\lceil \log_3 r \rceil} \subseteq B_{\theta r}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - (v)_{B_r}\|_{L^2(B_r)} &\leq Cr (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/4} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(B_{\theta r})} + Cr^2 \|g\|_{L^2(B_{\theta r})} \\ &\leq Cr (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/4} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(B_R)} + Cr^2 \|g\|_{L^2(A_r)}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce from the previous two displays and Young's inequality that

$$(2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/4} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(B_R)} \leq Cr \|g\|_{L^2(A_r)}. \quad (9.42)$$

By testing the equation for  $u$  with  $v$  and the equation for  $v$  with  $u$ , we obtain

$$\int_{A_r} ug = \frac{1}{2} (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/2} \nu \int_{B_r} \nabla v \cdot \nabla u = - \int_{B_r} \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{f} = - \int_{B_1} \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{f} \leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(B_1)} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Observe that the ellipticity ratio of  $(\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon)^*$  in  $B_{\mathcal{X}}$  is at most  $(C \log \mathcal{X})^2$  (by the last row of (8.5)) so that by the (usual) Caccippoli inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_1)} &\leq \mathcal{X}^{d/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{\mathcal{X}})} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d/2} ((C\nu^{-1} \log \mathcal{X})^2)^{d/4} \|v - (v)_{B_{2\mathcal{X}}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{2\mathcal{X}})} \\ &\leq C \mathcal{X}^{d/2+1} \|v - (v)_{B_{2\mathcal{X}}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{2\mathcal{X}})}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.43)$$

Using the large-scale Hölder estimate (1.27) and observing that  $g$  vanishes in the ball  $B_{r/2}$ , we get

$$\|v - (v)_{B_{2\mathcal{X}}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{2\mathcal{X}})} \leq C \left(\frac{\mathcal{X}}{r}\right)^\gamma \|v - (v)_{B_{r/3}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{r/(3\theta)})}.$$

By applying Lemma 9.7, using that  $B_{r/3\theta} \subseteq \square_{\lfloor \log_3(r/3\theta) \rfloor} \subseteq B_{r/3}$ , we have

$$\|v - (v)_{B_{r/3}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{r/(3\theta)})} \leq Cr (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/4} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{r/3})}.$$

Combining the previous two displays, we obtain

$$\|v - (v)_{B_{2\mathcal{X}}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{2\mathcal{X}})} \leq C \left(\frac{\mathcal{X}}{r}\right)^\gamma r (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/4} \nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{r/3})}.$$

By (9.42), (9.43) and the previous display, we obtain

$$\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_1)} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} r^{1-d/2-\gamma} (2c_*^2 |\log \varepsilon|)^{-1/4} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(B_R)} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} r^{2-\gamma-d/2} \|g\|_{L^2(B_R)}.$$

Combining the above inequalities, we get

$$\int_{A_r} ug \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} r^{2-\gamma-d/2} \|g\|_{L^2(B_R)} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Taking  $g = u - (u)_{A_r}$  yields

$$\|u - (u)_{A_r}\|_{L^2(A_r)} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} r^{2-\gamma-d/2} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Dividing by  $|A_r|^{1/2} = Cr^{d/2}$  and using  $|A_r|^{-1/2} \|u - (u)_{A_r}\|_{L^2(A_r)} = \|u - (u)_{A_r}\|_{\underline{L}^2(A_r)}$ , we get

$$\|u - (u)_{B_r \setminus B_{r/2}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_r \setminus B_{r/2})} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} r^{2-\gamma-d} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \quad (9.44)$$

In the case that  $r < \frac{3}{4}R$ , we use the interior  $L^\infty$ - $L^2$  estimate in Lemma 9.8 to get

$$\|u - (u)_{B_r \setminus B_{r/2}}\|_{L^\infty(B_r \setminus B_{r/2})} \leq C \|u - (u)_{B_{4r/3} \setminus B_{r/3}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_{4r/3} \setminus B_{r/3})} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} r^{2-\gamma-d} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \quad (9.45)$$

In the case  $r = R$ , we instead use the full (global) version of Lemma 9.8, with  $U = B_1$ ,  $V = B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}$  and  $W = B_1 \setminus B_{1/4}$ , and with  $\varepsilon/R$  in place of  $\varepsilon$ , to obtain, after a rescaling,

$$\|u - (u)_{B_R \setminus B_{R/2}}\|_{L^\infty(B_R \setminus B_{R/2})} \leq C \|u - (u)_{B_R \setminus B_{R/4}}\|_{\underline{L}^2(B_R \setminus B_{R/4})} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} R^{2-\gamma-d} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Since  $u = 0$  on  $\partial B_R$ , we obtain by the triangle inequality and the previous display that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R \setminus B_{R/2})} \leq C \mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma} R^{2-\gamma-d} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Combining this with (9.45) and using the triangle inequality and chaining together overlapping annuli, we obtain (9.38).  $\square$



*Proof of Proposition 9.5.* Fix  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Let  $R_0 \geq 1$  be so large that  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_{R_0})$ . By scaling we may assume that  $R_0 = 1$ . In what follows, we will allow the constants  $C$  to depend on  $u$  in addition to  $(c_*, \nu, d)$ .

