

# COLLAPSE OF THE GIBBS MEASURE FOR THE DYNAMICAL $\Phi_2^3$ -MODELS ON THE INFINITE VOLUME

KIHOON SEONG AND PHILIPPE SOSOE

ABSTRACT. We study the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure in the infinite volume limit. This is the invariant measure for several stochastic partial differential equations including the parabolic and hyperbolic  $\Phi_2^3$ -models. In the large torus limit, we observe a concentration phenomenon of the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure around zero, which is the single minimizer of the corresponding Hamiltonian for any fixed torus size. From our sharp estimates for the partition function, we obtain a trivality result for the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure on infinite volume: the ensemble collapses onto a delta function on the zero field.

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
1.1.	Grand-canonical $\Phi_2^3$ -measure	1
1.2.	Main result	4
1.3.	Motivation and comments on the literature	8
1.4.	Organization of the paper	10
2.	Notations and basic lemmas	10
2.1.	Function spaces	10
2.2.	Tools from stochastic analysis	11
3.	Variational characterization of the minimizers	12
3.1.	Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality	12
3.2.	Existence and stability of minimizers	14
4.	Ultraviolet stability for $\Phi_2^3$ -measure	19
4.1.	Boué-Dupuis variational formalism for the Gibbs measure	20
4.2.	Ultraviolet stability of Wick powers	21
4.3.	Gamma convergence	25
5.	Analysis of the free energy	30
5.1.	Upper bound for the free energy	30
5.2.	Lower bound for the free energy	36
5.3.	Proofs of the auxiliary lemmas	38
6.	Collapse of the $\Phi_2^3$ -measure	39
	References	42

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Grand-canonical  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure.** We study a measure on two-dimensional distributions inspired by Euclidean quantum field theory, the so-called  $\Phi_2^3$ . This measure is defined on the

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 81T08, 60H30, 60H15 .

*Key words and phrases.*  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure; infinite-volume limit; concentration phenomenon; trivality.

space  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  of Schwartz distributions, and is formally written as

$$d\rho_L(\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi(x)^3 dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla \phi(x)|^2 dx} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2} d\phi(x). \quad (1.1)$$

Here  $Z_L$  is the partition function,  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 = (\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z})^2$  is a dilated torus of sidelength  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2} d\phi(x)$  is the (non-existent) Lebesgue measure on fields  $\phi : \mathbb{T}_L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  is the coupling constant measuring the strength of the cubic interaction potential. The main result of this paper is a concentration estimate for measures  $\rho_L$  in (1.1) in infinite volume limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , from which we deduce triviality of the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure in that limit, as explained below.

When  $\sigma = 0$ , the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure in (1.1) reduces to the Gaussian free field  $\mu_L$  with the covariance operator  $(-\Delta)^{-1}$  on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ , which corresponds to the following formal expression:<sup>1</sup>

$$\mu_L(d\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle -\Delta \phi, \phi \rangle_{L^2}} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2} d\phi(x). \quad (1.2)$$

This is known as the massless Gaussian free field on mean-zero fields. The free field theory describes a trivial system of particles that do not interact with each other. We consider the measure with an additional cubic interaction  $\sigma\phi^3$ , corresponding to an interacting quantum field theory. This cubic interaction, which represents a self-interaction in the scalar field  $\phi$ , introduces fundamental complexities.

The construction of the better known  $\Phi^4$  theory, characterized by a quartic interaction  $\sigma\phi^4$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ , was a fundamental achievement in the constructive field theory program during the 70s and 80s [35, 19, 20, 22, 23, 17, 21]. The  $\Phi^3$  theory represents a distinct scenario. Even in the case  $d = 1$  and finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L = \mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z}$ , the cubic interaction  $\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L} \phi^3 dx$  is unbounded from both above and below and so for every  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L} \phi^3 dx}$  is not integrable with respect to the periodic Wiener measure  $\mu_L$  on  $\mathbb{T}_L$ , as already observed by Lebowitz, Rose, and Speer [32]. Thus, one does not expect to be able to normalize the measure to obtain a probability measure. This ‘‘large field problem’’ is not an infinite dimensional phenomenon, and indeed, it is similar to the non-normalizability of the measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  given by

$$e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} x^3 - \frac{1}{2} |x|^2} dx.$$

In order to recover the integrability of the density with respect to  $\mu_L$  on  $\mathbb{T}_L$ , Lebowitz, Rose, and Speer [32] proposed to consider (i) truncated Gibbs measures with an  $L^2$  cut-off,

$$d\rho_L(\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L} \phi^3 dx} \mathbf{1}_{\{\int_{\mathbb{T}_L} \phi^2 dx \leq K\}} d\mu_L(\phi) \quad (1.3)$$

for some  $K > 0$ , and (ii) generalized grand-canonical Gibbs measures with a taming by the  $L^2$ -norm

$$d\rho_L(\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L} \phi^3 dx - A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L} \phi^2 dx \right)^\gamma} d\mu_L(\phi) \quad (1.4)$$

for some parameter  $\gamma > 0$  and  $A > 0$ . Here, the parameter  $A > 0$  is sometimes known as a chemical potential, by analogy with statistical mechanics. In [32], Lebowitz, Rose, and Speer constructed the one-dimensional focusing Gibbs measures (1.3) for every  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $K > 0$ . See also the work by Carlen, Fröhlich, and Lebowitz [13] for further discussion and details of the

<sup>1</sup>Here,  $Z_L$  denotes a normalizing constant, which may differ in various instances.

<sup>2</sup>Compared to the  $\Phi^4$  theory, the cubic interaction  $\phi^3$  is not sign-definite and so, the sign of the coupling constant  $\sigma$  plays no significant role. Therefore, we assume  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ .

construction of the generalized grand-canonical Gibbs measure (1.4) for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and all  $A > 0$  under specific  $\gamma > 0$ . Regarding the higher order focusing interaction, namely, focusing  $\Phi^p$ -measure<sup>3</sup> ( $p \geq 4$ ) on the one-dimensional case  $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , see Subsection 1.3.1.

In contrast, in the two-dimensional case  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 = (\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z})^2$ , the free field  $\mu_L$  is not supported on a space of functions anymore. It thus becomes necessary to interpret samples as distributions. In fact, it can be readily shown that  $\int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx$  is almost surely infinite under the free field  $\mu_L$ . In order to overcome this issue, one must subtract suitable ‘‘counter-terms’’ from a regularized version of the nonlinear expression, a procedure known as renormalization, to compensate for divergences. In [8] Bourgain reported Jaffe’s construction of a  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure in finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ . A measure is obtained by taking a renormalization on the interaction potential  $\int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx$  and the  $L^2$ -cutoff as follows

$$d\rho_L(\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx} \mathbf{1}_{\{\int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \leq K\}} d\mu_L(\phi) \quad (1.5)$$

where  $:\phi^3:$  and  $:\phi^2:$  denote the standard Wick renormalizations (see below). However, a measure with a (Wick-ordered)  $L^2$ -cutoff is not compatible with the heat and wave dynamics that one might expect to leave the ensemble invariant, due to the absence of  $L^2$ -conservation for those equations. See Subsection 1.3.3 for details. In [8], Bourgain instead proposed to consider the grand-canonical Gibbs measure of the form

$$d\rho_L(u) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx - A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2} d\mu_L(u) \quad (1.6)$$

for sufficiently large  $A > 0$ . The choice of the exponent  $\gamma = 2$  in  $A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^\gamma$  (with  $A \gg 1$ ) is optimal. See Remark 3.3 and [39, Remark 4.2]. Formally speaking, stochastic quantization implies that the grand-canonical Gibbs measure in (1.6) can be interpreted as the equilibrium state of the parabolic/hyperbolic  $\Phi_2^3$ -model, see Subsection 1.3.3. Regarding the construction of the grand-canonical Gibbs measure (1.6) on finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ , see [40]. We point out that in the two-dimensional case, even in finite volume, it is known that the higher order focusing  $\Phi^p$ -measure ( $p \geq 4$ ) on  $\mathbb{T}^2 = (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2$  cannot be constructed as a probability measure even with a  $L^2$ -cutoff or taming by a power of the  $L^2$ -norm. See Subsection 1.3.1 for further discussion of the non-normalizability of the focusing  $\Phi_2^p$ -measure ( $p \geq 4$ ). In the two-dimensional context considered here, the only Gibbs measure based on the Gaussian free field with a focusing nonlinearity that can be considered is the one with cubic interaction, namely, the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure.

Our paper is thus a continuation of the study of the grand-canonical  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure (1.6), examining in particular the behavior of the measure in the infinite volume limit as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . We first state our main result in a somewhat informal manner. See Theorem 1.5 for the precise statement.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\rho_L$  be the grand-canonical  $\Phi_2^3$  measure (1.6) on finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ . Then, for any given  $\eta, \varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and all  $A \geq A_0$*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in \dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) = 0.$$

---

<sup>3</sup>If (i)  $p \in 2\mathbb{N} + 3$  or (ii)  $p \in 2\mathbb{N} + 2$  with a negative sign  $\sigma$  on the potential energy  $\frac{\sigma}{p} \int \phi^p$ , one speaks of a focusing nonlinearity.

As a consequence, the infinite volume limit as  $L \rightarrow \infty$  in sense of weak convergence, is the trivial measure  $\delta_0$  placing unit mass on the zero field, which corresponds to the minimizer of the Hamiltonian (1.22) generating the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure.

We present the precise statement and more explanations about Theorem 1.1 in the following subsection.

**Remark 1.2.** In [43, Remark 1.3. (ii)], the authors stated “Due to the non-defocusing nature of the problem, however, we expect a certain triviality phenomenon to take place in taking a large torus limit of the  $L$ -periodic  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure.” Our proof of Theorem 1.1 provides the answer to the remark.

**1.2. Main result.** In this subsection, we state our main theorem 1.5. We first provide an overview of the  $L$ -periodic problem on the dilated torus  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$  and introduce the relevant notation, since the presentation in [8, 39] for the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure is for a torus of fixed size, even though the results of [8, 39] apply to the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$  for every  $L > 0$ .

Given  $L > 0$ , we denote by  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 = (\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z})^2$  the dilated torus. Let us also define

$$\mathbb{Z}_L^2 = (\mathbb{Z}/L)^2.$$

For any given  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2$ , we define

$$e_\lambda^L(x) = \frac{1}{L} e^{2\pi i \lambda \cdot x} \quad (1.7)$$

for  $x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$ . Note that  $\{e_\lambda^L\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ . For any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2$ , the Fourier transform  $\widehat{f}(\lambda)$  of a function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$  is defined by

$$\widehat{f}(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} f(x) \overline{e_\lambda^L(x)} dx,$$

with the corresponding Fourier representation:

$$f(x) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2} \widehat{f}(\lambda) e_\lambda^L(x).$$

We now review the construction of the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure on  $L$ -periodic distributions on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ , namely,  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ .

Let  $\mu_L$  denote a Gaussian measure on  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ , formally defined by

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu_L(\phi) &= Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \|\phi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2} d\phi(x) \\ &= Z_L^{-1} \prod_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle \lambda \rangle^2 |\widehat{\phi}(\lambda)|^2} d\widehat{\phi}(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\langle \cdot \rangle = (1 + |\cdot|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , and  $\widehat{\phi}(\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2$ , represents the Fourier transform of  $\phi$  on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ . The measure  $\mu_L$  corresponds to the massive Gaussian free field on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ , defined as the law of the following Gaussian Fourier series

$$\omega \in \Omega \longmapsto u_L(x; \omega) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2} \frac{g_{L\lambda}(\omega)}{\langle \lambda \rangle} e_\lambda^L \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{T}_L^2). \quad (1.8)$$

Here,  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$  is a sequence of mutually independent standard complex-valued Gaussian random variables on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  conditioned on  $g_{-n} = \overline{g_n}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ . Denoting the

law of a random variable  $X$  by  $\text{Law}(X)$  (with respect to the underlying probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ ), we have

$$\text{Law}_{\mathbb{P}}(u_L) = \mu_L$$

for  $u$  in (1.8). For any  $L > 0$ ,  $\mu_L$  is supported on  $H^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2) \setminus L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  when  $s < 0$ .

**Remark 1.3.** For technical considerations, we employ a massive Gaussian free field as our reference measure. That is, we introduce an identity “mass” term into the covariance  $(1 - \Delta)^{-1}$  to avoid the degeneracy of the zeroth Fourier mode. If one wishes to consider the massless Gaussian free field as in (1.2), it is necessary to restrict discussion to fields which satisfy the mean-zero condition.

As is usual for fields based on the Gaussian free field in higher dimensions, attention must be given to ultraviolet (small scale) divergences. To explain this problem, let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and define the frequency projector  $\mathbf{P}_N$  onto the frequencies  $\{|\lambda| \leq N\}$  as follows

$$\mathbf{P}_N f = \sum_{|\lambda| \leq N} \widehat{f}(\lambda) e_\lambda^L. \quad (1.9)$$

We set  $f_N := \mathbf{P}_N f$ . Letting  $L > 0$  and  $\phi$  be the free field under measure  $\mu_L$ , it follows from (1.8) and (1.7), and a Riemann sum approximation that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{L,N} &:= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ |\mathbf{P}_N \phi(x)|^2 \right] = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|y| \leq N\}} \frac{dy}{1 + |y|^2} \sim \log N \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , independently of  $x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$  thanks to the stationarity of the Gaussian free field  $\mu_L$ . In particular,  $\phi = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_N \phi$  is merely a distribution, meaning that the expression  $(\mathbf{P}_N u)^k$ , where  $k \geq 2$ , does not converge to any limit. Hence, for each  $x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$ , we define the Wick powers  $:\phi_N^2:$  and  $:\phi_N^3:$  as follows

$$:\phi_N^2: = \phi_N^2 - \mathcal{Q}_{L,N} \quad (1.11)$$

$$:\phi_N^3: = \phi_N^3 - 3\mathcal{Q}_{L,N}\phi_N. \quad (1.12)$$

One can show that  $:\phi_N^2:$  and  $:\phi_N^3:$  converge, almost surely and in  $L^p(\Omega)$  for any finite  $p \geq 1$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , to limits which we denote by  $:\phi^2:$  and  $:\phi^3:$  in  $H^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ , where  $s < 0$ . We study the corresponding renormalized interaction potential

$$\mathbf{V}_N^L(\phi) := \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :\phi_N^3: dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :\phi_N^2: dx \right)^2 \quad (1.13)$$

where  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A \geq 1$ . We define the renormalized truncated Gibbs measure

$$d\rho_{N,L}(\phi) = Z_{L,N}^{-1} \exp \left\{ -\mathbf{V}_N^L(\phi) \right\} d\mu_L(\phi) \quad (1.14)$$

with the partition function  $Z_{L,N}$

$$Z_{L,N} = \int e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :\phi_N^3: dx - A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :\phi_N^2: dx \right)^2} d\mu_L(u). \quad (1.15)$$

The following proposition shows that the objects just defined converge as the frequency cutoff  $N$  goes to  $\infty$ .

**Proposition 1.4.** *Let  $L > 0$  and  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . Given any finite  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbf{V}_N^L(\phi)$  in (1.13) converges in  $L^p(d\mu_L)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , to a limit  $\mathbf{V}^L(\phi)$ ,*

$$\mathbf{V}^L(\phi) = \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi^3 : dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi^2 : dx \right)^2. \quad (1.16)$$

Moreover, there exists  $A_0 \geq 1$  and  $C_{p,A_0} > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| e^{-\mathbf{V}_N^L(\phi)} \right\|_{L^p(d\mu_L)} \leq C_{p,A_0} < \infty \quad (1.17)$$

for any  $A \geq A_0$ . In particular, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\mathbf{V}_N^L(\phi)} = e^{-\mathbf{V}^L(\phi)} \quad \text{in } L^p(d\mu_L). \quad (1.18)$$

As a consequence, the truncated renormalized  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure in (1.14) converges, in the sense of (1.18)<sup>4</sup>, to the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure given by

$$d\rho_L(\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\mathbf{V}^L(\phi)} d\mu_L(\phi) \quad (1.19)$$

where  $Z_L$  is the partition function

$$Z_L = \int e^{-\mathbf{V}^L(\phi)} d\mu_L(\phi). \quad (1.20)$$

Furthermore, for each  $0 < L < \infty$ , the limiting  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure  $\rho_L$  is mutually absolutely continuous with the base Gaussian measure  $\mu_L$ .

