

$\Phi_3^4$  THEORY FROM MANY-BODY QUANTUM GIBBS STATES

PHAN THÀNH NAM, RONGCHAN ZHU, AND XIANGCHAN ZHU

ABSTRACT. We derive the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure on the torus as a rigorous limit of the quantum Gibbs state of an interacting Bose gas, where the limiting classical measure describes the critical behavior of the Bose gas just above the Bose–Einstein phase transition. Since the quantum problem is typically formulated using a nonlocal interaction potential, a key challenge is to approximate the local  $\Phi_3^4$  theory by a Hartree measure with a nonlocal interaction. This requires uniform estimates on the Hartree measure, which are achieved using techniques from recent development on stochastic quantization and paracontrolled calculus from [GIP15]. The connection to the quantum problem is then established by applying the variational approach in [LNR21], where using a recent correlation inequality from [DNN25] we refine the analysis and derive a quantitative convergence of the quantum correlation functions to those of the Hartree classical field.

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction   | 1  |
| 2. Main results and Structure of the proof  | 5  |
| 3. Convergence of the dynamics associated with (2.15)                                   | 12 |
| 4. Uniform in $\varepsilon$ estimates and convergence of the measures $\nu^\varepsilon$ | 35 |
| 5. Stochastic calculations  | 51 |
| 6. A-priori and correlation estimates for the quantum Gibbs state                       | 57 |
| 7. Convergence of free energy and Gibbs state   | 64 |
| Appendix A. Notations and Besov spaces  | 73 |
| Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 3.8, Theorem 3.17 and Lemma 4.17                           | 76 |
| Appendix C. The ideal Bose gas  | 78 |
| References  | 80 |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The  $\Phi_3^4$  measure on a domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is a probability measure over complex-valued distributions  $\Phi : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  which is formally defined by

$$d\nu(\Phi) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp \left( - \int_D \left( |\nabla \Phi(x)|^2 + m_0 |\Phi(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\Phi(x)|^4 \right) dx \right) \mathcal{D}\Phi \quad (1.1)$$

with a given parameter  $m_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . This formula is purely formal since all the relevant terms, namely the kinetic energy  $\int_D |\nabla \Phi(x)|^2 dx$ , the mass  $\int_D |\Phi(x)|^2 dx$  and the interaction energy  $\int_D |\Phi(x)|^4 dx$ , are *infinite* almost surely in the support of the measure. Therefore,  $\nu$  must be defined via an appropriate renormalization procedure.

Historically, the measure in (1.1) is a typical example of a class of nonlinear Gibbs measures which were first defined in the 1960s and 1970s in the context of *Constructive Quantum Field Theory* [S66,

---

Date: February 10, 2025.

[N73](#), [S74](#), [GJS74](#), [GRS75](#), [GJ87](#)]. In this direction, the Gibbs measures serve as a tool to construct interacting quantum fields in the Euclidean framework.

Afterwards, starting from the work of Lebowitz, Rose, and Speer [[LRS88](#)], and a series of papers by Bourgain [[Bou94](#), [Bou96](#), [Bou97](#)], the same Gibbs measures have been used to study *nonlinear Schrödinger equations* (NLS). Heuristically, since  $d\nu$  in (1.1) is formally the invariant measure of the cubic NSL, it is helpful to establish the wellposedness with low regular data; see [[T08](#), [TT10](#), [BTT13](#), [BB14a](#), [BB14b](#), [CDS15](#), [OT18](#), [DNY19](#), [DNY22](#)] for more recent developments.