For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $u_R^\varepsilon$  be the solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u_R^\varepsilon = \Delta u & \text{in } B_R, \\ u_R^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R. \end{cases} \quad (9.46)$$

We extend the domain of  $u_R^\varepsilon$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by defining  $u_R^\varepsilon$  to be zero in  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R$ . According to Lemma 9.6, we have that, for every  $R, r \geq \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\|u_R^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_r)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}r^{2-\gamma-d}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}r^{2-\gamma-d}.$$

By the maximum principle, for each  $S \geq R \geq \mathcal{X}$ , the difference  $u_R^\varepsilon - u_S^\varepsilon$  satisfies

$$\|u_R^\varepsilon - u_S^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq \|u_{2R}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_R)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}R^{2-\gamma-d}.$$

It follows that

$$\|u_R^\varepsilon - u_S^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}R^{2-\gamma-d}.$$

Since  $2 - \gamma - d \leq -\gamma < 0$ , we deduce that  $u_R^\varepsilon$  converges as  $R \rightarrow \infty$  to a function  $u^\varepsilon$  which solves

$$-\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = \Delta u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \quad (9.47)$$

and satisfies

$$\|u_R^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}R^{2-\gamma-d} \quad (9.48)$$

and the decay estimate

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}R^{2-\gamma-d}.$$

In particular,  $u^\varepsilon \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Since the operator  $\mathfrak{L}^\varepsilon$  has coefficients which are  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely  $C^{1,1}$  by assumption **(J3)**, standard Schauder estimates imply that  $u^\varepsilon \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The limit (9.34) is obvious from (9.47). To check (9.33), we apply Theorem B in a fixed ball  $B_R$ , which yields, for all sufficiently small  $\varepsilon$  (depending on  $R$ ),

$$\|u_R^\varepsilon - u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C|\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha}.$$

Since  $u$  vanishes outside of  $B_1$ , we also have that

$$\|u_R^\varepsilon - u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R)} = \|u_R^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}R^{2-\gamma-d}.$$

Combining the previous displays with (9.48) and using the triangle inequality, we find that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u^\varepsilon - u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\mathcal{X}^{d+1+\gamma}R^{2-\gamma-d}.$$

Sending  $R \rightarrow \infty$  yields (9.33). □

## A. The log-correlated Gaussian field

**A.1. Construction of the log-correlated Gaussian field.** In this appendix, we give an explicit construction of the log-correlated Gaussian field (LGF) in general dimension  $d \geq 2$  based on an annuli decomposition and a standard Gaussian white noise. This definition in physical space will be shown to be equivalent to other definitions which are typically given in Fourier space or using the Bochner-Minlos theorem, but, as we will see in the next subsection, is more amenable to a finite-range decomposition.

Throughout, we let  $W$  denote a standard Gaussian white noise field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . That is,  $W$  is a random distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^{1+d}$  such that  $W(\psi)$  is a Gaussian random variable for every test function  $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ , and which satisfies the covariance formula

$$\text{cov}[W(\psi_1), W(\psi_2)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} \psi_1(x)\psi_2(x) dx, \quad \forall \psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The distribution  $W$  is not a function. In fact, it (almost surely) belongs to  $H_{\text{loc}}^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+d)-\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ , for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , but not  $H_{\text{loc}}^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+d)}(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ . See [AKM19, Chapter 5] for a proof of this fact, as well as an explicit construction of the white noise field  $W$ . Throughout, we abuse notation by informally writing  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+d}} \psi(x)W(x) dx$  in place of  $W(\psi)$ .

Fix a smooth, radial function  $\zeta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying

$$\mathbf{1}_{B_{1/2}} \leq \zeta \leq \mathbf{1}_{B_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla^k \zeta\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq 20, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and define, for each  $r > 0$ ,

$$\zeta_r(x) := \zeta(x/r). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

**Lemma A.1.** *For every  $\alpha > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have that*

$$|x|^{-\alpha} = M_\alpha \int_0^\infty r^{-(1+d+\alpha)} (\zeta_r * \zeta_r)(x) dr, \quad \text{where} \quad M_\alpha := \left( \int_0^\infty r^{-(1+\alpha)} (\zeta * \zeta)(1/r) dr \right)^{-1}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \alpha M_\alpha = (\zeta * \zeta)(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\zeta(x)|^2 dx =: M_0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

*Proof.* Using that  $\zeta_r * \zeta_r = r^d (\zeta * \zeta)(\cdot/r)$  and that  $\zeta$  is radial, we find that, for every  $\beta > 0$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty r^{-\beta} (\zeta_r * \zeta_r)(x) dr = \int_0^\infty r^{d-\beta} (\zeta * \zeta)(x/r) dr = |x|^{1+d-\beta} \int_0^\infty r^{d-\beta} (\zeta * \zeta)(1/r) dr.$$