Proposition 1.4 shows that taking proper renormalizations on the interaction potential gives the control of the ultraviolet (small scale) issues. The details can be found, for example, in [41, 39].

Before presenting the main result (Theorem 1.5), we explain the infrared (large scale) divergence as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Proposition 1.4 shows that  $\rho_L$  and  $\mu_L$  are mutually absolutely continuous for each finite  $L > 0$ . However, this equivalence between  $\rho_L$  and  $\mu_L$  is not uniform as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . This lack of uniformity arises because the potential energy  $\mathbf{V}^L(\phi)$ , which is the limit of  $\mathbf{V}_N^L$  as defined in (1.13), has polynomial growth

$$\mathbf{V}^L(\phi) \sim L^2$$

under  $\mu_L$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . This indicates that any possible infinite-volume limit  $\rho_\infty$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and the base Gaussian measure  $\mu_\infty$ <sup>5</sup> are mutually singular. See Lemma 4.2 (ii). This makes it nontrivial to get the uniform control of the  $L$ -periodic  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure and is the main issue in the study of the infinite volume limit as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

The main contribution of this paper is to exhibit concentration of the  $L$ -periodic  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure around zero, which is the unique minimizer of Hamiltonian (1.22) as  $L \rightarrow \infty$  in the range of parameters we consider.

<sup>4</sup>This implies that the truncated measure  $\rho_{N,L}$  converges in total variation to the limiting measure  $\rho_L$

<sup>5</sup>Namely, the large torus limit of  $\mu_L$

**Theorem 1.5.** *There exists a large constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A \geq A_0$ , the free energy  $\log Z_L$  of the grand-canonical partition function  $Z_L$  in (1.20) satisfies*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} = - \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) \quad (1.21)$$

where

$$H(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^3 dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2. \quad (1.22)$$

Moreover, if  $\rho_L$  is the grand-canonical  $\Phi_2^3$  measure (1.6) on finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ , associated with the Hamiltonian

$$H_L(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2, \quad (1.23)$$

then, given any  $\eta, m, \varepsilon > 0$  and test functions<sup>6</sup>  $g_j$  with  $\text{supp}(g_j) \subset \mathbb{T}_L^2$ ,

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |\langle \phi, g_j \rangle| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) = 0 \quad (1.24)$$

for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and all  $A \geq A_0$ . As a consequence, the infinite volume limit as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , in the sense of weak convergence,

$$\rho_L \longrightarrow \delta_0$$

is the trivial measure  $\delta_0$  that places unit mass on the zero field.

The unboundedness of the cubic interaction  $\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx$  results in a sharp local concentration of the field around a single minimizer of the Hamiltonian (1.22) as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , which is zero when  $A$  is sufficiently large. This collapse is a result of the intense competition between the cubic interaction  $\frac{\sigma}{3} \int \phi^3 dx$ , which drives the ground state energy towards  $-\infty$ , and the taming by the (Wick-ordered)  $L^2$ -norm  $A \left( \int \phi^2 dx \right)^2$ , acting to counterbalance the focusing nature. As long as the chemical potential  $A$  is sufficiently large, the unboundedness of the cubic interaction can be controlled by the taming part. See Remark 3.8 for an explanation of the critical value of the chemical potential. We also point out that compared to the  $\Phi^4$  theory whose infinite volume limit depends qualitatively on the temperature parameter  $\beta$ , all results in Theorem 1.5 are true regardless of temperature scale for the temperature dependent ensemble  $e^{-\beta H(\phi)} \prod_x d\phi(x)$ . In other words, we do not encounter a change of phase depending on low and high temperatures. In Theorem 1.5, the infinite volume limit is not only unique but is in fact trivial for every temperature.

The first step of proving the concentration (1.24) is to establish a large deviation estimate, in other words, to compute the first order behavior of the free energy  $\log Z_L$  in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  (1.21). In contrast to the one-dimensional case, where the ensemble is supported on a space of functions, the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure on the finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$  lives on the space of distributions on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ . Because of the renormalization required by this low regularity, one cannot proceed with the computation of the free energy as in the one-dimensional focusing  $\Phi_1^4$ -measure treated in [45] and [56], since the renormalization process destroys the coercive structure. See Subsection 1.3.2 for the explanation about the triviality of the focusing  $\Phi_1^4$ -measure, which was proved by Rider

<sup>6</sup>We extend the test functions to  $\mathbb{R}^2$  by periodic extension.

[45] and Tolomeo and Weber [56]. In particular, the main task of our work is to show that the free energy  $\log Z_L$  in the infinite volume limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  is ultraviolet stable, namely, the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  is uniform in  $N \geq 1$ . To achieve this, we initially address the small-scale singularities and extend the variational characterization of the free energy without the small-scale (ultraviolet) cutoff. Then we control large scale (infrared) divergences as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , arising from the stationarity of the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure.

**Remark 1.6.** By considering only the mean-zero fields<sup>7</sup>, we can refine the result (1.24) as follows

$$\rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in \dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \geq L^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \right\} \right) \lesssim \exp \left\{ -cL^{2\eta} \right\} \quad (1.25)$$

as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) = \{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \widehat{\phi}(0) = 0 \}$ . Specifically, this shows stretched exponential concentration of the  $L$ -periodic  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure around the minimizer of the Hamiltonian (1.22). See Proposition 6.1 and Remark 6.2.

**Remark 1.7.** Regarding the interaction potential  $\mathbf{V}^L(\phi)$ , which is the limit of  $\mathbf{V}_N^L$  as defined in (1.13), we write

$$\mathbf{V}^L(\phi) := \mathbf{V}^{(1),L}(\phi) + \mathbf{V}^{(2),L}(\phi)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}^{(1),L}(\phi) &= \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi^3 : dx \\ \mathbf{V}^{(2),L}(\phi) &= A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi_L^2 : dx \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 4.2 (ii), we have  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ (\mathbf{V}^{(1),L}(\phi))^2 \right] \sim L^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \mathbf{V}^{(2),L}(\phi) \right] \sim L^2$ . Therefore, the potential energy  $\mathbf{V}^{(1),L}(\phi)$  grows linearly  $L$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , while  $\mathbf{V}^{(2),L}(\phi)$  behaves quadratically  $L^2$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, we conclude that  $\mathbf{V}^L(\phi)$  grows like  $L^2$ .

Notice that  $\mathbf{V}^{(1),L}(\phi)$  and  $\mathbf{V}^{(2),L}(\phi)$  exhibit different growth rates. Hence, by taking the rescaling as follows

$$\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi^3 : dx + \frac{A}{L^\gamma} \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi_L^2 : dx \right)^2 \quad (1.26)$$

for some  $\gamma > 0$ , we can investigate a chance to show a different behavior not being equal to collapse as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . We, however, expect that it is impossible to avoid collapse although we take the rescaling as in (1.26). Based on Remark 3.3 and 3.7, the critical value  $A_0$  of the chemical potential is related to the ground state  $Q$ , ensuring the construction of the  $\Phi_2^3$  measure on the finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ . Hence, in (1.26), we should set  $A > A_0 L^\gamma$  at least. This implies that no interesting behavior occurs because the critical value  $A_0$  is independent of  $L$ .

### 1.3. Motivation and comments on the literature.

1.3.1. *Focusing Gibbs measures.* In the seminal work [32], motivated by an analogy with statistical mechanics, Lebowitz, Rose, and Speer started studying the one-dimensional focusing Gibbs measure with an  $L^2$ -cutoff, of the form

$$d\rho(\phi) = Z^{-1} e^{\frac{\sigma}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi^p dx} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi^2 dx \leq K \right\}} d\mu(\phi) \quad (1.27)$$

<sup>7</sup>by replacing the massive Gaussian free field with a massless Gaussian free field

where (i)  $p \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$  with  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  or (ii)  $p \in 2\mathbb{N} + 2$  with  $\sigma > 0$ . For the (non)-construction of the focusing  $\Phi^p$ -measure on  $\mathbb{T}$ , see [32, 6, 40]. In [13], Carlen, Fröhlich, and Lebowitz also investigated the construction of the generalized grand-canonical Gibbs measure (1.4) given by

$$d\rho(\phi) = Z^{-1} e^{\frac{\sigma}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi^p dx - A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi^2 dx \right)^\gamma} d\mu(\phi) \quad (1.28)$$

for specific values of  $\sigma$ ,  $p$ ,  $A$ , and  $\gamma$ . Additionally, we highlight a phase transition concerning the normalizability ( $Z < \infty$ ) and non-normalizability ( $Z = \infty$ ) with respect to these parameters, as proven by the second author with Oh and Tolomeo in [40]

In the two-dimensional setting  $\mathbb{T}^2$ , other than  $p = 3$ , the focusing  $\Phi^p$  measure cannot be constructed as a probability measure, even with a Wick renormalization on the interaction potential  $\int \phi^p dx$  and on the  $L^2$ -cutoff (or the taming by  $L^2$ -norm), without encountering a phase transition. This was proven by Brydges and Slade [12] ( $p = 4$ ) and Oh, Tolomeo, and the first author [39] ( $p \geq 4$ ). Therefore, in the two-dimensional case, the only possible nonlinearity leading to a renormalizable measure is the cubic interaction, namely, the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure.

It would be interesting to see whether our method could be used to deduce similar results in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . For the construction of  $\Phi_3^3$  measure on the finite volume  $\mathbb{T}^3$  and a phase transition depending on the size of  $\sigma$ , we refer to [38]. We leave the problem of characterizing the infinite volume limit of the  $\Phi_3^3$ -measure to further work.

Regarding other focusing Gibbs measures associated to nonlinear Hamiltonian PDEs, for example, see [7, 10, 58, 37, 11, 48, 49, 50]. We emphasize that many of papers cited above only treat compact domains (such as the periodic box  $\mathbb{T}^d$ ). It would be also interesting to see whether the triviality also happens when taking the infinite volume limit of the focusing Gibbs measures as in our Theorem 1.5.

**1.3.2. Triviality of focusing Gibbs measures on the infinite volume.** The question raised by McKean [33] and Rider [45] is to identify the  $\infty$ -volume Gibbs states for the microcanonical ensemble

$$d\rho_L(\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{\frac{\sigma}{4} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L} |\phi|^4 dx} \mathbf{1}_{\{\int_{\mathbb{T}_L} |\phi|^2 dx \leq LK\}} d\mu_L(\phi) \quad (1.29)$$

for any  $\sigma > 0$  and any  $K > 0$ , where  $\phi : \mathbb{T}_L \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is the complex scalar field. This corresponds to the invariant measure for one-dimensional focusing Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t u + \Delta u + \sigma|u|^2 u = 0, \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}_L \times \mathbb{R}.$$

As shown by Rider [45] and Tolomeo and Weber [56], the leading contribution to the partition function in the measure  $\rho_L$  is a single increasingly focused soliton of height  $L$  and width  $\frac{1}{L}$ , like  $LQ(L \cdot)$  where  $Q$  is a Schwartz function on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and it follows from the translation invariance of  $\rho_L$  that the infinite volume limit is not only unique but also trivial. In other words, the  $\infty$ -volume Gibbs state is the unit mass on the zero path, namely,  $\rho_L \rightarrow \delta_0$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Our result in Theorem 1.5 is an extension of [45] and [56], to a setting where small scale (ultraviolet) issues exist.

**1.3.3. Stochastic quantization.** Sampling from  $\Phi^3$ -measure plays a crucial role in evaluating observables in the  $\Phi^3$  quantum field theory. Instead of taking samples from the  $\Phi^3$ -measure, one can perform sampling from stochastic quantization equations, namely, parabolic/hyperbolic  $\Phi^3$ -model on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\partial_t u - \Delta u + u^2 - \infty + M(u) \cdot u = \sqrt{2}\xi_L \quad (1.30)$$

$$\partial_t^2 u + \partial_t u - \Delta u + u^2 - \infty + M(u) \cdot u = \sqrt{2}\xi_L \quad (1.31)$$

where  $M(u) = A \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : u^2 : dx$  arises from the taming part by the  $L^2$ -norm in (1.6), and  $\xi_L = \xi_L(x, t)$  denotes the (Gaussian) space-time white noise on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . This can be justified from the fact that the formal ergodicity implies (i)  $\text{Law}(u(t)) \rightarrow \rho_L$  for (1.30) or (ii)  $\text{Law}(u(t), \partial_t u(t)) \rightarrow \rho_L \otimes \mu_0$  for (1.31) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $u$  is the solution to the dynamical  $\Phi_2^3$ -model, either (1.30) or (1.31), and  $\mu_0$  is the (spatial) white noise measure. In fact, this was one of the motivations to introduce stochastic quantization of Euclidean quantum field theories by Parisi and Wu in [44]. The analysis of singular SPDEs based on the renormalization has been a significant achievement in recent years [15, 30, 26, 14, 46, 34, 57, 25, 28, 27, 37, 16, 51, 52, 53].

We point out that the Gibbs measures constructed by adding an  $L^2$  cut-off<sup>8</sup>

$$d\rho_L(\phi) = Z_L^{-1} e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi^3 : dx} \mathbf{1}_{\{\int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} : \phi^2 : dx \leq K\}} d\mu_L(\phi)$$

is not suitable to generate any Schrödinger / wave / heat dynamics since (i) the renormalized cubic power  $: \phi^3 :$  makes sense only in the real-valued setting and hence is not suitable for the Schrödinger equation with complex-valued solution and (ii) (1.30) and (1.31) do not preserve the  $L^2$ -norm of a solution and thus are incompatible with the Wick-ordered  $L^2$ -cutoff.

**1.4. Organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we introduce some notations and preliminary lemmas. Section 3 presents the variational characterization of the minimizers of the Hamiltonian. In Section 4, we establish ultraviolet stability for the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure by using the variational formulation of the partition. Section 5 analyzes the behavior of the free energy  $\log Z_L$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Finally, in Section 6, we prove the main results, specifically Theorem 1.5.

## 2. NOTATIONS AND BASIC LEMMAS

When addressing regularities of functions and distributions, we use  $\eta > 0$  to denote a small constant. We usually suppress the dependence on such  $\eta > 0$  in estimates. For  $a, b > 0$ ,  $a \lesssim b$  means that there exists  $C > 0$  such that  $a \leq Cb$ . By  $a \sim b$ , we mean that  $a \lesssim b$  and  $b \lesssim a$ . Regarding space-time functions, we use the following short-hand notation  $L_T^q L_x^r = L^q([0, T]; L^r(\mathbb{T}^2))$ , etc.

**2.1. Function spaces.** Let  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . We define the  $L^p$ -based Sobolev space  $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  by

$$\|f\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} = \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\langle \lambda \rangle^s \widehat{f}(\lambda)]\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}.$$

When  $p = 2$ , we have  $H^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2) = W^{s,2}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ .

Let  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a smooth bump function supported on  $[-\frac{8}{5}, \frac{8}{5}]$  and  $\phi \equiv 1$  on  $[-\frac{5}{4}, \frac{5}{4}]$ . For  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we set  $\varphi_0(\xi) = \phi(|\xi|)$  and

$$\varphi_j(\xi) = \phi\left(\frac{|\xi|}{2^j}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{|\xi|}{2^{j-1}}\right) \quad (2.1)$$

for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, for  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , we define the Littlewood-Paley projector  $\pi_j$  as the Fourier multiplier operator with a symbol  $\varphi_j$ . Note that we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varphi_j(\xi) = 1$$

<sup>8</sup>When looking for an invariant measure, the introduction of the  $L^2$ -cutoff can be justified by conservation of the  $L^2$  norm when it is available. For example, the microcanonical focusing  $\Phi_1^4$ -measure remains invariant under the flow of the cubic Schrödinger equation [6].

for each  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \pi_j f$ . We next recall the basic properties of the Besov spaces  $B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  defined by the norm

$$\|u\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} = \left\| \left\| 2^{sj} \|\pi_j u\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \right\|_{\ell_j^q(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})}.$$

We denote the Hölder-Besov space by  $\mathcal{C}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2) = B_{\infty,\infty}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ . Note that the parameter  $s$  measures differentiability and  $p$  measures integrability. In particular,  $H^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2) = B_{2,2}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  and for  $s > 0$  and not an integer,  $\mathcal{C}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  coincides with the classical Hölder spaces  $C^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ ; see [24].