In another direction, in 1981, Parisi and Wu [[PW81](#)] introduced a framework for Euclidean quantum field theory that seeks to obtain Gibbs states of classical statistical mechanics as limiting distributions of stochastic processes, particularly through solutions to nonlinear stochastic differential equations. These stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) can then be employed to study the properties of Gibbs states, a procedure known as *stochastic quantization*. We refer to [[JLM85](#), [AR91](#), [DD03](#), [Hai14](#), [Kup16](#), [RZZ17a](#), [TW18](#), [MW17a](#), [MW17](#), [CC18](#), [GH19](#), [GH21](#)] for some further works in this approach. In particular, for the  $\Phi_d^4$  measure, the corresponding stochastic quantization equation is referred to as the dynamical  $\Phi_d^4$  model.

Initiated by [[LRS88](#)], the idea of using Gibbs measures is also widely applied in quantum statistical mechanics; see, e.g., [[ZJ89](#), [C96](#), [ZJ13](#), [BBS19](#)]. In particular, the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure is closely related to the description of the *Bose–Einstein phase transition* [[AM01](#), [BBHLV99](#), [BBHLV01](#), [HB03](#), [KPS01](#)].

The aim of the present paper is to provide a rigorous derivation of the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure by making a link between two areas: stochastic partial differential equations and the physics of Bose gases. Starting from many-body quantum mechanics, where the problem is linear and regular but involving non commutative operators, we will justify the emergence of the  $\Phi_3^4$  as a semiclassical limit which captures the formation of the Bose–Einstein condensation just above the critical temperature, thus resolving a natural question raised from a series of works [[LNR15](#), [FKSS17](#), [LNR18](#), [FKSS19](#), [LNR21](#), [FKSS22](#), [FKSS23](#)]. In this process, techniques from stochastic quantization allow us to achieve uniform estimates which are crucial to pass from the quantum setting involving a non-local interaction to the model (1.1) with a local interaction.

More precisely, we will study an interacting Bose gas on the torus  $\mathbb{T}^3$  in the grand canonical ensemble, which is described by the quantum Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}$  on the bosonic Fock space  $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}(L^2(\mathbb{T}^3))$  with the Hamiltonian

$$\mathbb{H}_\lambda = \lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a_x^* (-\Delta_x - \vartheta) a_x dx + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{T}^3} v^\varepsilon(x-y) a_x^* a_y^* a_x a_y dx dy. \quad (1.2)$$

Here we use the second quantization formalism where the creation and annihilation operators  $a_x^*$ ,  $a_x$  satisfy the canonical commutation relations (CCR)

$$[a_x, a_y] = 0 = [a_x^*, a_y^*], \quad [a_x, a_y^*] = \delta_0(x-y), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{T}^3. \quad (1.3)$$

We will take  $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$  as the inverse temperature and choose  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\lambda) \rightarrow 0^+$  so that  $v^\varepsilon$  converges to the Dirac delta function  $\delta_0$ . The important parameter  $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}$ , called the *chemical potential*, is used to adjust the number of particles (or equivalently, the density) of the system. We will choose the chemical potential such that the number of particles in the zero-momentum mode is comparable to that in every nonzero momentum mode, which is appropriate to derive the classical field theory and essentially places the Gibbs state just slightly above the critical point of the Bose–Einstein phase transition.

Heuristically, the reader may also think of  $\lambda$  as a semiclassical parameter, and interpret  $\sqrt{\lambda} a_x$  and  $\sqrt{\lambda} a_x^*$  as the second quantized version of  $\Phi(x)$  and  $\overline{\Phi(x)}$  in the classical field theory. In this way,  $\mathbb{H}_\lambda$  formally gives rise to the energy functional in a  $\Phi_3^4$  measure.

We are interested in the following question: *Is it possible to derive the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory as a limiting description of the quantum Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ ?* In statistical physics, the macroscopic properties of a system are typically characterized by its volume, temperature, and number of particles. Here we have

already chosen the first two parameters, so it is desirable to show that the nonlinear measure in (1.1) can be obtained under an appropriate choice of the chemical potential  $\vartheta$ . This type of question, in the more general context of nonlinear Gibbs measures, was proposed in [LNR15] and further studied in [FKSS17, LNR18, FKSS19, LNR21, FKSS22, FKSS23]. While these works cover many important cases, including  $\Phi_1^4$  theory [LNR15, FKSS17, LNR18, FKSS19], Hartree-type measures with non-local interactions in 2D and 3D [LNR21, FKSS22], and  $\Phi_2^4$  theory in [FKSS23], the derivation of the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory remains open. Our goal is to resolve this issue.