Taking  $\beta = 1 + d + \alpha$  yields (A.4). □

We define, for each  $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi = 0$ ,

$$H(\psi) := \left( \frac{d|B_1|}{M_0(2\pi)^d} \right)^{1/2} \int_0^\infty r^{-\frac{1}{2}(d+1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\zeta_r * \psi)(y) W(r, y) dy dr. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

In order to show that  $H$  defined in (A.6) is equivalent to other definitions of the LGF (e.g., those in [LSSW16, DRSV17]), it suffices to compute its covariance. Indeed, since the random variable defined in (A.6) is Gaussian, the random variable is determined entirely by these covariances.

**Lemma A.2.** Let  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_i = 0$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Then

$$\text{cov}[H(\psi_1), H(\psi_2)] = \frac{d|B_1|}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\log|x-y|\psi_1(x)\psi_2(y) dx dy. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The expression (A.7) matches the covariance formula (including the multiplicative constant) for the LGF defined in [LSSW16]: see Theorem 3.3(iv) of that paper. In particular, in two dimensions we have the formula

$$\text{cov}[H(\psi_1), H(\psi_2)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log|x-y|\psi_1(x)\psi_2(y) dx dy, \quad \text{if } d = 2, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

which matches the usual definition of the Gaussian free field, as the function  $G(x, y) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log|x-y|$  is the Green function for the Laplacian in two dimensions.

*Proof of Lemma A.2.* It suffices by polarization to compute the variance of  $H(\psi)$  for a single test function  $\psi$ , that is, we may assume that  $\psi_1 = \psi_2 = \psi$ . We have, using the definition of white noise (A.1),

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{M_0(2\pi)^d}{d|B_1|} \text{var}[H(\psi)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (st)^{-\frac{1}{2}(d+1)} (\zeta_s * \psi)(x) (\zeta_t * \psi)(y) W(s, x) W(t, y) dx dy dt ds \right] \\ &= \int_0^\infty r^{-(d+1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |(\zeta_r * \psi)(x)|^2 dx dr. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The above display implies by dominated convergence,

$$\frac{M_0(2\pi)^d}{d|B_1|} \text{var}[H(\psi)] = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^\infty r^{-(d+1+\alpha)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |(\zeta_r * \psi)(x)|^2 dx dr, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

and for each positive  $\alpha$  we have, by (A.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty r^{-(d+1+\alpha)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |(\zeta_r * \psi)(x)|^2 dx dr \\ &= \int_0^\infty r^{-(d+1+\alpha)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta_r(x-z) \zeta_r(x-y) \psi(z) \psi(y) dx dy dz dr \\ &= \int_0^\infty r^{-(d+1+\alpha)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\zeta_r * \zeta_r)(z-y) \psi(z) \psi(y) dy dz dr \\ &= M_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z-y|^{-\alpha} \psi(z) \psi(y) dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Using the limit

$$-\log|z| = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\alpha} (|z|^{-\alpha} - 1), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\},$$

and (A.5) together with the assumption that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi = 0$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M_0(2\pi)^d}{d|B_1|} \text{var}[H(\psi)] &= \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} \alpha M_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \alpha^{-1} |z-y|^{-\alpha} \psi(z) \psi(y) dy dz \\ &= \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} \alpha M_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \alpha^{-1} (|z-y|^{-\alpha} - 1) \psi(z) \psi(y) dy dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -M_0 \log|z-y| \psi(z) \psi(y) dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above display with (A.10) we obtain

$$\text{var}[H(\psi)] = \frac{d|B_1|}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\log|x-y|\psi(x)\psi(y) dx dy,$$

which matches the right side of (A.7). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**A.2. A decomposition of the LGF into finite range fields.** In this subsection we verify the assumptions (J1)–(J5) for the LGF, mollified on the unit scale. We define, for each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$H_n(x) := \left( \frac{d|B_1|}{M_0(2\pi)^d} \right)^{1/2} \int_{3^{n-1}}^{3^n} r^{-\frac{1}{2}(d+1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta_r(x-y)W(r,y) dy dr.$$

It is clear that  $\{H_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence of independent,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ –stationary Gaussian random fields with zero mean. The range of dependence of  $H_n$  is at most  $3^n$  by definition. Since the function  $\zeta$  is radial, the joint law of the sequence  $\{H_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is isotropic and invariant under negation. In view of the definition (A.6), we have that, for every  $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) dx = 0$ ,

$$H(\psi) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H_n(x)\psi(x) dx. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}[H_n(0)] &= \frac{d|B_1|}{M_0(2\pi)^d} \int_{3^{n-1}}^{3^n} r^{-(d+1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\zeta_r(x)|^2 dx dr. \\ &= \frac{d|B_1|}{M_0(2\pi)^d} \int_{3^{n-1}}^{3^n} r^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\zeta(x)|^2 dx dr \\ &= \frac{d|B_1|}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{3^{n-1}}^{3^n} r^{-1} dr = \frac{d|B_1|}{(2\pi)^d} (\log 3) = \frac{2^{1-d}\pi^{-d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)} (\log 3). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