We recall the following basic estimates in Besov spaces, see [1], for example.

**Lemma 2.1.** *The following estimates hold.*

(i) (interpolation) *Let  $s, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$  such that  $s = \theta s_1 + (1 - \theta)s_2$  and  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\theta}{p_1} + \frac{1-\theta}{p_2}$  for some  $0 < \theta < 1$ . Then, we have*

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \lesssim \|u\|_{W^{s_1,p_1}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^\theta \|u\|_{W^{s_2,p_2}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^{1-\theta}. \quad (2.2)$$

(ii) (embeddings) *Let  $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$ . Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{B_{p_1,q_1}^{s_1}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} &\lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p_2,q_2}^{s_2}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} && \text{for } s_1 \leq s_2, p_1 \leq p_2, \text{ and } q_1 \geq q_2, \\ \|u\|_{B_{p_1,q_1}^{s_1}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} &\lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p_1,\infty}^{s_2}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} && \text{for } s_1 < s_2, \\ \|u\|_{B_{p_1,\infty}^0(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p_1,1}^0(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

(iii) (Besov embedding) *Let  $1 \leq p_2 \leq p_1 \leq \infty$ ,  $q \in [1, \infty]$ , and  $s_2 \geq s_1 + d(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p_1})$ . Then, we have*

$$\|u\|_{B_{p_1,q}^{s_1}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p_2,q}^{s_2}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}. \quad (2.4)$$

(iv) (duality) *Let  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $p, p', q, q' \in [1, \infty]$  such that  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$ . Then, we have*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} uv \, dx \right| \leq \|u\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|v\|_{B_{p',q'}^{-s}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} uv \, dx$  denotes the duality pairing between  $B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  and  $B_{p',q'}^{-s}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ .

(v) (fractional Leibniz rule) *Let  $p, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \in [1, \infty]$  such that  $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4} = \frac{1}{p}$ . Then, for every  $s > 0$ , we have*

$$\|uv\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p_1,q}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|v\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} + \|u\|_{L^{p_3}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|v\|_{B_{p_4,q}^s(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}. \quad (2.6)$$

**2.2. Tools from stochastic analysis.** We conclude this section by recalling some lemmas from stochastic analysis. See [4, 54] for basic definitions. Let  $(H, B, \mu)$  be an abstract Wiener space, that is,  $\mu$  is a Gaussian measure on a separable Banach space  $B$ , and  $H \subset B$  is its Cameron-Martin space. Given a complete orthonormal system  $\{e_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset B^* = H$ , we define a polynomial chaos of order  $k$  to be an element of the form  $\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} H_{k_j}(\langle x, e_j \rangle)$ , where  $x \in B$ ,  $k_j \neq 0$  for only finitely many  $j$ 's,  $k = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} k_j$ ,  $H_{k_j}$  is the Hermite polynomial of degree  $k_j$ , and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = {}_B \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{B^*}$  denotes the  $B$ - $B^*$  duality pairing. We then denote the closure of polynomial chaoses of order  $k$  under  $L^2(B, \mu)$  by  $\mathcal{H}_k$ . The element in  $\mathcal{H}_k$  is called homogeneous Wiener chaos of order  $k$ . We also set

$$\mathcal{H}_{\leq k} = \bigoplus_{j=0}^k \mathcal{H}_j$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $L = \Delta - x \cdot \nabla$  be the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator. Then, it is known that any element in  $\mathcal{H}_k$  is an eigenfunction of  $L$  with eigenvalue  $-k$ . Then, as a consequence of the hypercontractivity of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup  $U(t) = e^{tL}$  due to Nelson [35], we have the following Wiener chaos estimate [55, Theorem I.22].

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, we have*

$$\|X\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq (p-1)^{\frac{k}{2}} \|X\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for any  $p \geq 2$  and any  $X \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq k}$ .

We recall the following orthogonality relation for the Hermite polynomials, see [36, Lemma 1.1.1].

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be jointly Gaussian random variables with mean zero and variances  $\sigma_X$  and  $\sigma_Y$ . Then, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[H_k(X; \sigma_X) H_\ell(Y; \sigma_Y)] = \delta_{k\ell} k! \{\mathbb{E}[XY]\}^k,$$

where  $H_k(x, \sigma)$  denotes the Hermite polynomial of degree  $k$  with variance parameter  $\sigma$ .

We recall the following Wick's theorem. See Proposition I.2 in [55].

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $g_1, \dots, g_{2n}$  be (not necessarily distinct) jointly Gaussian random variables. Then, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[g_1 \cdots g_{2n}] = \sum \prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[g_{i_k} g_{j_k}],$$

where the sum is over all partitions of  $\{1, \dots, 2n\}$  into disjoint pairs  $(i_k, j_k)$ .

### 3. VARIATIONAL CHARACTERIZATION OF THE MINIMIZERS

In this section, we investigate the stability of minimizers for the Hamiltonian (3.1). To analyze stability, we begin by examining the Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality.

**3.1. Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality.** The Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev (GNS) inequality plays an important role in the study of the the minimizers of the Hamiltonian

$$H_L(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2 \quad (3.1)$$

for any  $1 \leq L \leq \infty$ . When  $L = \infty$ , the Hamiltonian is defined for functions of the full space  $\mathbb{T}_\infty^2 = \mathbb{R}^2$ . The following result on the optimal constant  $C_{\text{GNS}}$  and optimizers was proved by Weinstein [60] for general dimensions  $d \geq 2$ . We present the case  $d = 2$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *For any finite  $p > 2$  and  $\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , we have*

$$\|\phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}^p \leq C_{\text{GNS}}(p) \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{p-2} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$C_{\text{GNS}}^{-1}(p) := \inf_{\substack{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \\ \phi \neq 0}} \frac{\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{p-2} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2}{\|\phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}^p}.$$

Then, the minimum is attained at a positive, radial, and exponentially decaying function  $Q \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  which is the unique radial solution to the elliptic equation on  $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$(p-2)\Delta Q + 2Q^{p-1} - 2Q = 0$$

with the minimal  $L^2$ -norm (namely, the ground state). In particular, we have

$$C_{\text{GNS}}(p) = \frac{p}{2} \|Q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{2-p}.$$

The GNS inequality (3.2) fails on the bounded domain  $\mathbb{T}_L^d$ . For example, (3.2) does not hold for constant functions. A related inequality, with an additional term on the right, does hold on  $\mathbb{T}_L^d$  and appears below in (3.3). The result is elementary, but we could not locate a proof in a form suitable for our application.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $2 < p < \infty$  if  $d = 1, 2$  and  $2 < p < \frac{2d}{d-2}$  if  $d \geq 3$ . Then, there exists a constant  $C = C(d, p)$  independent of  $L$  such that for any  $\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^d)$*

$$\|\phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}_L^d)} \leq C \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}^\theta \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}^{(1-\theta)} + CL^{-\theta} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}. \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\theta = d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})$ .

*Proof.* We first assume the case  $L = 1$ , namely, for any  $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^\theta \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^{(1-\theta)} + C \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\theta = d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})$ , and then prove the main result (3.3). For any  $\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^d)$  and  $1 \leq L < \infty$ , we set  $\phi_L(x) := L^{\frac{d}{p}} \phi(Lx)$ . Then,  $\phi_L \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \phi_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} &= L^{\frac{d}{p} - \frac{d}{2} + 1} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)} \\ \|\phi_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} &= L^{\frac{d}{p} - \frac{d}{2}} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

By using (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}_L^d)} &= \|\phi_L\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C \|\nabla \phi_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^\theta \|\phi_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^{1-\theta} + C \|\phi_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \\ &\leq CL^{\theta(\frac{d}{p} - \frac{d}{2} + 1) + (1-\theta)(\frac{d}{p} - \frac{d}{2})} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}^\theta \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}^{1-\theta} + CL^{-\theta} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}^\theta \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}^{1-\theta} + CL^{-\theta} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to prove (3.4). By interpolation in  $L^p$ , we have that for any  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{L^r(\mathbb{T}^d)}^\theta \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{r}$  and  $2 < p < r < \infty$  if  $d = 1, 2$ , and  $2 < p < r \leq \frac{2d}{d-2}$  if  $d \geq 3$ . Also, there exists an extension operator  $E$  from  $H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$  to  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and a constant  $C$  such that for every  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,  $Eu = u$  on  $\mathbb{T}^d$  and  $\text{supp } Eu \subset \mathbb{T}_{L_0}^d$  for some  $L_0 \gg 1$  and

$$\|Eu\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}. \quad (3.6)$$

Since  $Eu = u$  on  $\mathbb{T}^d$ , using the Sobolev inequality, and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^r(\mathbb{T}^d)} &\leq \|Eu\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|Eu\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{d}$ . Combining (3.5) and (3.7), we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^{1-\theta} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^\theta + C \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)},$$

which completes the proof of (3.4).  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.** The sharp Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev (GNS) inequality on  $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$\|\phi\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2)}^3 \leq C_{\text{GNS}} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \quad (3.8)$$

plays an important role in the study of the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure. The positive radial solution to the following semilinear elliptic equation on  $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$\Delta Q + 2Q^2 - 2Q = 0 \quad (3.9)$$

appearing in Proposition 3.1 is referred to as the ground state for the associated elliptic problem (3.9).

The construction of the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure (1.19) and relevance of the GNS inequality (3.8) can be seen at heuristic level by formally rewriting (1.6) as a functional integral (ignoring the renormalization)

$$Z_L = \int e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int \phi^3 - A \left( \int \phi^2 dx \right)^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla\phi|^2 dx} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2} d\phi(x) \quad (3.10)$$

for  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A > 0$ . Thanks to the GNS inequality (3.8) and Young's inequality, we can control the cubic interaction as follows

$$\|\phi\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2)}^3 \leq \delta \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + c(\delta) \|\phi\|_{L^2}^4$$

for all sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  and some large constant  $c(\delta)$  depending on  $\delta$  and  $C_{\text{GNS}}$  in (3.8). From this, we can establish an upper bound

$$(3.10) \leq \int e^{-(A-c(\delta)) \left( \int \phi^2 dx \right)^2} e^{-\left(\frac{1}{2}-\delta\right) \int |\nabla\phi|^2 dx} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2} d\phi(x).$$

Hence, when the chemical potential  $A$  is sufficiently large, we expect the partition function  $Z_L$  to be finite. In fact, the choice of the exponent  $\gamma = 2$  in  $A \left( \int \phi^2 dx \right)^\gamma$  with  $A \gg 1$  is optimal. When  $\gamma < 2$  or when  $\gamma = 2$  and  $A$  is sufficiently small, the taming by the Wick-ordered  $L^2$ -norm in (3.10) is too weak to control the cubic interaction, and thus we expect a nonnormalizability result to hold. See [39] for a rigorous argument. The optimal threshold for  $A$  when  $\gamma = 2$  is related to the ground state  $Q$ , given that  $c(\delta)$  depends on  $C_{\text{GNS}}$ . See also Lemma 3.6 (i). It would be interesting to see whether the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure can be constructed as a probability measure at this optimal threshold, even on the finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ .

**3.2. Existence and stability of minimizers.** In this subsection, we study the optimizers for the Hamiltonian (3.1), along with their stability properties.

We first define the following Hamiltonian, which does not include taming by the  $L^2$ -norm:

$$H_0(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^3 dx \quad (3.11)$$

for any  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . For any fixed  $q > 0$ , define

$$H_{0,q}^* = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \{H_0(\phi) : M(\phi) = q\} \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$M(\phi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^2 dx. \quad (3.13)$$

We first prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** *For every  $q > 0$ , we have*

$$-\infty < H_{0,q}^* < 0$$

where  $H_{0,q}^*$  is given as in (3.12).

*Proof.* We first assume  $\sigma > 0$ . Take any function  $W \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  such that  $M(W) = q$ ,  $W > 0$ , and so  $\int W^3 dx > 0$ . For each  $\zeta > 0$ , define  $W_\zeta(x) = -\zeta W(\zeta x)$ . Then, we have  $M(W_\zeta) = M(W) = q$  for every  $\zeta > 0$ , where  $M(W)$  is as in (3.13). Moreover, we get

$$H_0(W_\zeta) = \frac{\zeta^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla W|^2 dx - \frac{\sigma \zeta}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} W^3 dx.$$

Hence, by choosing  $\zeta$  sufficiently small, we have  $H_0(W_\zeta) < 0$ . From the definition of  $H_{0,q}^*$ , we obtain  $H_{0,q}^* \leq H(W_\zeta) < 0$ . If  $\sigma < 0$ , then one can proceed similarly with  $W_\zeta(x) = \zeta W(\zeta x)$ .

We now prove the lower bound. By the GNS (3.2) and Young inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2)}^3 &\leq C_{\text{GNS}} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\ &\leq \delta \|\nabla \phi\|_{H^1}^2 + A(\delta) \|\phi\|_{L^2}^4 \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

for every  $\delta > 0$ , where  $A = A(\delta)$  is a large constant depending on  $\delta > 0$ . It follows from (3.14) and  $M(\phi) = q$  that

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(\phi) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^3 dx \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta_1\right) \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}^2 - cA(\delta_1)q^2 \geq -cA(\delta_1)q^2 > -\infty \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

for some small  $\delta_1 > 0$  and a constant  $c > 0$ . In view of (3.15), we obtain  $H_{0,q}^* > -\infty$  for any fixed  $q > 0$ . □

We next prove the existence of minimizers for the variational problem in (3.12). The set of minimizers for the problem (3.12) is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_q = \{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) : H_0(\phi) = H_{0,q}^* \text{ and } M(\phi) = q\}.$$

A minimizing sequence for  $H_{0,q}^*$  is any sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$  of functions in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  satisfying

$$M(\varphi_n) = q$$

for every  $n \geq 1$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_0(\varphi_n) = H_{0,q}^*.$$

**Lemma 3.5.** *For every  $q > 0$ , the set  $\mathcal{M}_q$  is not empty. Moreover, if  $\{\varphi_n\}$  is any minimizing sequence for  $H_{0,q}^*$ , then there exists a sequence  $\{y_n\}$  and an element  $W \in \mathcal{M}_q$  such that  $\{\varphi_n(\cdot + y_n)\}$  has a subsequence converging to  $W$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . In particular, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\substack{W \in \mathcal{M}_q \\ y \in \mathbb{R}^2}} \|\varphi_n(\cdot + y) - W\|_{H^1} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Instead of considering the minimization problem (3.12), we study the minimization problem

$$\bar{H}_{0,q}^* = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \{\bar{H}_0(\phi) : M(\phi) = q\},$$

where

$$\bar{H}_0(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx - \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\phi|^3 dx. \quad (3.16)$$

Its minimum is the same as for (3.12):

$$H_{0,q}^* = \bar{H}_{0,q}^*$$

In the definition of  $\bar{H}_0$ , we assume  $\sigma > 0$ . If  $\sigma < 0$ , then replace  $-\frac{\sigma}{3}$  in the right hand side of (3.16) by  $\frac{\sigma}{3}$ . From the diamagnetic inequality, we have

$$|\nabla|\phi|(x)| \leq |\nabla\phi(x)| \quad (3.17)$$

for almost every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . In particular,  $|\phi| \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  if  $\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Thanks to (3.17), we get  $\bar{H}_0(|\phi|) \leq \bar{H}_0(\phi)$  for any  $\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Hence, if  $W$  is one of the minimizers for  $\bar{H}_{0,q}^*$ , then  $|W|$  is also a minimizer for  $\bar{H}_{0,q}^*$  since  $M(|W|) = q$ . Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\substack{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \\ \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = q}} H_0(\phi) &\geq \inf_{\substack{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \\ \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = q}} \bar{H}_0(\phi) = \bar{H}_0(|W|) = H_0(-|W|) \\ &\geq \inf_{\substack{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \\ \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = q}} H_0(\phi) \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where in the last part we used the fact that  $|W| \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Therefore, in order to show  $\mathcal{M}_q$  is not empty, it suffices to prove that there exists a minimizer for  $\bar{H}_{0,q}^*$ .

By Lemma 3.4, we can choose a minimizing sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  for  $\bar{H}_{0,q}^*$ , namely,  $\|\varphi_n\|_{L^2}^2 = q$  for every  $n \geq 1$  and

$$\bar{H}_{0,q}^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{H}_0(\varphi_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \varphi_n|^2 dx - \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\varphi_n|^3 dx \right). \quad (3.19)$$

From the GNS inequality (3.2), we have

$$\bar{H}_0(\varphi_n) \geq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \int |\nabla \varphi_n|^2 dx - c(\delta)q^2 \quad (3.20)$$

for some small  $\delta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and large  $c(\delta) \geq 1$ . From (3.19) and (3.20),  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a bounded sequence in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  and so we can exploit the profile decomposition for the subcritical Sobolev embedding  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . See Theorem in [31, Proposition 3.1]. Every bounded sequence in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  can be written, up to a subsequence, as an almost orthogonal sum of sequences with a small remainder term in  $L^p$ , as follows: there exists  $J^* \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ , a sequence  $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^{J^*}$  of non-trivial  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ -functions, and a sequence  $\{x_n^j\}_{j=1}^{J^*}$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that up to a subsequence, still denoted by  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we have

$$\varphi_n(x) = \sum_{j=1}^J \psi^j(x - x_n^j) + r_n^J(x)$$

for each finite  $0 \leq J \leq J^*$ , where the remainder term  $r_n^J$  satisfies

$$\lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|r_n^J\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 0 \quad (3.21)$$

for every  $2 \leq p < \infty$ . Here,  $\lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} f(J) := f(J^*)$  if  $J^* < \infty$ . Moreover, for any finite  $0 \leq J \leq J^*$ , we have

$$\|\varphi_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^J \|\psi^j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|r_n^J\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + o(1) \quad (3.22)$$

$$\|\nabla \varphi_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla \psi^j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|\nabla r_n^J\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + o(1) \quad (3.23)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi_n\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2)}^3 = \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \|\psi^j\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2)}^3. \quad (3.24)$$

We define  $\tilde{\psi}_j := \frac{q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\|\psi_j\|_{L^2}} \psi_j$ . Then, it follows from the definition of the infimum  $\bar{H}_{0,q}^*$  and  $\|\tilde{\psi}^j\|_{L^2}^2 = q$  that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{\psi}_j|^2 dx \geq \bar{H}_{0,q}^* + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\tilde{\psi}_j|^3 dx. \quad (3.25)$$

By taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $J \rightarrow J^*$  with (3.21), (3.22), (3.23), (3.24), and (3.25), we have

$$\bar{H}_{0,q}^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \varphi_n|^2 dx - \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\varphi_n|^3 dx \right) \quad (3.26)$$

$$\geq \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \psi^j|^2 dx - \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\psi^j|^3 dx \quad (3.27)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \frac{\|\psi^j\|_{L^2}^2}{2q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{\psi}^j|^2 dx - \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \frac{\sigma \|\psi^j\|_{L^2}^3}{3q^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\tilde{\psi}^j|^3 dx$$

$$\geq \bar{H}_{0,q}^* \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \frac{\|\psi^j\|_{L^2}^2}{q} + \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \frac{\sigma \|\psi^j\|_{L^2}^2}{3q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\tilde{\psi}^j|^3 \left( 1 - \frac{\|\psi^j\|_{L^2}}{q^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)$$

$$\geq \bar{H}_{0,q}^* + \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \frac{\sigma \|\psi^j\|_{L^2}^2}{3q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\tilde{\psi}^j|^3 \left( 1 - \frac{\|\psi^j\|_{L^2}}{q^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)$$

$$\geq \bar{H}_{0,q}^*. \quad (3.28)$$

In order for the last inequality to become an equality, we require either  $J^* = 0$  or  $J^* = 1$  with  $\|\psi^1\|_{L^2}^2 = q$ . Suppose that  $J^* = 0$ . Then, by repeating (3.26) and (3.27), we have  $\bar{H}_{0,q}^* \geq 0$  which implies a contradiction from Lemma 3.4. Hence, we get  $J^* = 1$  and so  $\varphi_n(x) = \psi^1(x - x_n^1) + r_n^1(x)$  from which

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1) - \psi^1\|_{L^2} = 0. \quad (3.29)$$

Since  $\{\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1)\}_{n \geq 1}$  is also weakly convergent in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , we deduce  $\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1)$  converges weakly to  $\psi^1$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , which implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \psi^1|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \varphi_n|^2 dx. \quad (3.30)$$

Thanks to the GNS inequality (3.2) and (3.29), we get  $\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1) \rightarrow \psi^1$  in  $L^3$ . Therefore, from (3.30) and the convergence in  $L^3$ , we have

$$\bar{H}_{0,q}^* \leq \bar{H}_0(\psi^1) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{H}_0(\varphi_n) = \bar{H}_{0,q}^*.$$

This shows that  $\psi^1$  is a minimizer for  $\bar{H}_{0,q}^*$  and so it follows from (3.18) that  $\mathcal{M}_q$  is not empty. In other words,  $-|\psi^1|$  is a minimizer for  $H_{0,q}^*$ .

It remains to check that  $\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1)$  converges to  $\psi^1$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{H}_0(\varphi_n) = H(\psi^1)$ , we have  $\int |\nabla \varphi_n|^2 dx \rightarrow \int |\nabla \psi^1|^2 dx$  and so  $\|\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1)\|_{H^1} \rightarrow \|\psi^1\|_{H^1}$ . Therefore, combined with the weak convergence of  $\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1)$  to  $\psi^1$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , we have

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi_n(\cdot + x_n^1) - \psi^1\|_{H^1} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\substack{W \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_q \\ y \in \mathbb{R}^2}} \|\varphi_n(\cdot + y) - W\|_{H^1}$$

where  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_q = \{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) : \bar{H}_0(\phi) = \bar{H}_{0,q}^* \text{ and } M(\phi) = q\}$ . We now choose a minimizing sequence  $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  for  $H_{0,q}^*$ . From (3.18), we have  $H_{0,q}^* = \bar{H}_{0,q}^*$ . Therefore, we can repeat the process in (3.28) with (3.25) to obtain that there exists a sequence  $\{y_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  and a minimizer  $\psi$  for  $H_{0,q}^*$  such that

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\phi_n(\cdot + y_n) - \psi\|_{H^1} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\substack{W \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_q \\ y \in \mathbb{R}^2}} \|\phi_n(\cdot + y) - W\|_{H^1}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.5. □

We now study the optimizers for the Hamiltonian (3.1) with a taming by the  $L^2$ -norm, along with their stability properties.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ .*

(i) *The Hamiltonian*

$$H(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^3 dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2. \quad (3.31)$$

*has the unique minimizer  $\phi = 0$  if  $A > |H_{0,1}^*|$  and infinitely many minimizers if  $A = |H_{0,1}^*|$ , where*

$$H_{0,1}^* = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \{H_0(\phi) : M(\phi) = 1\}. \quad (3.32)$$

*Here,  $H_0$  is the Hamiltonian given in (3.11).*

(ii) *There exists a large constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  such that for every  $A \geq A_0$  and every  $L > 0$ , the Hamiltonian*

$$H_L(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2$$

*has the unique minimizer  $\phi = 0$ . Furthermore, there exists a constant  $c > 0$  independent of  $L$  such that*

$$H_L(\varphi) \geq \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} H_L(\phi) + c \left( \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 \right). \quad (3.33)$$

*In other words, if the energy  $H_L(\varphi)$  is close to the minimal energy  $\inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} H_L(\phi)$ , then  $\varphi$  is close to the minimizer, namely the zero function  $\varphi = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove part (i). Start from the decomposition of the minimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) &= \inf_{q \geq 0} \left\{ \inf_{\substack{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \\ \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = q}} H_0(\phi) + Aq^2 \right\} \\ &= \inf_{q \geq 0} \left\{ q^2 \inf_{\substack{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \\ \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = 1}} H_0(\phi) + Aq^2 \right\} \\ &= \inf_{q \geq 0} \left\{ q^2 H_{0,1}^* + Aq^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Given that Lemma 3.4 shows that  $-\infty < H_{0,1}^* < 0$ , if  $A > |H_{0,1}^*|$ , then the minimum is achieved at  $q = 0$  in (3.34). This shows that  $\phi = 0$  is the unique minimizer.

If  $A = |H_{0,1}^*|$ , then from (3.34), we have  $\inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) = 0$ . For any  $q \geq 0$  and  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , define  $Q_{q,x_0} := qQ(q^{\frac{1}{2}}(\cdot - x_0))$  where  $\|Q\|_{L^2}^2 = 1$  and

$$H_0(Q) = \inf_{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = 1} H_0(\phi) = H_{0,1}^*$$

where  $H_0$  is the Hamiltonian given in (3.11). The existence of such  $Q$  is guaranteed by Lemma 3.5. Then, since  $\|Q_{q,x_0}\|_{L^2}^2 = q$  and

$$H_0(Q_{q,x_0}) = \frac{q^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q|^2 dx + \frac{q^2 \sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^3 dx = q^2 H_{0,1}^*,$$

we obtain

$$H(Q_{q,x_0}) = q^2 H_{0,1}^* + Aq^2 = 0,$$

which shows that  $\{Q_{q,x_0}\}_{q \geq 0, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2}$  is a set of infinitely many minimizers.

We next prove Part (ii). From the GNS inequality on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$  (Lemma 3.2) and Young's inequality, we have

$$H_L(\varphi) \geq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx + (A - c(\delta) - c(L)) \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \varphi^2 dx \right)^2 \geq 0 \quad (3.35)$$

if  $A$  is sufficiently large, where  $c(L) \rightarrow 0$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, (3.35) implies that  $H_L(\varphi) > 0$  if  $\varphi \neq 0$ , which shows that  $\varphi = 0$  is the unique minimizer for every  $L \geq 1$ . Moreover, the estimate (3.35) implies the quantitative stability (3.33).  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** A direct application of the GNS inequality (3.2) without Lemma 3.5 does not characterize the critical value of  $A$  given in (3.32).

If  $A < |H_{0,1}^*|$ , then from the argument in (3.34), we have  $\inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) = -\infty$ . In other words, it drives the ground state energy towards  $-\infty$ . Hence, one does not expect the construction of the  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure if  $A < |H_{0,1}^*|$  to be possible, even on the finite volume  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ . It would be interesting to see whether the  $L$ -periodic  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure can be constructed as a probability measure in the full range  $A \geq |H_{0,1}^*|$ , especially the critical case  $A = |H_{0,1}^*|$ .

#### 4. ULTRAVIOLET STABILITY FOR $\Phi_2^3$ -MEASURE

In this section, we first address the small-scale (ultraviolet) singularities and give a variational characterization of the free energy  $\log Z_L$ .

**4.1. Boué-Dupuis variational formalism for the Gibbs measure.** In this subsection, we introduce the main framework to analyze expectations of certain random fields under the Gaussian measure  $\mu_L$ .

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space on which is defined a space-time white noise  $\xi_L$  on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . Let  $W_L(t)$  be the cylindrical Wiener process on  $L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  with respect to the underlying probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . That is,

$$W_L(t) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2} B_\lambda(t) e_\lambda^L$$

where  $\{B_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2}$  is defined by  $B_\lambda(t) = \langle \xi_L, \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]} \cdot e_\lambda^L \rangle_{\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{R}}$ . Here,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{R}}$  denotes the duality pairing on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $\xi_L$  is a space-time white noise on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . Then, we see that  $\{B_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2}$  is a family of mutually independent complex-valued<sup>9</sup> Brownian motions conditioned that  $B_{-\lambda} = \overline{B_\lambda}$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2$ . We then define a centered Gaussian process  $\mathfrak{I}_L(t)$  by

$$\mathfrak{I}_L(t) = \langle \nabla \rangle^{-1} W_L(t). \quad (4.1)$$

Then, we have  $\text{Law}(\mathfrak{I}_L(1)) = \mu_L$ . By setting  $\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t) = \mathbf{P}_N \mathfrak{I}_L(t)$ , we have  $\text{Law}(\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(1)) = (\mathbf{P}_N)_\# \mu_L$ . We define the second and third Wick powers of  $\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}$  as follows

$$\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(t) = \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}^2(t) - \mathfrak{Q}_{L,N}(t), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}^3(t) = \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}^3(t) - 3\mathfrak{Q}_{L,N}(t)\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t), \quad (4.3)$$

where a Riemann sum approximation gives

$$\mathfrak{Q}_{L,N}(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)|^2 \right] = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \sim t \log N.$$

The second and third Wick powers of  $\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)$  are the space-stationary stochastic processes. In particular,  $\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(1)$  and  $\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}^3(1)$  are equal in law to  $:\phi_N^2:$  and  $:\phi_N^3:$  in (1.11) and (1.12), respectively.

Next, let  $\mathbb{H}_a = \mathbb{H}_a(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  denote the space of drifts, which are the progressively measurable processes<sup>10</sup> belonging to  $L^2([0, 1]; L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2))$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely. We are now ready to state the Boué-Dupuis variational formula [5, 59]; in particular, see Theorem 7 in [59]. See also Theorem 2 in [2].

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{I}_L(t) = \langle \nabla \rangle^{-1} W_L(t)$  be as in (4.1). Fix  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose that  $F : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}_L^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is measurable such that  $\mathbb{E}[|F(\mathbf{P}_N \mathfrak{I}_L(1))|^p] < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|e^{-F(\mathbf{P}_N \mathfrak{I}_L(1))}|^q] < \infty$  for some  $1 < p, q < \infty$  with  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ . Then, we have*

$$-\log \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-F(\mathbf{P}_N \mathfrak{I}_L(1))} \right] = \inf_{\theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ F(\mathbf{P}_N \mathfrak{I}_L(1) + \mathbf{P}_N \Theta_L(1)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\theta_L(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right],$$

where  $\Theta_L$  is defined by

$$\Theta_L(t) = \int_0^t \langle \nabla \rangle^{-1} \theta_L(t') dt' \quad (4.4)$$

and the expectation  $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}$  is an expectation with respect to the underlying probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ .

<sup>9</sup>In particular,  $B_0$  is a standard real-valued Brownian motion.

<sup>10</sup>With respect to the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(B_\lambda(s), \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2, 0 \leq s \leq t)$ .

In the following, we set  $\mathfrak{I}_{L,N} = \mathbf{P}_N \mathfrak{I}_L(1)$  and  $\Theta_{L,N} = \mathbf{P}_N \Theta_L(1)$  for  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and finite  $L > 0$ .

**4.2. Ultraviolet stability of Wick powers.** We present a lemma on pathwise regularity estimates of  $\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)$ ,  $\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(t)$ ,  $\mathfrak{V}^{\bullet}_{L,N}(t)$ , and  $\Theta_L(t)$ . In particular, we also specify the growth rate as  $L \rightarrow \infty$  for the stochastic objects.

**Lemma 4.2.** (i) *For any finite  $p \geq 2$ ,  $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\eta > 0$ , each Wick power in (4.2) and (4.3) converges to a limit in  $L^p(\Omega; W^{-\eta,r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2))$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and almost surely in  $W^{-\eta,r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ . Moreover, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)\|_{W^{-\eta,r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p + \|\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(t)\|_{W^{-\eta,r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p + \|\mathfrak{V}^{\bullet}_{L,N}(t)\|_{W^{-\eta,r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p \right] \lesssim L^2 < \infty, \quad (4.5)$$

uniformly in<sup>11</sup>  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

(ii) *For any  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{V}^{\bullet}_{L,N}(1) dx \right] = 0 \quad (4.6)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(1) dx \right|^2 \right] \sim L^2 \quad (4.7)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(1) dx \right|^2 \right] \sim L^2 \quad (4.8)$$

as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , where the implicit constant is uniform in  $N \geq 1$ .