In particular, there exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that

$$H_n(x) = \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C).$$

By a similar computation, using (A.2), we find that

$$3^n |\nabla H_n(0)| + 3^{2n} |\nabla^2 H_n(0)| + 3^{3n} |\nabla^3 H_n(0)| \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C).$$

By the previous two displays, we deduce that

$$\|H_n\|_{L^\infty(B_{3^n})} + 3^n \|\nabla H_n\|_{L^\infty(B_{3^n})} + 3^{2n} \|\nabla^2 H_n\|_{L^\infty(B_{3^n})} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_2}(C). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

We next need to compute the quantity

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla \Delta^{-1}(\partial_{x_i} H_n)(0)|^2\right].$$

To do so, we will perform integration by parts “in probability.” By this we mean that, for every pair locally smooth,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ –stationary random fields  $F$  and  $G$  with each of  $\mathbb{E}[|F(0)|]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|\nabla F(0)|]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|G(0)|]$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[|\nabla G(0)|]$  finite, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial_{x_i} F(0)G(0)] = -\mathbb{E}[F(0)\partial_{x_i} G(0)]. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

To see this, we reduce this identity to an integration by parts in space. Fix a cutoff function  $\zeta_R$  such that  $\mathbf{1}_{B_R} \leq \zeta_R \leq \mathbf{1}_{B_{R+1}}$  and  $\|\nabla^k \zeta_R\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C$  for  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$  and compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\partial_{x_i} F(0)G(0)] \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ |B_R|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta_R(x) \partial_{x_i} F(x) G(x) dx \right] \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ -|B_R|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\zeta_R(x) F(x) \partial_{x_i} G(x)) \right] + \underbrace{\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ -|B_R|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_{x_i} \zeta_R F(x) G(x) dx \right]}_{=0} \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[F(0) \partial_{x_i} G(0)]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (A.14) twice, we obtain, for every locally smooth,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary random field  $F$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[|\nabla^k F(0)|] < \infty$  for  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ |\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} F(0)|^2 \right] &= \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ -\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} F(0) \partial_{x_j} F(0) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_i} F(0) \partial_{x_j} \partial_{x_j} F(0) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ |\Delta F(0)|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Using this, we find that, for every  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -stationary random field  $F$  which has dihedral symmetry in law and satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[|\nabla^k F(0)|] < \infty$  for  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\nabla \Delta^{-1}(\partial_{x_i} F)(0)|^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ |\nabla \Delta^{-1}(\partial_{x_i} F)(0)|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ |\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \Delta^{-1} F(0)|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{d} \mathbb{E}[F(0)]. \end{aligned}$$

Using independence, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \nabla \Delta^{-1} \left( \partial_{x_i} \sum_{n=l+1}^m H_n \right) (0) \right|^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{d} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{n=l+1}^m H_n(0) \right|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{n=l+1}^m \text{var}[H_n(0)] \\ &= \frac{2^{1-d} \pi^{-d/2} (\log 3) (m-l)}{d \Gamma(d/2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the mollified fields  $H_n * \eta$ , we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \nabla \Delta^{-1} \left( \partial_{x_i} \sum_{n=l+1}^m (H_n * \eta) \right) (0) \right|^2 \right] - \frac{2^{1-d} \pi^{-d/2} (\log 3) (m-l)}{d \Gamma(d/2)} \right| \leq C.$$

Suppose now that  $\mathbf{k}$  is a  $d$ -by- $d$  anti-symmetric matrix such that the entries  $\mathbf{k}_{ij}$  for  $i < j$  are independent copies of  $H * \eta$  for a radial mollifier  $\eta$ . For  $n \geq 1$ , we let  $\mathbf{j}_n$  be the anti-symmetric matrix corresponding to the  $H_n$ 's defined above, and we let  $\mathbf{j}_0$  be the anti-symmetric matrix corresponding to  $\sum_{n \in -\mathbb{N}} H_n$ . Since there are  $\frac{1}{2}d(d-1)$  many independent entries, we discover that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \nabla \Delta^{-1} \left( \nabla \cdot \sum_{n=l+1}^m (\mathbf{j}_n * \eta) \right) (0) \right|^2 \right] - \frac{(d-1) 2^{1-d} (\log 3)}{\pi^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2)} (m-l) \right| \leq C.$$

This coincides with the value of  $c_*$  announced in (1.7), and completes verification of the assumptions (J1)–(J5) for the field  $\mathbf{k}$ .