(iii) *The drift term  $\theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  has the regularity of the Cameron-Martin space, that is, for any  $\theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ , we have*

$$\|\Theta_L(1)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \leq \int_0^1 \|\theta_L(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt. \quad (4.9)$$

*Proof.* We first prove Part (i). Regarding the convergence of the stochastic objects, see for example [42, Proposition 2.3]. We concentrate on proving (4.5) to make the  $L$ -dependent growth rate  $L^2$  explicit. Applying the Sobolev inequality, we can reduce the case  $r = \infty$  to the case of large but finite  $r$  at the expense of a slight loss of spatial derivative

$$\|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)\|_{W^{-\eta,\infty}} \lesssim \|\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)\|_{L^r}. \quad (4.10)$$

Using the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 2.2) and a Riemann sum approximation, we have that for any  $p_1 \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mathbb{E} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)|^{p_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} &\lesssim p_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{t}{\langle \lambda \rangle^{2+\eta}} \frac{1}{L^2} = \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LN}} \frac{t}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^{2+\eta}} \frac{1}{L^2} \\ &\sim t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|y| \leq N\}} \frac{dy}{1 + |y|^{2+\eta}} < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

<sup>11</sup>When  $N = \infty$ , the statement concerns the norms of the limiting objects.

uniformly in  $N, L \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Let  $p_1 \geq \max(r, p)$ . It follows from (4.10), the Minkowski's integral inequality and (4.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)\|_{W^{-\eta,\infty}}^p \right] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)\|_{L^r}^p \right] \\ &\lesssim 1 + \left\| \left( \mathbb{E} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)|^{p_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \right\|_{L^r(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^{p_1} \lesssim p_1^{\frac{p_1}{2}} L^{\frac{2p_1}{r}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

By choosing  $r \geq p$ , where  $r$  comes from the Sobolev inequality  $W^{\frac{\eta}{2},r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ , and  $p_1 = r$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(t)\|_{W^{-\eta,r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p \right] = O(L^2).$$

for any  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . From now on, we prove the estimate for  $\mathfrak{V}_{L,N} = \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(1)$  at  $t = 1$ . We first write

$$\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N} = \mathbb{I}_{L,N} + \mathbb{II}_{L,N}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{L,N} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \neq 0}} \frac{B_{\lambda_1}(1) B_{\lambda_2}(1)}{\langle \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \rangle^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \langle \lambda_1 \rangle \langle \lambda_2 \rangle} \frac{e^{2\pi i(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \cdot x}}{L^2} \\ \mathbb{II}_{L,N} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{|B_\lambda(1)|^2 - 1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 2.2), the Wick's theorem (Lemma 2.4), and a Riemann sum approximation, we have that for any  $p_1 \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{I}_{L,N}|^{p_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} &\lesssim p_1 \left( \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{I}_{L,N}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left( \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda_1| \leq N, |\lambda_2| \leq N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \rangle^\eta \langle \lambda_1 \rangle^2 \langle \lambda_2 \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^4} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left( \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq 2N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^\eta} \left( \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |\lambda_1| \leq N, |\lambda_2| \leq N \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \lambda}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda_1 \rangle^2 \langle \lambda_2 \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \right) \frac{1}{L^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\sim \left( \int_{|z| \leq 2N} \frac{1}{1 + |z|^\eta} \left( \int_{|z_1| \leq N} \frac{dz_1}{(1 + |z_1|^2)(1 + |z - z_1|^2)} \right) dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left( \int_{|z| \leq 2N} \frac{1}{1 + |z|^\eta} \frac{1}{\langle z \rangle^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbb{I}_{L,N}|^{p_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} &\lesssim p_1 \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbb{I}_{L,N}|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sim \left(\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^4} \frac{1}{L^4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\sim \left(\int_{|z| \leq 2N} \frac{dz}{1+|z|^4} \frac{1}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

uniformly in  $N, L \geq 1$ . Let  $p_1 \geq \max(r, p)$ . It follows from (4.10) (replacing  $\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}$  by  $\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}$ ), the Minkowski's integral inequality, (4.13), and (4.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}\|_{W^{-\eta, \infty}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p \right] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p \right] \\ &\lesssim 1 + \left\| \left( \mathbb{E} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}|^{p_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \right\|_{L^r(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^{p_1} \lesssim p_1^{p_1} L^{\frac{2p_1}{r}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

By choosing  $r \geq p$ , where  $r$  comes from the Sobolev inequality  $W^{\frac{\eta}{4}, r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ , and  $p_1 = r$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathfrak{V}_{L,N}\|_{W^{-\eta, r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p \right] = O(L^2).$$

For stochastic object  $\mathfrak{V}_{L,N} = \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}(1)$ , by following the above arguments, it suffices to check that for any  $p_1 \geq 2$

$$\left(\mathbb{E} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}|^{p_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \lesssim p_1^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty,$$

uniformly in  $N, L \geq 1$ . Inclusion-exclusion applied to the indices  $\lambda_j, j = 1, 2, 3$  gives the decomposition

$$\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N} = \mathbb{I}_{L,N} + \mathbb{IV}_{L,N}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{L,N} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_j \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2, |\lambda_j| \leq N, j=1,2,3 \\ (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \neq 0}} \frac{B_{\lambda_1}(1)B_{\lambda_2}(1)B_{\lambda_3}(1)}{\langle \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \rangle^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \langle \lambda_1 \rangle \langle \lambda_2 \rangle \langle \lambda_3 \rangle} \frac{e^{2\pi i(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \cdot x}}{L^3} \\ \mathbb{IV}_{L,N} &= 3 \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{|B_\lambda(1)|^2 - 1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^2} \sum_{\substack{\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\zeta| \leq N}} \frac{B_\zeta(1)}{\langle \zeta \rangle^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}}} \frac{e^{2\pi i \zeta \cdot x}}{L^3} - 3 \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{|B_\lambda(1)|^2 B_\lambda(1)}{\langle \lambda \rangle^{3+\frac{\eta}{2}}} \frac{1}{L^3} e^{2\pi i \lambda \cdot x} + |B_0(1)|^2 B_0(1) \frac{1}{L^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 2.2), Wick's theorem (Lemma 2.4), and a Riemann sum approximation, we have that for any  $p_1 \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbb{III}_{L,N}|^{p_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} &\lesssim p_1^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbb{III}_{L,N}|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda_1| \leq N, |\lambda_2|, |\lambda_3| \leq N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \rangle^\eta \langle \lambda_1 \rangle^2 \langle \lambda_2 \rangle^2 \langle \lambda_3 \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^6}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq 3N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^\eta} \left(\sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |\lambda_1| \leq N, |\lambda_2| \leq N, |\lambda_3| \leq N \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \lambda}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda_1 \rangle^2 \langle \lambda_2 \rangle^2 \langle \lambda_3 \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^4}\right) \frac{1}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\sim \left(\int_{|z| \leq 3N} \frac{1}{1 + |z|^\eta} \left(\int_{\substack{|z_j| \leq N, j=1,2,3 \\ z_1 + z_2 + z_3 = z}} \frac{dz_1 dz_2}{(1 + |z_1|^2)(1 + |z_2|^2)(1 + |z_3|^2)}\right) dz\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\int_{|z| \leq 3N} \frac{1}{1 + |z|^\eta} \frac{1}{\langle z \rangle^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty, \tag{4.16}
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in  $N \geq 1$ . From a Riemann sum approximation and the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 2.2), we have that for any  $p_1 \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbb{IV}_{L,N}|^{p_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} &\lesssim 1 + \left(\mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{|B_\lambda(t)|^2 - 1}{\langle \lambda \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2}\right|^{2p_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2p_1}} \left(\mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{\substack{\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\zeta| \leq N}} \frac{B_\zeta(t)}{\langle \zeta \rangle^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}}} \frac{e^{2\pi i \zeta \cdot x}}{L}\right|^{2p_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2p_1}} \\
&\lesssim 1, \tag{4.17}
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in  $N \geq 1$ . Hence, by following either (4.12) or (4.15) with (4.16) and (4.17), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\heartsuit_{L,N}\|_{W^{-\eta, r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^p\right] = O(L^2)$$

for any finite  $p \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ .

We now prove Part (ii). (4.6) follows from a standard computation. Hence, we present the derivation of (4.7). It follows from Lemma 2.3 and a Riemann sum approximation that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \heartsuit_L(x) dx \right|^2 \right] &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \heartsuit_{L,N}(x) dx \right|^2 \right] \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \heartsuit_{L,N}(x) \heartsuit_{L,N}(y) \right] dx dy \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{T}_L^2} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \spadesuit_{L,N}(x) \spadesuit_{L,N}(y) \right] \right)^3 dx dy \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{\mathbb{T}_L^2 \times \mathbb{T}_L^2} \left( \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{e_\lambda^L(x-y)}{\langle \lambda \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L} \right)^3 dx dy
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= L^2 \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\substack{n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 0 \\ |n_j| \leq LN}} \left( \prod_{j=1}^3 \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n_j}{L} \rangle^2} \right) \frac{1}{L^4} \\
&\sim L^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

By following the same calculation in (4.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathbf{v}_L(x) dx \right|^2 \right] &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathbf{v}_{L,N}(x) dx \right|^2 \right] \\
&= L^2 \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\substack{n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ n_1 + n_2 = 0 \\ |n_j| \leq LN}} \left( \prod_{j=1}^2 \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n_j}{L} \rangle^2} \right) \frac{1}{L^2} \\
&\sim L^2
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

As for Part (iii), the estimate (4.9) follows from Minkowski's and Cauchy-Schwarz' inequalities. See also the proof of Lemma 4.7 in [29].  $\square$

**4.3. Gamma convergence.** In this subsection, we study the  $\Gamma$ -convergence (Proposition 4.8) of the variational problem by taking the ultraviolet limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , following an idea in [2]. This allows us to remove the ultraviolet cutoff  $\mathbf{P}_N$  when applying Lemma 4.1, and obtain a variational characterization for  $Z_L$ .

By the Boué-Dupuis formula (Lemma 4.1), the partition function  $Z_{L,N}$  with ultraviolet  $\mathbf{P}_N$  and infrared cutoffs  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ , defined by

$$Z_{L,N} = \int e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi_N^3 : dx - A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi_N^2 : dx \right)^2} d\mu_L(u), \tag{4.20}$$

has the variational expression

$$\begin{aligned}
-\log Z_{L,N} &= \inf_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{V}_N^L(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_L(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right] \\
&= \inf_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \Phi_{N,L}(\Xi_L, \Theta_L) + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \Theta_{L,N}^2 dx \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_L(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where  $\Xi_L = (\mathfrak{r}_L, \mathfrak{v}_L, \mathfrak{v}'_L)$  and  $\Phi_{L,N} = \Phi_{L,N}^{(1)} + \Phi_{L,N}^{(2)}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{L,N}^{(1)}(\Xi_L, \Theta_L) &= \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{v}'_{L,N} dx + \sigma \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{v}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N} dx + \sigma \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{r}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N}^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \Theta_{L,N}^3 dx \\
\Phi_{L,N}^{(2)}(\Xi_L, \Theta_L) &= A \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} (\mathfrak{v}'_{L,N} + 2\mathfrak{r}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N} + \Theta_{L,N}^2) dx \right\}^2 - A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \Theta_{L,N}^2 dx \right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

The positive terms  $A \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4$  and  $\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_L(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt$  in (4.21) ensure that the free energy  $\log Z_{L,N}$  is finite uniformly in  $N$  for each fixed  $L > 0$ . For convenience of notation, we set

$$\int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_L(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt := \|\Theta_L\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2.$$

We now study the  $\Gamma$ -convergence of the variational problem in (4.21) as the ultraviolet cutoff  $\mathbf{P}_N$  is removed (i.e. as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ).

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ <sup>12</sup> be a sequence of functionals on  $X$ . The sequence of functionals  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$   $\Gamma$ -converges to the  $\Gamma$ -limit  $F_\infty$  if the following two conditions hold:

(i) For every sequence  $x_n \rightarrow x$  in  $X$ , we have

$$F_\infty(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x_n).$$

(ii) For every point  $x \in X$ , there exists a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  (recovery sequence) converging to  $x$  in  $X$  such that we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x_n) \leq F_\infty(x).$$

We also need the notion of equicoercivity.

**Definition 4.4.** A sequence of functionals denoted as  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is said to be equicoercive if there is a compact set  $K \subset X$  such that, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following condition holds:

$$\inf_{x \in K} F_n(x) = \inf_{x \in X} F_n(x).$$

One important implication of  $\Gamma$ -convergence and equicoercivity is the convergence of the minima.

**Proposition 4.5.** Suppose that  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$   $\Gamma$ -converges to  $F_\infty$  and  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is equicoercive. Then,  $F_\infty$  possesses a minimum. Moreover, we have the convergence of minima

$$\min_{x \in X} F_\infty(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{x \in X} F_n(x).$$

Our goal in this section is to establish the  $\Gamma$ -convergence of the variational problem in (4.21) as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  (Proposition 4.8). For this, we relax the variational problem presented in (4.21). Instead of solving the problem over  $\mathbb{H}_a^1$  with the strong topology, we consider a problem on the space of probability measures with a weak topology. Define

$$\mathcal{X}_L := \left\{ \mu = \text{Law}(\Xi_L, \Theta_L) \in \mathcal{P}(\vec{W}^{-\eta, r} \times \mathbb{H}_w^1) : \Theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a^1 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \|\Theta\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right] < \infty \right\}, \quad (4.23)$$

where  $\vec{W}^{-\eta, r} = W^{-\eta, r} \times W^{-\eta, r} \times W^{-\eta, r}$  for any fixed  $1 \leq r < \infty$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\vec{W}^{-\eta, r} \times \mathbb{H}_w^1)$  is the space of Borel probability measures on  $\vec{W}^{-\eta, r} \times \mathbb{H}_w^1$ . Here  $\mathbb{H}_w^1$  means that  $\mathbb{H}^1$  is equipped with the weak topology. We will set up a minimization problem over the space  $\mathcal{X}_L$  of distributions  $\mu_L = \text{Law}_{\mathbb{P}}(\Xi_L, \Theta_L)$ , where  $\Xi_L = (\spadesuit_L, \heartsuit_L, \clubsuit_L)$  is fixed, and  $\Theta_L$  varies within  $\mathbb{H}_a^1$ , employing the weak topology.

We now complete the space  $\mathcal{X}_L$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{X}}_L := & \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\vec{W}^{-\eta, r} \times \mathbb{H}_w^1) : \mu_n \rightarrow \mu \text{ weakly for some } \{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{X}_L \right. \\ & \left. \text{and } \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[ \|\Theta\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right] < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\mathcal{X}_L$  is equipped with the following topology:  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$  converges to  $\mu$  if (i)  $\mu_n$  converges to  $\mu$  weakly on  $\vec{W}^{-\eta, r} \times H_w^1$  and (ii)  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[ \|\Theta\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right] < \infty$ . Each element  $\mathcal{X}_L$  has

---

<sup>12</sup> $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$  means the set of extended natural numbers, i.e.  $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$

first marginal equal to  $\text{Law}_{\mathbb{P}}(\Xi_L)$ , and this fact extends to  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ . Passing to this space ensures compactness.

To present the relaxation of the variational problem, define, for  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} F_N^L(\Theta_L) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \mathbf{V}_N^L(\mathbf{r}_L + \Theta_L) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_L(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \Phi_{L,N}(\Xi_L, \Theta_L) + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \Theta_{L,N}^2 dx \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_L(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where  $\Phi_{L,N} = \Phi_{L,N}^{(1)} + \Phi_{L,N}^{(2)}$  is given in (2.1). When  $N = \infty$ , the projection is interpreted the identity operator (i.e.  $\mathbf{P}_N = \text{Id}$ ). We substitute the initial variational problem (4.21) with a new variational problem over  $\mathcal{X}_L$  as follows

$$\inf_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a^1} F_N^L(\Theta) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}_L} F_N^L(\mu). \quad (4.25)$$

Here  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}$  denotes the expectation with respect to the probability measure  $\mu$ . The following lemma shows that the variational problem on  $\mathcal{X}_L$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$  are equivalent. In particular, the infimum is achieved within  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ . For the proof of Lemma 4.6, see [2, Lemma 15, 18] or [3, Lemma 8].

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $L > 0$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Then, we have*

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{X}_L} F_N^L(\mu) = \min_{\mu \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}_L} F_N^L(\mu).$$

Here the infimum is attained at an element in  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$ .

The following lemma establishes compactness on  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$ . For the proof, see 4.7, see [2, Lemma 10].

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $L > 0$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  be a subset of  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$  such that  $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[ \|\Theta_L\|_{\mathbb{H}^1}^2 \right] < \infty$ . Then,  $\mathcal{K}$  is compact in  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$ .*

We are now ready to prove the following proposition that allows us to obtain the variational characterization of the grand-canonical partition function  $Z_L$  without the ultraviolet cutoff  $\mathbf{P}_N$ .

**Proposition 4.8** (Gamma convergence). *Let  $L > 0$ . Then, the sequence of functional  $\{F_N^L\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$   $\Gamma$ -converges to  $F_{\infty}^L$  on  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\Theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a^1} F_N^L(\Theta_L) = \inf_{\Theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a^1} F_{\infty}^L(\Theta_L) \quad (4.26)$$

where the functionals  $F_N^L$  and  $F_{\infty}^L$  are given as in (4.24). In particular, the grand-canonical partition function  $Z_L$  in (1.20) is given by

$$-\log Z_L = \inf_{\Theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a^1} F_{\infty}^L(\Theta_L) \quad (4.27)$$

for every  $L > 0$ .

*Proof.* Thanks to the relaxed variational problems coming from (4.25) and Lemma 4.6, it suffices to consider the variational problem (4.26) over  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$ . We first prove the following liminf inequality

$$F_{\infty}^L(\mu) \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N^L(\mu_N) \quad (4.28)$$

when  $\mu_N \rightarrow \mu$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_L$ . We may assume that  $\sup_N F_N^L(\mu_N) < \infty$ . Otherwise, there is nothing to prove. By exploiting the Skorokhod's representation theorem, there exists random variables

$\{X_N, \zeta_N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{X_\infty, \zeta_\infty\}$  on a common probability space  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ , with values in  $\vec{W}^{-\eta, r} \times \mathbb{H}_w^1$  such that

$$\text{Law}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}(X_N, \zeta_N) = \mu_N \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Law}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}(X_\infty, \zeta_\infty) = \mu \quad (4.29)$$

for every  $N \geq 1$ . Furthermore, we have the following almost sure convergence

$$X_N \rightarrow X \quad \text{in} \quad \vec{W}^{-\eta, r} \quad (4.30)$$

$$\zeta_N \rightarrow \zeta \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{H}_w^1 \quad (4.31)$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . It can be easily proven that for any sequence  $\{X_N, \zeta_N\}$  satisfying  $X_N \rightarrow X_\infty$  in  $\vec{W}^{-\eta, r}$  and  $\zeta_N \rightarrow \zeta_\infty$  in  $\mathbb{H}_w^1$ , we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{L, N}(X_N, \zeta_N) = \Phi_{L, \infty}(X_\infty, \zeta_\infty). \quad (4.32)$$

Thanks to the pathwise regularity estimates in Lemma 5.6, we have the following pathwise bound on the same probability space

$$\Phi_{L, N}(X_N, \zeta_N) + A\|\zeta_N\|_{L^2}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|\zeta_N\|_{H^1}^2 + H(X_N) \geq 0 \quad (4.33)$$

for some random variable  $H(X_N) \in L^1(d\tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ , uniformly in  $N$ , such that  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[H(X_N)] = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[H(\Xi_N)]$  for every  $N$ , where  $\Xi_N = (\mathfrak{I}_{L, N}, \mathfrak{V}_{L, N}, \mathfrak{V}_{L, N})$ . For example, we can choose  $H(X_N) = C(1 + \|X_N\|_{\vec{W}^{-\eta, r}}^p)$  for some large  $C \gg 1$  and  $p \gg 1$ . It follows from (4.29), (4.33), (4.32), and Fatou's lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N^L(\mu_N) &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \left[ \Phi_{L, N}(X_N, \zeta_N) + A\|\zeta_N\|_{L^2}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|\zeta_N\|_{H^1}^2 \right] \\ &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \left[ \Phi_{L, N}(X_N, \zeta_N) + A\|\zeta_N\|_{L^2}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|\zeta_N\|_{H^1}^2 + H(X_N) \right] - \mathbb{E}[H(X_N)] \right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \Phi_{L, N}(X_N, \zeta_N) + A\|\zeta_N\|_{L^2}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|\zeta_N\|_{H^1}^2 + H(X_N) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[H(\Xi)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \left[ \Phi_{L, \infty}(X_\infty, \zeta_\infty) + A\|\zeta_\infty\|_{L^2}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|\zeta_\infty\|_{H^1}^2 \right] \\ &= F_\infty^L(\mu), \end{aligned}$$

from which we obtain (4.28).

Next, we prove that for every  $\mu \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_L$ , there exists a sequence  $\{\mu_N\}$  such that  $\{\mu_N\}$  converges to  $\mu$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_L$  and

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N^L(\mu_N) \leq F_\infty^L(\mu). \quad (4.34)$$

Let  $\mu \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_L$ . By setting  $\mu_N := \mu$  for every  $N \geq 1$ , we obtain  $\mu_N \rightarrow \mu$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_L$ . We may assume that  $F_\infty^L(\mu) < \infty$ . Thanks to Lemma 4.2 and 5.6, we have

$$F_\infty^L(\mu) \geq -cL^2 + (1 - \delta)\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ A\|\Theta_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|\Theta_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] \quad (4.35)$$

for some small  $0 < \delta \ll 1$  and  $c > 0$ , where  $L^2$  follows from computing the expected values of the higher moments for each component of  $\Xi_{L, N} = (\mathfrak{I}_{L, N}, \mathfrak{V}_{L, N}, \mathfrak{V}_{L, N})$  in  $W^{-\eta, r}$ , uniformly in  $N \geq 1$ . From the assumption  $F_\infty^L(\mu) < \infty$  and (4.35), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ A\|\Theta_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|\Theta_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] < \infty \quad (4.36)$$

for each fixed  $L > 0$ . Then, by the definition of  $F_N^L(\mu)$  in (4.24), Lemma 4.2, 5.6, and (4.36), we can use the dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N^L(\mu_N) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N^L(\mu) \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \Phi_{L,N}(\mathbf{P}_N \Xi_L, \mathbf{P}_N \Theta_L) + A \|\mathbf{P}_N \Theta_L\|_{L^2}^4 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{P}_N \Theta_L\|_{H^1}^2 \right] \\ &= F_L^\infty(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain the result (4.34).

Finally, we show that  $\{F_N^L\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  is equicoercive on  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_L$ . Define

$$\mathcal{K} := \left\{ \mu \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_L : \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \|\Theta_L\|_{L^2}^4 \right] + \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \|\Theta_L\|_{H^1}^2 \right] \leq K \right\}$$

for some sufficiently large  $K \gg 1$ , which will be specified below. Thanks to Lemma 4.7,  $\mathcal{K}$  is compact. By using Lemma 5.6 and 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mu \notin \mathcal{K}} F_N^L(\mu) &\geq -c_1 L^2 + (1 - \delta) \inf_{\mu \notin \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E} \left[ A \|\Theta_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \frac{1}{2} \|\Theta_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] \\ &\geq -c_1 L^2 + c_2 (1 - \delta) K \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

for some  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  and small  $\delta > 0$ , where  $L^2$  arises by computing the expected values of the higher moments for each component of  $\Xi_{L,N} = (\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}, \mathfrak{V}_{L,N}, \mathfrak{V}_{L,N})$  in  $W^{-\eta, r}$ , uniformly in  $N \geq 1$ . Thanks to Lemma 5.6 and 4.2, we have

$$\sup_N \inf_{\mu \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_L} F_N^L(\mu) \leq c_1 L^2 + (1 + \delta) \inf_{\mu \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_L} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ A \|\Theta_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \frac{1}{2} \|\Theta_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] < \infty, \quad (4.38)$$

Hence, it follows from (4.37), (4.38), and choosing  $K \gg 1$  sufficiently large that

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}} F_N^L(\mu) = \inf_{\mu \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_L} F_N^L(\mu),$$

for every  $N \geq 1$ , from which we conclude that  $\{F_N^L\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  is equicoercive.  $\square$

We close this subsection by showing convergence of the Hamiltonian  $H_L$  as the size of the torus goes to infinity (i.e.  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ).

**Lemma 4.9.** *There exists a large constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  independent of  $L$  such that for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A \geq A_0$ ,*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} H_L(\phi) = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi)$$

where

$$H_L(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^3 dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* We first prove

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} H_L(\phi) \geq \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi). \quad (4.39)$$

Thanks to the GNS inequality (3.8) on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$  (Lemma 3.2) and Young's inequality, we have

$$H_L(\phi) \geq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx + (A - c(\delta) - c(L)) \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2 \geq 0$$

if  $A$  is sufficiently large, where  $c(L) \rightarrow 0$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} H_L(\phi) \geq 0.$$

From Lemma 3.6, we have  $\inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) = 0$  and so obtain the result (4.39).

It remains to prove

$$\inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) \geq \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} H_L(\phi). \quad (4.40)$$

Let  $u^*$  be a minimizer, namely,  $\inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) = H(u^*)$ . Let  $\{\varphi_L\}_{L \geq 1}$  be a sequence of smooth cutoff functions where  $\varphi_L$  is supported on  $[-\frac{L}{8}, \frac{L}{8}]^2$  and  $\varphi_L = 1$  on  $[-\frac{L}{16}, \frac{L}{16}]^2$ . Then,  $\varphi_L u^* \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  and so  $\{\varphi_L u^*\}_{L \geq 1}$  is a minimizing sequence. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi) &= H(u^*) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} H(\varphi_L u^*) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} H_L(\varphi_L u^*) \\ &\geq \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} H_L(\phi). \end{aligned}$$

By combining (4.39) and (4.40), we obtain the result.  $\square$

## 5. ANALYSIS OF THE FREE ENERGY

In this section, we analyze the behavior of the free energy  $\log Z_L$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Our main goal is to establish the following large deviation estimate.

**Proposition 5.1.** *There exists a large constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A \geq A_0$ , the grand-canonical partition function  $Z_L$  satisfies*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} = - \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(\phi)$$

where

$$H(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^3 dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi^2 dx \right)^2.$$

We prove Proposition 5.1 by showing Lemma 5.2 and 5.5 in the following subsections.

**5.1. Upper bound for the free energy.** In this subsection, we investigate the limiting behavior of the free energy  $\log Z_L$ , concentrating on obtaining an upper bound.

**Lemma 5.2.** *There exists a large constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A \geq A_0$ , we have*

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} \leq - \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(W).$$

*Proof.* Thanks to Proposition 4.8, the grand-canonical partition function can be expressed without the ultraviolet cutoff  $\mathbf{P}_N$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_L &= \sup_{\Theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a^1} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_L(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\Theta_L \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) - \frac{1}{2} \|\Theta_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^1$  represents the collection of drifts  $\Theta_L$ , characterized as processes that belong to  $H^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely (possibly non-adapted). For any  $\Theta_L \in \mathcal{H}_x^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ , we perform the change of variable  $L^2W(L \cdot) := \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} + \Theta_L$  where  $\mathfrak{r}_{L,M} = \mathbf{P}_M \mathfrak{r}_L$ . Set

$$\Theta_L = -\mathfrak{r}_{L,M} + W_L \quad (5.2)$$

where  $W_L := L^2W(L \cdot)$  for some  $W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)$ . From (5.1) and (5.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_L &\leq \sup_{W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}) + W_L) - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \langle \nabla \rangle \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} \langle \nabla \rangle W_L dx \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}) + W_L) + \left( c(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - \frac{1-\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where we used Young's inequality to find that for any  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \langle \nabla \rangle \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} \langle \nabla \rangle W_L dx \right| \leq c(\delta) \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2.$$

With the change of variable given by (5.2), we can express

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}^L(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :((\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}) + W_L)^3: dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :((\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}) + W_L)^2: \right)^2 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_{L,M} + W_L)^3: dx + A \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_{L,M} + W_L)^2: dx \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Here,  $\tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_{L,M} = \mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}$  represents a new Gaussian field whose variance is given by

$$\mathbb{E} |\tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_{L,M}(x)|^2 = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ M < |\lambda| \leq N}} \frac{1}{\langle \lambda^2 \rangle} \frac{1}{L^2} = \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ LM < |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{M < |y| \leq N\}} \frac{dy}{1 + |y|^2}$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

For any Gaussian  $X$  and  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(X; \sigma_1) &= H_1(X; \sigma_2) \\ H_2(X; \sigma_1) &= H_2(X; \sigma_2) - (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) \\ H_3(X; \sigma_1) &= H_3(X; \sigma_2) - 3(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) H_1(X, \sigma_2) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

where  $H_k(x; \sigma)$  is the Hermite polynomial of degree  $k$ . Defining  $\tilde{\Psi}_{L,M}, \tilde{\Psi}_{L,M}$  and the corresponding Wick powers relative to the Gaussian  $\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M}$ , it follows from (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L)^3: dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L)^3:_{\mathcal{M}} dx - 3C_M \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} (\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \tilde{\Psi}_{L,M} dx + 3 \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \tilde{\Psi}_{L,M} W_L dx + 3 \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} W_L^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^3 dx \\ &\quad - 3C_M \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} (\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L) dx \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L)^2: dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L)^2:_{\mathcal{M}} dx - C_M \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \tilde{\Psi}_{L,M} dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} W_L dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^2 dx - C_M \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_M &:= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} - \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ LM < |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LM}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|y| \leq M\}} \frac{dy}{1 + |y|^2} \sim \log M \end{aligned}$$

as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, from (5.6), (5.7), Lemma 5.6, and Lemma 4.2(i), it follows that for arbitrarily small  $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L)^3: dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^3 dx \right| \right] \leq \delta \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \frac{\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + O((\log M)^2 L^2) \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$A \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M} + W_L)^2: dx + C_M \right|^2 \right] \geq \frac{A}{2} \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 - \frac{1}{100} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - O(AL^2) - A(\log M)^2 \quad (5.9)$$

where the term  $O(L^2)$  comes from Lemma 4.2 (i) by computing the expectation of the higher moments for each component of  $(\tilde{\Psi}_{L,M}, \tilde{\Psi}_{L,M}, \tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M})$  in  $W^{-\eta, r}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  for  $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ . We also note that

$$C_M \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L dx \right| \leq \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} C_M L \leq \delta \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + O(\delta^{-1}) + C_M^2 L^2 \quad (5.10)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\tilde{\Upsilon}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq M}} = \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LM}} = O(L^2 M^2). \quad (5.11)$$

It follows from (5.3), (5.8), (5.9), (5.10), (5.11), and undoing the scaling  $W_L = L^2W(L)$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log Z_L \\
& \leq \sup_{\Theta_L \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}) + W_L) + \left(c(\delta) - \frac{1}{2}\right) \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 - \frac{1-\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] \\
& \leq \sup_{W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^3 dx - \frac{A-\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 - \frac{1-2\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(c(\delta) - \frac{1}{2}\right) \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] + O(L^2(\log M)^2) + O(\delta^{-1}) \\
& \leq -L^4 \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} H_{L^2}^\delta(W) + O(L^2M^2) + O(\delta^{-1}) \tag{5.12}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_{L^2}^\delta(W) = \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} W^3 dx + \frac{A-\delta}{2} \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} W^2 dx \right)^2 + \frac{1-2\delta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla W|^2 dx.$$

Therefore, by taking the limit first  $L \rightarrow \infty$  in (5.12) with Lemma 4.9 and then  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} \leq - \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(W),$$

the desired result. □

**Remark 5.3.** Following the arguments in the proof of Lemma 5.2 with the change of variable  $\Theta_L = -\mathfrak{r}_{L,N} + W_L$ , we obtain

$$\log Z_{L,N} \leq -L^4 \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} H_{L^2}^\delta(W) + O(L^2N^2) + O(\delta^{-1}). \tag{5.13}$$

Here, the term  $O(L^2N^2)$  arises from  $\|\mathfrak{r}_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2$ . Consequently, by taking the ultraviolet limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the truncated partition function  $\log Z_{L,N}$  converges to  $\log Z_L$ . However, the right-hand side of (5.13) tends to infinity due to the term  $O(L^2N^2)$ . Therefore, it is necessary to address the ultraviolet problem initially by using Proposition 4.8 and then separately control the infrared limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  as in the proof of Lemma 5.2. The same phenomena occur in the proofs of Lemma 5.4 and 5.5.