## B. Nash-Aronson estimates

In this appendix, we show that the solution of the SDE (1.1) is a Feller process. This a consequence of the following deterministic estimate on the decay of the parabolic Green function for an operator which is locally uniformly elliptic but may have its ellipticity constants growing like a power of  $\log|x|$ . Notice that, for the field  $\mathbf{a}$  defined via (1.12) and (1.13), the condition (2.58) yields, for every  $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$e \cdot (\mathbf{a}(x) - \mathbf{k}(0))^{-1} e \geq \left( C\nu^{-1} (\log(\mathcal{K}_\sigma^2 + |x|^2))^{2(1+\sigma)} \right)^{-1} |e|^2 \quad (\text{B.1})$$

with the random variable  $\mathcal{K}_\sigma$  satisfying (2.55).

**Proposition B.1** (Nash-Aronson type bounds). *Suppose that  $\Lambda_0, \theta, \nu \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $\kappa \in [2, \infty)$ , and let  $\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [\nu, \infty)$  be given by*

$$\Lambda(x) \leq \frac{\Lambda_0}{1 + \theta^2} (\log(\kappa^2 + |x|^2))^\theta. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

*Suppose that  $\mathbf{a}(\cdot)$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ -valued coefficient field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  which satisfies the local uniform ellipticity condition*

$$e \cdot \mathbf{a}(x)e \geq \nu|e|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad e \cdot \mathbf{a}^{-1}(x)e \geq (\Lambda(x))^{-1}|e|^2, \quad \forall x, e \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

*Then there exists a constant  $C(d) < \infty$  such that the parabolic Green function  $P(t, x, y)$  satisfies the pointwise upper bound*

$$|P(t, x, y)| \leq Ct^{-d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{40\Lambda_0 t (3 \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x-y|^2))^\theta}\right). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

*Proof.* Fix  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $u$  be a solution of the parabolic equation

$$\partial_t u - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \infty)$$

satisfying an initial condition  $u(0, \cdot) = u_0 \in C_c^\infty(B_1(y))$  with  $u_0 \geq 0$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_0 = 1$ .

*Step 1.* The diagonal estimate. There exists  $C(d) < \infty$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, x)|^2 dx \leq C(\nu t)^{-d/2}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

This estimate just uses the lower bound for  $\mathbf{a}(x)$  and so is no different from the usual uniformly elliptic case. Using Nash's inequality, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |u(t, \cdot)|^2 &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla u \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u)(t, \cdot) \\ &\leq -\nu \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u(t, \cdot)|^2 \\ &\leq -c\nu \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, \cdot)|^2 \right)^{1+2/d} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, \cdot)| \right)^{-4/d} = -c\nu \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, \cdot)|^2 \right)^{1+2/d}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this inequality yields (B.5).

*Step 2.* The off-diagonal estimate. We will show that, for every  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, x)|^2 \exp\left(\frac{|x-y|^2}{40\Lambda_0 t (\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x-y|^2))^\theta}\right) dx \leq Ct^{-d/2}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

For any test function  $\zeta$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} (\zeta u)^2 dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\nabla(\zeta^2 u) \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u + \zeta u^2 \partial_t \zeta) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\zeta^2 \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u - 2\zeta u \nabla \zeta \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u + \zeta u^2 \partial_t \zeta) dx.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$|2\zeta u \nabla \zeta \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u| \leq \frac{1}{2} \zeta^2 \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u + 8\Lambda(x) u^2 |\nabla \zeta|^2$$

Combining the previous two displays yields

$$\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} (\zeta u)^2 dx \leq -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta^2 \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2 (\zeta \partial_t \zeta + 8\Lambda(x) |\nabla \zeta|^2) dx. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Let  $A$  be a parameter satisfying  $A \geq 20\Lambda_0$  and consider the test function

$$\zeta(t, x) := \exp\left(\frac{|x - y|^2}{4At(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta}\right).$$

We have that

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \zeta(t, x) = \frac{\zeta(t, x)}{2At(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta} \\ \quad \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\theta |x - y|^2}{(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2) \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2)}\right) (x - y), \\ \partial_t \zeta(t, x) = -\frac{\zeta(t, x)}{4At(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta} \cdot \frac{|x - y|^2}{t}. \end{cases}$$

Using also (B.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta \partial_t \zeta + 8\Lambda(x) |\nabla \zeta|^2 &= \frac{\zeta(t, x)^2}{4At(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta} \cdot \frac{|x - y|^2}{t} \left(-1 + \frac{8(2 + 2\theta^2)\Lambda(x)}{A(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\zeta(t, x)^2}{4At(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta} \cdot \frac{|x - y|^2}{t} \left(-1 + \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (B.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} (\zeta u)^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta^2 \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u dx \\ \leq -\frac{1}{t} \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2 \zeta^2 \left(\frac{|x - y|^2}{4At(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta}\right) dx.\end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

We next discard the second integral on the left side, as well as the contribution of the second integral for the set

$$E := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - y|^2 < K(4At) \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2)\}$$

for a parameter  $K > 0$  to be chosen below. We thereby obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} (\zeta u)^2 dx &\leq -\frac{1}{t} \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E} u^2 \zeta^2 \left( \frac{|x-y|^2}{4At(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x-y|^2))^\theta} \right) dx \\
&\leq -\frac{K}{t} \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E} u^2 \zeta^2 dx \\
&= -\frac{K}{t} \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2 \zeta^2 dx + \frac{K}{t} \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) \int_E u^2 \zeta^2 dx \\
&\leq -\frac{2K}{t} \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} u^2 \zeta^2 dx + CK \exp(K) \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) t^{-1-d/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the diagonal estimate (B.5). Selecting the parameters  $A, K$  to satisfy

$$A := 20\Lambda_0, \quad K := \frac{5}{2} + \frac{5d}{4} \implies 2K \left(1 - \frac{16\Lambda_0}{A}\right) = \frac{2}{5}K = 1 + \frac{d}{2},$$

we obtain

$$\partial_t \left( t^{1+d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} (\zeta u)^2 dx \right) = t^{1+d/2} \left( \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} (\zeta u)^2 + \left(1 + \frac{d}{2}\right) \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} (\zeta u)^2 \right) \leq C.$$

Integrating the previous display yields the claim (B.6) since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{1+d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\zeta u)^2 \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{1+d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta^2 = 0.$$

*Step 3.* Let  $\{u_0^{(n)}\}_n$  be a sequence of initial values converging to  $\delta_y$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  where  $u_0^{(n)}$  is supported in  $B_{1/2n}(y)$ , and let  $\{u^{(n)}\}_n$  be the corresponding sequence of solutions. Due to (B.2), we have that, for every given  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the coefficient field  $\mathbf{a}$  is uniformly elliptic in  $V_k := ((\overline{B}_k \setminus B_{1/k}) \times [0, k]) \cup (\overline{B}_{2/k} \times [1/k, k])$  and, by (B.6) and parabolic Nash-Moser theory,  $\{u^{(n)}\}_{n>k}$  is equicontinuous on  $V_k$  and  $\{\nabla u^{(n)}\}_{n>k}$  is equibounded in  $L^2(V_k)$ . Then, by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem and weak convergence of the gradients, we find a subsequence  $u^{(n_j)}$  such that  $u^{(n_j)} \rightarrow u$  in  $C(V_k)$  and  $\nabla u^{(n_j)} \rightarrow \nabla u$  weakly in  $L^2(V_k)$ . Therefore  $u$  is also a solution in  $V_k$ . By a diagonal argument, we then find a solution  $u$  which is continuous on  $V_k$  for every  $k$ , has initial condition  $\delta_y$  and satisfies, by Fatou's lemma, both (B.5) and (B.6) for every  $t > 0$ . By uniqueness, the obtained  $u$  must be  $P(\cdot, \cdot, y)$ .

*Step 4.* We apply the semigroup argument and obtain a pointwise upper bound on  $u$ . First, we deduce from the previous two steps that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |P(t, x, y)|^2 \exp\left(\frac{|x-y|^2}{40\Lambda_0 t (3 \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x-y|^2))^\theta}\right) dx \leq Ct^{-d/2}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

We will use this together with the semigroup property and the fact that  $(t, x, y) \mapsto P(t, y, x)$  is the parabolic Green function for the adjoint operator (which therefore satisfies the same bounds). We claim that

$$\frac{|x-y|^2}{4(3 \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x-y|^2))^\theta} \leq \frac{|x-z|^2}{(\log(\kappa^2 + |x|^2 + |x-z|^2))^\theta} + \frac{|z-y|^2}{(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |z-y|^2))^\theta}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

To see this, we first have the elementary implication

$$|x-y| \leq 2|z-y| \implies \frac{|x-y|^2}{4(2 \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x-y|^2))^\theta} \leq \frac{|z-y|^2}{(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |z-y|^2))^\theta}$$



On the other hand, we also have, by the triangle inequality and Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
|z - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - y| &\implies |y|^2 + |x - y|^2 \geq (|x| - |x - y|)^2 + (|x - z| - |z - y|)^2 \\
&\geq |x|^2 + |x - y|^2 - 2|x||x - y| + |x - z|^2 - 2|x - z||z - y| \\
&\geq |x|^2 + |x - y|^2 - 2|x||x - y| + |x - z|^2 - |x - z||x - y| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}|x|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|x - z|^2 - \frac{3}{2}|x - y|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

After rearranging this, we get

$$|z - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - y| \implies \begin{cases} |y|^2 + |x - y|^2 \geq \frac{1}{5}(|x|^2 + |x - z|^2), \\ |y|^2 + |x - y|^2 \geq |y|^2 + |z - y|^2. \end{cases}$$

Since  $|x - y|^2 \leq 2|x - z|^2 + 2|z - y|^2$ , we also obtain that  $|z - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - y|$  implies

$$\frac{|x - y|^2}{4(3 \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta} \leq \frac{|x - z|^2}{(\log(\kappa^2 + |x|^2 + |x - z|^2))^\theta} + \frac{|z - y|^2}{(\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |z - y|^2))^\theta}.$$