The following lemma, whose proof follows similar lines to Lemma 5.2, is used in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

**Lemma 5.4.** *There exists a large constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  and  $c > 0$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A \geq A_0$ ,*

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\mathbf{V}^L(\phi) \right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}} \right]}{L^4} \leq -c\varepsilon^4$$

where

$$S_L = \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2}\phi(L^{-1}\cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} < \varepsilon \right\}.$$

*Proof.* We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_L(S_L^c) &:= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\mathbf{V}^L(\phi) \right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\mathbf{V}^L(\phi) \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

We proceed as in the proof of Lemma 5.2 with considering  $\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}}$ . It follows from (5.14) and the analog of Proposition 4.8 with  $\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_L(S_L^c) &\leq \sup_{\theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) \mathbf{1}_{\{(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) \notin S_L\}} - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\theta_L(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\Theta_L \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) \mathbf{1}_{\{(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) \notin S_L\}} - \frac{1}{2} \|\Theta_L\|_{H^1}^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

where the space  $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$  represents the set of  $H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ -valued random variables (these processes need not be adapted). For any  $\Theta_L \in \mathcal{H}_x^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ , we perform the change of variable  $L^2W(L \cdot) := \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} + \Theta_L$  where  $\mathfrak{r}_{L,M} = \mathbf{P}_M \mathfrak{r}_L$ . Then, we write

$$\Theta_L = -\mathfrak{r}_{L,M} + W_L \quad (5.16)$$

where  $W_L := L^2W(L \cdot)$  for some  $W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)$ . Define the set

$$\mathcal{W}_L = \left\{ W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2) : \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \geq \varepsilon/2 \right\}. \quad (5.17)$$

If

$$L^{-2}(\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} + W_L)(L^{-1} \cdot) \notin S_L,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} &\geq \|L^{-2}(\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M})(L^{-1} \cdot) + W\|_{H^{-\eta}} - \|L^{-2}(\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M})(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}} \\ &\geq \varepsilon - \|L^{-2}(\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M})(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}} \geq \varepsilon/2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

by choosing sufficiently large  $M = M(L) \gg 1$  with high probability, where we used the fact that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \|L^{-2}(\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M})(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows from (5.15), (5.16), (5.18), and (5.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_L(S_L^c) &\leq \sup_{W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}) + W_L) \mathbf{1}_{\{L^{-2}(\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} + W_L)(L^{-1} \cdot) \notin S_L\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \langle \nabla \rangle \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} \langle \nabla \rangle W_L dx \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M}) + W_L) \mathbf{1}_{\{L^{-2}(\mathfrak{r}_L - \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} + W_L)(L^{-1} \cdot) \notin S_L\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( c(\zeta) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - \frac{1-\zeta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

for arbitrary small  $\zeta > 0$ , where in the last line we used the fact that Young's inequality gives

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \langle \nabla \rangle \mathfrak{r}_{L,M} \langle \nabla \rangle W_L dx \right| \leq c(\zeta) \|\mathfrak{r}_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + \frac{\zeta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2.$$

By proceeding as in (5.12) together with (5.17), (5.18), and (5.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log Z_L(S_L^c) \\
& \leq \sup_{W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( -\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^3 dx - \frac{A-\zeta}{2} \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1-\zeta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{L^{-2}(\bullet_{L-\bullet_{L,M+W_L}})(L^{-1}) \notin S_L\}} \right] + O(L^2 M^2) + O(\zeta^{-1}) \\
& \leq L^4 \sup_{W \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( -\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} W^3 dx - \frac{A-\zeta}{2} \|W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^4 \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1-\zeta}{2} \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{W \in \mathcal{W}_L\}} \right] + O(L^2 M^2) + O(\zeta^{-1}) \\
& \leq -L^4 \inf_{\substack{W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2), \\ \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}} H_{L^2}^\zeta(W) + O(L^2 M^2) + O(\zeta^{-1}). \tag{5.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_{L^2}^\zeta(W) = \frac{1-\zeta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} |\nabla W|^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} W^3 dx + \frac{A-\zeta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} W^4 dx.$$

Thanks to the GNS inequality on  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$  (Lemma 3.2) and Young's inequality, we have

$$H_L(\varphi) \geq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx + (A - c(\delta) - c(L)) \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \varphi^2 dx \right)^2 \geq 0,$$

where we used the fact that  $A \geq A_0$  for some sufficiently large  $A_0 > 0$  and  $c(L) \rightarrow 0$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . This implies that there exists a constant  $c$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that

$$H_{L^2}^\zeta(W) \geq c \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 + c \|W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^4,$$

from which we have

$$\inf_{\substack{W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2), \\ \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \geq \varepsilon/2}} H_{L^2}^\zeta(W) \geq c \inf_{\substack{W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2), \\ \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \geq \varepsilon/2}} \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^4 \geq c\varepsilon^4 \tag{5.21}$$

where in the first inequality we used the fact that the infimum is attained when  $\|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}$  is equal to  $\varepsilon/2$  and so  $\|\nabla W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^4$  if  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small. It follows from (5.20), (5.21), and taking the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  that

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \exp \{ -\mathbf{V}_L(\phi) \} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}} \right]}{L^4} \leq -c\varepsilon^4.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.4.  $\square$

**5.2. Lower bound for the free energy.** In this subsection, we derive a lower bound for the free energy.

**Lemma 5.5.** *There exists a large constant  $A_0 \geq 1$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $A \geq A_0$ , we have*

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} \geq - \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(W).$$

*Proof.* Thanks to Proposition 4.8, we have

$$\log Z_L = \sup_{\theta_L \in \mathbb{H}_a} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L(\mathfrak{r}_L + \Theta_L) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\theta_L(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 dt \right] \quad (5.22)$$

We choose a specific drift  $\theta_L^0 \in \mathbb{H}_a$ , defined by

$$\theta_L^0(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{1}_{\{t > 1-\varepsilon\}} \langle \nabla \rangle (-Z_{M,L} + W_L) \quad (5.23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{M,L} &:= \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq M}} \widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_\lambda (1-\varepsilon) e_L^\lambda, \\ W_L &:= L^2 W(L \cdot) \end{aligned}$$

for any fixed  $W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)$ . Thanks to the time cutoff  $\mathbf{1}_{\{t > 1-\varepsilon\}}$  and the definition of  $Z_{M,L}$ , the drift  $\theta_L$  belongs to the right  $\mathbb{H}_a$ . Then, by the definition of  $\Theta_L(t)$  in (4.4), we have

$$\Theta_L^0(1) = \int_0^1 \langle \nabla \rangle^{-1} \theta_L^0(t) dt = -Z_{M,L} + W_L. \quad (5.24)$$

It follows from (5.22), (5.23), and (5.24) that

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_L &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - Z_{M,L}) + W_L) - \frac{1}{2} \|Z_{M,L}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \langle \nabla \rangle Z_{M,L} \langle \nabla \rangle W_L dx \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ -\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - Z_{M,L}) + W_L) - c(\delta) \|Z_{M,L}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 - \frac{1+\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

where we used the fact that Young's inequality gives

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \langle \nabla \rangle Z_{L,M} \langle \nabla \rangle W_L dx \right| \leq c(\delta) \|Z_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2.$$

Notice that  $X_{L,M} := \mathfrak{r}_L - Z_{M,L}$  is a new Gaussian process and so the Wick powers in  $\mathbf{V}^L((\mathfrak{r}_L - Z_{M,L}) + W_L) = \mathbf{V}^L(X_{L,M} + W_L)$  have to be taken with respect to the new Gaussian reference measure. Note that for any Gaussian  $X$  and  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(X; \sigma_1) &= H_1(X; \sigma_2) \\ H_2(X; \sigma_1) &= H_2(X; \sigma_2) - (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) \\ H_3(X; \sigma_1) &= H_3(X; \sigma_2) - 3(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) H_1(X, \sigma_2) \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

where  $H_k(x; \sigma)$  is the Hermite polynomial of degree  $k$ . It then follows from (5.26) and the Wick powers  $:X_{L,M}^2:_M, :X_{L,M}^3:_M$  that:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :((\mathfrak{I}_L - Z_{M,L}) + W_L)^3: dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(X_{L,M} + W_L)^3:_M dx - 3C_M \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} (X_{L,M} + W_L) dx \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :X_{L,M}^3:_M dx + \sigma \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :X_{L,M}^2:_M W_L dx + \sigma \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} X_{L,M} W_L^2 dx + \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^3 dx \\ &\quad - 3C_M \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} (X_{L,M} + W_L) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :((\mathfrak{I}_L - Z_{M,L}) + W_L)^2: dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(X_{L,M} + W_L)^2:_M dx - C_M \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :X_{L,M}^2:_M dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} X_{L,M} W_L dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^2 dx - C_M \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_M &:= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} - \left( \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ LM < |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} - \varepsilon \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LM}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \right) \right) \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LM}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|y| \leq M\}} \frac{dy}{1 + |y|^2} \sim \log M \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that  $C_M$  in (5.29) comes from

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \mathfrak{I}_{L,N}(x) \right|^2 &= \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left| X_{L,N,M}(x) \right|^2 &= \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ LM < |n| \leq LN}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} - \varepsilon \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LM}} \frac{1}{\langle \frac{n}{L} \rangle^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$ , where  $X_{L,N,M} := \mathfrak{I}_{L,N} - Z_{M,L}$ . From (5.27), (5.28), Lemma 5.6, and 4.2 (i), we have that for arbitrary small  $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(X_{L,M} + W_L)^3: dx - \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^3 dx \right| \right] \leq \delta \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \frac{\delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + O((\log M)^2 L^2) \quad (5.30)$$

and

$$A \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} :(X_{L,M} + W_L)^2: dx + C_M \right|^2 \right] \leq 3A \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \delta \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + O(AL^2). \quad (5.31)$$

We also notice that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|Z_{L,M}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \right] = (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_L^2 \\ |\lambda| \leq M}} = (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq LM}} = O(L^2 M^2). \quad (5.32)$$

Hence, it follows from (5.25), (5.30), (5.31), (5.32), and (5.10) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log Z_L \\
& \geq -\frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} W_L^3 dx - (3A + \delta) \|W_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 - \frac{1 + \delta}{2} \|W_L\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - O(L^2 M^2) - O(\delta^{-1}) \\
& = -L^4 \left( \frac{\sigma}{3} \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} W^3 dx + (3A + \delta) \|W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^4 + \frac{1 + \delta}{2} \|W\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad - O(L^2 M^2) - O(\delta^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Hence, we have

$$\log Z_L \geq -L^4 \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} H_{L^2}^\delta(W) - O(L^2 M^2) - O(\delta^{-1}).$$

By taking the limit first in  $L \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  and using Lemma 4.9, we obtain

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} \geq - \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(W),$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.5. □

**5.3. Proofs of the auxiliary lemmas.** In this subsection, we provide proofs of the auxiliary lemmas used in proving Lemmas 5.2, 5.4, and 5.5.

**Lemma 5.6.** (i) *Let  $\eta > 0$ . For every  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $c(\delta) > 0$  such that*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathbf{v}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N} dx \right| \leq c(\delta) \|\mathbf{v}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + \delta \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2, \quad (5.33)$$

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathbf{v}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N}^2 dx \right| \leq c(\delta) \|\mathbf{v}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \delta \left( \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 \right). \quad (5.34)$$

for every  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ .

(ii) *Let  $A > 0$ . Given any small  $\eta > 0$ , there exists  $c = c(\eta, A) > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& A \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \left( \mathbf{v}_{L,N} + 2\mathbf{v}_{L,N} \Theta_N + \Theta_N^2 \right) dx \right\}^2 \\
& \geq \frac{A}{4} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 - \frac{1}{100} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 - c \left\{ \|\mathbf{v}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}}^{\frac{4}{1-\eta}} + \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathbf{v}_{L,N} dx \right)^2 \right\},
\end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

uniformly in  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* We first prove Part (i). From Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathbf{v}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N} dx \right| & \leq \|\mathbf{v}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^\eta(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \leq \|\mathbf{v}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \\
& \leq c(\delta) \|\mathbf{v}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 + \delta \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2.
\end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

This yields (5.33). By the fractional Leibniz rule (2.6) and the Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N}^2 dx \right| &\leq \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|\Theta_{L,N}^2\|_{H^\eta(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta \Theta_{L,N}\|_{L^4(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|\Theta_N\|_{L^4(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \|\Theta_N\|_{L^4(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

Then, the second estimate (5.34) follows from Young's inequality.

We now prove Part (ii). From

$$(a + b + c)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}c^2 - 2(a^2 + b^2)$$

for any  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &A \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \left( \mathfrak{V}_{L,N} + 2\mathfrak{I}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N} + \Theta_{L,N}^2 \right) dx \right\}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{A}{2} \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \Theta_{L,N}^2 dx \right)^2 - 2A \left\{ \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{V}_{L,N} dx \right)^2 + \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N} dx \right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.38)$$

From Lemma 2.1 (i) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_L^2} \mathfrak{I}_{L,N} \Theta_{L,N} dx \right|^2 &\leq \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^\eta(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2 \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^{2(1-\eta)} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^{2\eta} \\ &\leq c \|\mathfrak{I}_{L,N}\|_{H^{-\eta}}^{\frac{4}{1-\eta}} + \frac{1}{8} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^4 + \frac{1}{200A} \|\Theta_{L,N}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.39)$$

Hence, (5.35) follows from (5.38) and (5.39).  $\square$

## 6. COLLAPSE OF THE $\Phi_2^3$ -MEASURE

In this section, we present the proof of Theorem 1.5, namely, that the  $L$ -periodic  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure exhibits a concentration phenomenon around the minimizer of the Hamiltonian (3.1). Before proceeding with the proof of Theorem 1.5, we first establish the following proposition, which plays a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

**Proposition 6.1.** *There exists a constant  $c > 0$  independent of  $L \geq 1$  such that for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2}\phi(L^{-1}\cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) \lesssim \exp \left\{ -c\varepsilon^4 L^4 \right\} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* We first write

$$\rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2}\phi(L^{-1}\cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\mathbf{V}^L(\phi) \right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}} \right]}{Z_L} \quad (6.1)$$

where  $Z_L$  is the partition function as in (1.20) and

$$S_L = \left\{ \phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2}\phi(L^{-1}\cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} < \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (6.2)$$

Hence, from (6.1) and (6.2), we have

$$\log \rho_L(S_L^c) = L^4 \left( \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\mathbf{V}_L(\phi) \right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}} \right]}{L^4} - \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} \right). \quad (6.3)$$

It follows from Proposition (5.1) and Lemma 5.4 that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_L}{L^4} = - \inf_{W \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} H(W) = 0 \quad (6.4)$$

and

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_{\mu_L} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\mathbf{V}_L(\phi) \right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi \notin S_L\}} \right]}{L^4} \leq -c\varepsilon^4. \quad (6.5)$$

Combining (6.3), (6.4), and (6.5), we obtain

$$\rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in H^1(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2}\phi(L^{-1}\cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \geq \varepsilon^4 \right\} \right) \lesssim \exp \left\{ -c\varepsilon^4 L^4 \right\} \rightarrow 0 \quad (6.6)$$

as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 6.1.