Thus, in all cases, we deduce (B.10). Therefore, by Hölder's inequality and (B.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
P(2t, x, y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P(t, x, z)P(t, z, y) dz \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{|x - y|^2}{80\Lambda_0 t (3 \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta}\right) \\
&\quad \times \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |P(t, x, z)|^2 \exp\left(\frac{|x - z|^2}{40\Lambda_0 t (\log(\kappa^2 + |x|^2 + |x - z|^2))^\theta}\right) dz\right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |P(t, z, y)|^2 \exp\left(\frac{|z - y|^2}{40\Lambda_0 t (\log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |z - y|^2))^\theta}\right) dz\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq Ct^{-d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|x - y|^2}{40\Lambda_0 (2t) (3 \log(\kappa^2 + |y|^2 + |x - y|^2))^\theta}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We next show that (B.4) yields bounds on the moments of the Markov process with that generator.

**Corollary B.2.** *Let  $P(t, x, y)$ , be the parabolic Green function associated to  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}(x)\nabla$ , where  $\mathbf{a}(x)$  satisfies the locally uniform ellipticity condition (B.3) for a function  $\Lambda(x)$  satisfying the growth condition (B.2). Then, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a constant  $C_n(\Lambda_0, \theta, \nu, d) < \infty$  such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^n |P(t, x, 0)| dx \leq C_n t^{n/2} (\log(t \vee \kappa^2))^{\frac{\theta}{2}(n+d)}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

*Proof.* By making  $\kappa$  larger, if necessary, we may assume that  $\kappa^2(\log \kappa^2)^{-\theta} \geq 2$ . For given  $t$ , we consider separately the cases  $\kappa^2(\log \kappa^2)^{-\theta} > t$  and  $\kappa^2(\log \kappa^2)^{-\theta} \leq t$ . In the first case we have that

$$\log(\kappa^2 + |x|^2) \leq \log \kappa^2 + \log(1 + \kappa^{-2}|x|^2) \leq \log \kappa^2 + \log(1 + (t(\log \kappa^2)^\theta)^{-1}|x|^2),$$

and thus (B.4) implies, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\kappa^2(\log \kappa^2)^{-\theta} > t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^n |P(t, x, 0)| &\leq C t^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^n \exp\left(-\frac{(t(\log \kappa^2)^\theta)^{-1} |x|^2}{C t (1 + \log(1 + (t(\log \kappa^2)^\theta)^{-1} |x|^2))^\theta}\right) dx \\ &= C_n t^{n/2} (\log \kappa)^{\frac{\theta}{2}(n+d)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

On the other hand, assuming  $\kappa^2(\log \kappa^2)^{-\theta} \leq t$  and letting  $\tau$  solve  $\tau(\log \tau)^{-\theta} = t$ , we see that  $\tau \geq \kappa^2$  and hence, again by (B.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^n |P(t, x, 0)| &\leq C t^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^n \exp\left(-\frac{|x|^2}{C t ((\log \tau)(\log(1 + \tau^{-1} |x|^2)))^\theta}\right) dx \\ &= C t^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^n \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^{-1} |x|^2}{C \log^\theta(1 + \tau^{-1} |x|^2)}\right) dx \\ &= C_n t^{-d/2} \tau^{\frac{1}{2}(n+d)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Since we assume that  $\kappa$  is larger than two and  $\tau \geq \kappa^2$  in the latter case, we have  $\tau \leq C t \log^\theta t$ . Combining the above two displays yields (B.11).  $\square$

We conclude this section by observing that Proposition B.1 implies the associated Markov process is Feller.

**Corollary B.3.** *Suppose that  $\{Y_t\}$  is a homogeneous Markov process with infinitesimal generator given by  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}(x) \nabla$ , where  $\mathbf{a}(x)$  satisfies the locally uniform ellipticity condition (B.3) for a function  $\Lambda(x)$  satisfying the growth condition (B.2). Then  $\{Y_t\}$  is a Feller process.*

*Proof.* We show that  $P(t, x, y)$ , the parabolic Green function corresponding to  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla$ , is a Feller transition function. We first check that it maps  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  into  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , that is,

$$x \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) P(t, x, y) dy \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \forall t > 0, f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Denote  $R_f(\varepsilon) := \sup\{|x| : |f(x)| > \varepsilon\}$  and write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) P(t, x, y) dy \right| &\leq \int_{B_{R_f(\varepsilon)}} (|f(y)| - \varepsilon)_+ P(t, x, y) dy + \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P(t, x, y) dy \\ &\leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{B_{R_f(\varepsilon)}} P(t, x, y) dy + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (B.4) yields that, for every  $R \in [1, \infty)$ ,

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R} P(t, x, y) dy = 0.$$

This completes the proof of (B.14).

We next observe that (B.4) implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) P(t, x, y) dy = f(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Indeed, since  $P(t, x, \cdot)$  has unit mass and the estimate (B.4) ensures that, for small  $t$ , nearly all of the mass is in a small ball near  $x$ .

Since it is immediate that the transition function is a contraction and satisfies the semigroup property, this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** S.A. was supported by NSF grants DMS-1954357 and DMS-2000200 and by the Simons Programme at IHES during a sabbatical visit. A.B. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2202940. T.K. was supported by the Academy of Finland and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 818437). We thank Pierre Le Doussal for making us aware of [BCGLD87].

## References

- [AK24a] S. Armstrong and T. Kuusi. Elliptic homogenization from qualitative to quantitative, 2024. preprint.
- [AK24b] S. Armstrong and T. Kuusi. The renormalization group and homogenization in high contrast, 2024. preprint.
- [AKM19] S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, and J.-C. Mourrat. *Quantitative stochastic homogenization and large-scale regularity*, volume 352 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [AN84] J. A. Aronovitz and D. R. Nelson. Anomalous diffusion in steady fluid flow through a porous medium. *Phys. Rev. A*, 30:1948–1954, Oct 1984.
- [AV23] S. Armstrong and V. Vicol. Anomalous diffusion by fractal homogenization, 2023. arXiv:2305.05048.
- [BCGLD87] J.P. Bouchaud, A. Comtet, A. Georges, and P. Le Doussal. Anomalous diffusion in random media of any dimensionality. *J. Phys. France*, 48(9):1445–1450, 1987.
- [BDG20] M. Biskup, J. Ding, and S. Goswami. Return probability and recurrence for the random walk driven by two-dimensional Gaussian free field. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 373(1):45–106, 2020.
- [BK91] J. Bricmont and A. Kupiainen. Random walks in asymmetric random environments. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 142(2):345–420, 1991.
- [BS21] P. Bella and M. Schäffner. Local boundedness and Harnack inequality for solutions of linear nonuniformly elliptic equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 74(3):453–477, 2021.
- [BSW23] J. Burczak, L. Székelyhidi, and B. Wu. Anomalous dissipation and Euler flows, 2023. 2310.02934.
- [CHST22] G. Cannizzaro, L. Haunschmid-Sibitz, and F. Toninelli.  $\sqrt{\log t}$ -superdiffusivity for a Brownian particle in the curl of the 2D GFF. *Ann. Probab.*, 50(6):2475–2498, 2022.
- [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:2212.14244v2.
- [DRSV17] B. Duplantier, R. Rhodes, S. Sheffield, and V. Vargas. Log-correlated Gaussian fields: an overview. In *Geometry, analysis and probability*, volume 310 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 191–216. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [Fan98] A. Fannjiang. Anomalous diffusion in random flows. In *Mathematics of multiscale materials (Minneapolis, MN, 1995–1996)*, volume 99 of *IMA Vol. Math. Appl.*, pages 81–99. Springer, New York, 1998.
- [FFQ<sup>+</sup>85] D. S. Fisher, D. Friedan, Z. Qiu, S. J. Shenker, and S. H. Shenker. Random walks in two-dimensional random environments with constrained drift forces. *Phys. Rev. A*, 31(6):3841, 1985.
- [Fis84] D. S. Fisher. Random walks in random environments. *Phys. Rev. A*, 30:960–964, Aug 1984.
- [FNS77] D. Forster, D. R. Nelson, and M. J. Stephen. Large-distance and long-time properties of a randomly stirred fluid. *Phys. Rev. A* (3), 16(2):732–749, 1977.

- [GNO20] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. A regularity theory for random elliptic operators. *Milan J. Math.*, 88(1):99–170, 2020.
- [Kal02] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [KLY85] V. E. Kravtsov, I. V. Lerner, and V. I. Yudson. Random walks in media with constrained disorder. *Phys. Rev. A*, 18(12):L703, 1985.
- [KO02] T. Komorowski and S. Olla. On the superdiffusive behavior of passive tracer with a Gaussian drift. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 108(3-4):647–668, 2002.
- [LSSW16] A. Lodhia, S. Sheffield, X. Sun, and S. S. Watson. Fractional Gaussian fields: A survey. *Probab. Surv.*, 13:1 – 56, 2016.
- [Maz11] Vladimir Maz'ya. *Sobolev spaces with applications to elliptic partial differential equations*, volume 342 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, augmented edition, 2011.
- [MT16] J. Marklof and B. Tóth. Superdiffusion in the periodic Lorentz gas. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 347(3):933–981, 2016.
- [Ste70] E. M. Stein. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, volume No. 30 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
- [SV07] D. Szász and T. Varjú. Limit laws and recurrence for the planar Lorentz process with infinite horizon. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 129(1):59–80, 2007.
- [SZ06] A.-S. Sznitman and O. Zeitouni. An invariance principle for isotropic diffusions in random environment. *Invent. Math.*, 164(3):455–567, 2006.
- [T18] B. Tóth. Diffusive and super-diffusive limits for random walks and diffusions with long memory. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. IV. Invited lectures*, pages 3039–3058. 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(1):113–131, 2012.