**Remark 6.2.** We can also establish Proposition 6.1 by restricting to mean-zero fields<sup>13</sup> and letting  $\varepsilon = L^{-1+\frac{\eta}{2}}$

$$\rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in \dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2}\phi(L^{-1}\cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} \geq L^{-1+\frac{\eta}{2}} \right\} \right) \lesssim \exp \left\{ -cL^{2\eta} \right\} \rightarrow 0 \quad (6.7)$$

as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) = \{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \widehat{\phi}(0) = 0 \}$ . It can be easily shown that

$$\|L^{-2}\phi(L^{-1}\cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)} = L^{-1+\eta} \|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}. \quad (6.8)$$

Hence, by combining (6.7) and (6.8), we obtain the exponential concentration of the  $L$ -periodic  $\Phi_2^3$ -measure

$$\rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in \dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)} \geq L^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \right\} \right) \lesssim \exp \left\{ -cL^{2\eta} \right\}.$$

When considering general fields which are not mean-zero, there is a loss caused by the inhomogeneous component of the  $\|\cdot\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2)}$  norm. In (6.8), the inhomogeneous component only has the factor  $L^{-1}$  which is not enough to control  $L^{-1+\frac{\eta}{2}}$  in (6.7). Therefore, an additional argument, given below is required to conclude weak convergence to zero.

□

We are now ready to present the proof of Theorem 1.5.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |\langle \phi, g_j \rangle| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : |\langle \phi, g_j \rangle| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{m}{\varepsilon} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} \left[ |\langle \phi, g_j \rangle| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>13</sup>replacing the massive Gaussian free field with a massless Gaussian free field.

In order to estimate  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} [|\langle \phi, g_j \rangle|]$ , we first write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} [|\langle \phi, g_j \rangle|] &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} \left[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2} \langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1}x)) \langle \nabla \rangle^\eta (g_i(L^{-1}x)) dx \right| \right] \\ &\leq \int_{|x| \leq L} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1}x))| |\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta (g_i(L^{-1}x))| dx \\ &\quad + \int_{L \leq |x| \leq L^2} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1}x))| |\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta (g_i(L^{-1}x))| dx \\ &= \text{I} + \text{II}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Before we estimate I and II in (6.9), we first consider the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} [\|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} [\|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2] &= \int_0^\infty \rho_L \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 > \lambda \right\} d\lambda \\ &= \int_0^{L^{-2+\eta}} \rho_L \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 > \lambda \right\} d\lambda \\ &\quad + \int_{L^{-2+\eta}}^\infty \rho_L \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 > \lambda \right\} d\lambda \\ &\leq L^{-2+\eta} + \int_{L^{-2+\eta}}^\infty \rho_L \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 > \lambda \right\} d\lambda \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

Thanks to Proposition 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{L^{-2+\eta}}^\infty \rho_L \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2 > \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} d\lambda \\ &\leq \int_{L^{-2+\eta}}^\infty e^{-\lambda^2 L^4} d\lambda \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} L^{2\eta}} \int_{L^{-2+\eta}}^\infty e^{-\frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 L^4} d\lambda = \sqrt{2\pi} L^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2} L^{2\eta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

Hence, by combining (6.10) and (6.11), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} [\|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2] \lesssim L^{-2+\eta}. \tag{6.12}$$

Thanks to the spatial stationarity of the measure  $\rho_L$ , we have that for any fixed  $x_1 \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} [\|L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} \cdot)\|_{H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_{L^2}^2)}^2] = L^4 \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} x_1))|^2. \tag{6.13}$$

It follows from (6.12) and (6.13) that for any fixed  $x_1 \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} x_1))|^2 \lesssim L^{-6+\eta}. \tag{6.14}$$

We now estimate the test function  $|\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta (g_i(L^{-1}x))|$  on the region  $\{2^{\ell-1}L \leq |x| \leq 2^\ell L\}$  for  $1 \leq \ell \leq \log L$ . Since  $g_i$  has compact support in  $\mathbb{T}_L^2$ , we have that for some large  $k \geq 1$

$$|\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta (g_i(L^{-1}x))| \lesssim 2^{-\ell k} \tag{6.15}$$

on the region  $\{2^{\ell-1}L \leq |x| \leq 2^\ell L\}$  for  $1 \leq \ell \leq \log L$ .

We are now ready to estimate I and II in (6.9). Let us first consider I. By using the spatial stationarity of the measure  $\rho_L$ , Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality, and  $L^\infty$  bound of the test function

$\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta g_i$ , we have that for any  $x_1 \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &\lesssim \left( \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} x_1))|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{|x| \leq L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta (g_i(L^{-1} x))| dx \\ &\lesssim L^{-3+\frac{\eta}{2}} L^2 = L^{-1+\frac{\eta}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

It follows from (6.15), the spatial stationarity of the measure  $\rho_L$ , Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality, and (6.14) that for any  $x_1 \in \mathbb{T}_L^2$  and some large  $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\log L} \int_{2^{\ell-1}L \leq |x| \leq 2^\ell L} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} x))| |\langle \nabla \rangle^\eta (g_i(L^{-1} x))| dx \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\log L} 2^{-\ell k} \int_{2^{\ell-1}L \leq |x| \leq 2^\ell L} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} x))| dx \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\log L} 2^{-\ell k} (2^\ell L)^2 \left( \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} |\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\eta} (L^{-2} \phi(L^{-1} x_1))|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq L^{-3+\frac{\eta}{2}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\log L} 2^{-\ell k} (2^\ell L)^2 \\ &\lesssim L^{-1+\frac{\eta}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

By combining (6.9), (6.16), and (6.17), we have

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} \left[ |\langle \phi, g_j \rangle| \right] \lesssim L^{-1+\frac{\eta}{2}}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_L \left( \left\{ \phi \in H^{-\eta}(\mathbb{T}_L^2) : \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |\langle \phi, g_j \rangle| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) &\leq \frac{m}{\varepsilon} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_L} \left[ |\langle \phi, g_j \rangle| \right] \\ &\lesssim \frac{m}{\varepsilon} L^{-1+\frac{\eta}{2}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Proposition 5.1 and (6.18) imply that we complete the proof of Theorem 1.5.  $\square$

**Remark 6.3.** By letting  $\varepsilon = L^{-1+\eta}$  in (6.18), one derives a quantified version of the concentration. It is not clear whether the resulting rate of concentration is optimal. We do not pursue optimizing the rate of concentration here.

**Acknowledgements.** The work of P.S. is partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1811093 and DMS-2154090.

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, R. Danchin, *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 343. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. xvi+523 pp.
- [2] N. Barashkov, M. Gubinelli *A variational method for  $\Phi_3^4$* , Duke Math. J. 169 (2020), no. 17, 3339–3415.
- [3] N. Barashkov, M. Gubinelli *On the variational method for Euclidean quantum fields in infinite volume*, Probab. Math. Phys.4(2023), no.4, 761–801.
- [4] V. Bogachev, *Gaussian measures*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 62. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998. xii+433 pp.
- [5] M. Boué, P. Dupuis, *A variational representation for certain functionals of Brownian motion*, Ann. Probab. 26 (1998), no. 4, 1641–1659.

- [6] J. Bourgain, *Periodic nonlinear Schrödinger equation and invariant measures*, Comm. Math. Phys. 166 (1994), no. 1, 1–26.
- [7] J. Bourgain, *On the Cauchy and invariant measure problem for the periodic Zakharov system*, Duke Math. J. 76 (1994), no. 1, 175–202.
- [8] J. Bourgain, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Hyperbolic equations and frequency interactions (Park City, UT, 1995), 3–157, IAS/Park City Math. Ser., 5, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [9] J. Bourgain, *Invariant measures for the 2D-defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. 176 (1996), no. 2, 421–445.
- [10] J. Bourgain, *Invariant measures for the Gross-Piatevskii equation*, J. Math. Pures Appl. 76 (1997), no. 8, 649–702.
- [11] B. Bringmann, *On Gibbs measures and topological solitons of exterior equivariant wave maps*, to appear in Rev. Mat. Iberoam.
- [12] D. Brydges, G. Slade, *Statistical mechanics of the 2-dimensional focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. 182 (1996), no. 2, 485–504.
- [13] E. Carlen, J. Fröhlich, J. Lebowitz, *Exponential relaxation to equilibrium for a one-dimensional focusing non-linear Schrödinger equation with noise*, Comm. Math. Phys. 342 (2016), no. 1, 303–332.
- [14] R. Catellier, K. Chouk, *Paracontrolled distributions and the 3-dimensional stochastic quantization equation*, Ann. Probab. 46 (2018), no. 5, 2621–2679.
- [15] G. Da Prato, A. Debussche, *Strong solutions to the stochastic quantization equations*, Ann. Probab. 31 (2003), no. 4, 1900–1916.
- [16] B. Bringmann, Y. Deng, A. Nahmod, H. Yue *Invariant Gibbs measures for the three dimensional cubic nonlinear wave equation*, to appear in Invent. Math.
- [17] J.S. Feldman, K. Osterwalder, *The Wightman axioms and the mass gap for weakly coupled  $(\Phi^4)_3$  quantum field theories*, Ann. Physics, 97(1):80–135, 1976.
- [18] B. Gess, K. Seong, P. Tsatsoulis, *Low temperature expansion for the Euclidean  $\Phi_2^4$ -measure*, arXiv:2404.14539 [math.PR].
- [19] J. Glimm, *Boson fields with the  $\Phi^4$ : interaction in three dimensions*, Comm. Math. Phys. 10 (1968), 1–47.
- [20] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, *Positivity of the  $\varphi_3^4$  Hamiltonian*, Fortschritte der Phys. 21 (7), 327–376 (1973)
- [21] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, *Quantum physics. A functional integral point of view*, Second edition. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987. xxii+535 pp.
- [22] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, T. Spencer *A convergent expansion about mean field theory. I. The expansion*, Ann. Physics 101 (1976), no. 2, 610–630.
- [23] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, T. Spencer *A convergent expansion about mean field theory. II. Convergence of the expansion*, Ann. Physics 101 (1976), no. 2, 631–669.
- [24] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier analysis*, Third edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 250. Springer, New York, 2014. xvi+624 pp.
- [25] M. Gubinelli, M. Hofmanová, *Global solutions to elliptic and parabolic  $\Phi^4$  models in Euclidean space*, Comm. Math. Phys. 368 (2019), no. 3, 1201–1266.
- [26] M. Gubinelli, P. Imkeller, N. Perkowski, *Paracontrolled distributions and singular PDEs*, Forum Math. Pi 3 (2015), e6, 75 pp.
- [27] M. Gubinelli, H. Koch, T. Oh, *Paracontrolled approach to the three-dimensional stochastic nonlinear wave equation with quadratic nonlinearity*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 26 (2024), no. 3, 817–874.
- [28] M. Gubinelli, H. Koch, T. Oh, L. Tolomeo, *Global dynamics for the two-dimensional stochastic nonlinear wave equations*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2022, no. 21, 16954–16999.
- [29] T. S. Gunaratnam, T. Oh, N. Tzvetkov, H. Weber *Quasi-invariant Gaussian measures for the nonlinear wave equation in three dimensions*, Probab. Math. Phys. 3 (2022), no. 2, 343–379.
- [30] M. Hairer, *A theory of regularity structures*, Invent. Math. 198 (2014), no. 2, 269–504.
- [31] T. Hmidi, S. Keraani, *Blowup theory for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations revisited*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2005, 2815–2828.
- [32] J. Lebowitz, H. Rose, E. Speer, *Statistical mechanics of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, J. Statist. Phys. 50 (1988), no. 3-4, 657–687.
- [33] H.P. McKean, *A Martin boundary connected with the  $\infty$ -volume limit of the focussing cubic Schrödinger equation*, Itô's stochastic calculus and probability theory, 251–259. Springer, Tokyo, 1996.
- [34] J.-C. Mourrat, H. Weber, *The dynamic  $\Phi_3^4$  model comes down from infinity*, Comm. Math. Phys. 356 (2017), no. 3, 673–753.
- [35] E. Nelson, *A quartic interaction in two dimensions*, 1966 Mathematical Theory of Elementary Particles (Proc. Conf., Dedham, Mass., 1965), pp. 69–73, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass.

- [36] D. Nualart, *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*, Second edition. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. xiv+382 pp.
- [37] T. Oh, M. Okamoto, L. Tolomeo, *Focusing  $\Phi_3^4$ -model with a Hartree-type nonlinearity*, to appear in Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.
- [38] T. Oh, M. Okamoto, L. Tolomeo, *Stochastic quantization of the  $\Phi_3^3$ -model*, to appear in Mem. Eur. Math. Soc.
- [39] T. Oh, K. Seong, L. Tolomeo, *A remark on Gibbs measures with log-correlated Gaussian fields*, Forum Math. Sigma 12 (2024), Paper No. e50.
- [40] T. Oh, P. Sosoe, L. Tolomeo, *Optimal integrability threshold for Gibbs measures associated with focusing NLS on the torus*, Invent. Math. 227 (2022), no. 3, 1323–1429.
- [41] T. Oh, L. Thomann, *A pedestrian approach to the invariant Gibbs measure for the 2-d defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput. 6 (2018), 397–445.
- [42] T. Oh, L. Thomann, *Invariant Gibbs measure for the 2-d defocusing nonlinear wave equations*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. 29 (2020), no. 1, 1–26
- [43] T. Oh, L. Tolomeo, Y. Wang, G. Zheng, *Hyperbolic  $P(\Phi)_2$ -model on the plane*, arXiv:2211.03735 [math.AP] (2022).
- [44] G. Parisi, Y.S. Wu, *Perturbation theory without gauge fixing*, Sci. Sinica 24 (1981), no. 4, 483–496.
- [45] B. Rider, *On the  $\infty$ -volume limit of the focusing cubic Schrödinger equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 55 (2002), no. 10, 1231–1248.
- [46] M. Röckner, R. Zhu, X. Zhu, *Ergodicity for the stochastic quantization problems on the 2D-torus*, Comm. Math. Phys. 352 (2017) 1061–1090.
- [47] S. Ryang, T. Saito, K. Shigemoto, *Canonical stochastic quantization*, Progr. Theoret. Phys. 73 (1985), no. 5, 1295–1298.
- [48] T. Robert, K. Seong, L. Tolomeo, Y. Wang *Focusing Gibbs measures with harmonic potential*, to appear in Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.
- [49] K. Seong, *Invariant Gibbs dynamics for the two-dimensional Zakharov-Yukawa system*, J. Funct. Anal. 286 (2024), no. 4, 81 pp.
- [50] K. Seong, *Phase transition of singular Gibbs measures for three-dimensional Schrödinger-wave system*, arXiv:2306.17013 [math.PR].
- [51] H. Shen, S. Smith, R. Zhu, X. Zhu, *Large  $N$  limit of the  $O(N)$  linear sigma model via stochastic quantization*, Ann. Probab. 50 (2022), no.1, 131–202.
- [52] H. Shen, R. Zhu, X. Zhu, *Large  $N$  limit of the  $O(N)$  linear sigma model in 3D*, Comm. Math. Phys. 394 (2022), no.3, 953–1009.
- [53] H. Shen, R. Zhu, X. Zhu, *An SPDE approach to perturbation theory of  $\Phi_2^4$ : asymptoticity and short distance behavior.*, Ann. Appl. Probab. 33 (2023), no. 4, 2600–2642.
- [54] I. Shigekawa, *Stochastic analysis*, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original by the author. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 224. Iwanami Series in Modern Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. xii+182 pp.
- [55] B. Simon, *The  $P(\varphi)_2$  Euclidean (quantum) field theory*, Princeton Series in Physics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1974. xx+392 pp.
- [56] L. Tolomeo, H. Weber, *Phase transition for invariant measures of the focusing Schrödinger equation*, arXiv:2306.07697 [math.AP].
- [57] P. Tsatsoulis, H. Weber, *Spectral gap for the stochastic quantization equation on the 2-dimensional torus*. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. 54 (2018), no. 3, 1204–1249.
- [58] N. Tzvetkov, *Construction of a Gibbs measure associated to the periodic Benjamin-Ono equation*, Probab. Theory Related Fields 146 (2010), no. 3-4, 481–514.
- [59] A. Üstünel, *Variational calculation of Laplace transforms via entropy on Wiener space and applications*, J. Funct. Anal. 267 (2014), no. 8, 3058–3083.
- [60] M. Weinstein *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation inequalities*, Comm. Math. Phys. 87 (1983), no. 4, 567–576.

KIHOON SEONG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, 310 MALOTT HALL, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK 14853, USA  
*Email address:* kihoonseong@cornell.edu

PHILIPPE SOSOE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, 310 MALOTT HALL, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK 14853, USA  
*Email address:* ps934@cornell.edu