The main challenge in deriving the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory, compared to previous works [LNR15, FKSS17, LNR18, FKSS19, LNR21, FKSS22, FKSS23], is that Wick renormalization alone is insufficient. In particular, determining the correct counterterm is a subtle task. As a first step, we will study a simplified version of this problem at the classical field theory level. We will show that the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure can be approximated by the Hartree measure

$$d\nu^\varepsilon(\Phi) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon} \exp\left(-\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|\nabla\Phi(x)|^2 + m_\varepsilon|\Phi(x)|^2)dx - \frac{1}{2} \int :|\Phi(x)|^2: v^\varepsilon(x-y) :|\Phi(y)|^2: dx dy\right) \mathcal{D}\Phi \quad (1.4)$$

in the limit  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , under a suitable choice of  $m_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ . Here,  $v^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-3}v(\varepsilon^{-1}x)$  is a nonlocal version of the delta function  $\delta_0$ , and  $:|\Phi(x)|^2:$  is formally defined as  $|\Phi(x)|^2 - \langle |\Phi(x)|^2 \rangle_{\mu_0}$ , the Wick renormalization of  $|\Phi(x)|^2$  with the (complex) Gaussian free field  $\mu_0$  with covariance  $(-\Delta + 1)^{-1}$ .

For every fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the Hartree measure (1.4) is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu_0$ , and its construction is standard. For example, this measure was constructed by Bourgain [Bou97] as the invariant measure for the Hartree (also called the Gross-Pitaevskii) equation

$$i\partial_t u = -\Delta u + (v^\varepsilon * |u|)u.$$

This measure has been also derived from the Gibbs state of quantum Bose gases through two independent methods in [LNR21] and [FKSS22].

On the other hand, since the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure is *singular* with respect to the Gaussian free field  $\mu_0$ , the limit of the Hartree measure (1.4) is well-defined only under a precise choice of  $m_\varepsilon$ . The first contribution of  $m_\varepsilon$  is  $a_\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v^\varepsilon(y)G(y)dy \sim \varepsilon^{-1}$ , where  $G(x)$  is the Green's function of  $-\Delta + 1$ , which behaves as  $(4\pi|x|)^{-1}$  as  $|x| \rightarrow 0$  (see, e.g., [RS16, Lemma 5.4]). The counterterm  $a_\varepsilon$  still arises from Wick normalization, and it must be corrected by an additional counterterm  $-6b_\varepsilon \sim \ln \varepsilon$ , which will be given in detail later. Combining these, we find that the corresponding Hartree measure

$$d\nu^\varepsilon(\Psi) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon} \exp\left(-\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|\nabla\Psi|^2 + m|\Psi|^2)dx - \frac{1}{2} \int :|\Psi(x)|^2: v^\varepsilon(x-y) :|\Psi(y)|^2: dx dy + (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} :|\Psi(x)|^2: dx\right) \mathcal{D}\Psi \quad (1.5)$$

converges to a  $\Phi_3^4$  measure in a suitable sense. At this point, an interesting aspect is the appearance of a further correction of order 1 to the mass coefficient  $m$  in the limiting  $\Phi_3^4$  measure. In fact, this correction would disappear if we take the alternative choice

$$d\tilde{\nu}^\varepsilon(\Psi) \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon} \exp\left(-\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|\nabla\Psi|^2 + m|\Psi|^2)dx - \frac{1}{2} \int :|\Psi(x)|^2: v^\varepsilon(x-y) :|\Psi(y)|^2: dx dy + \int \operatorname{Re}(\bar{\Psi}(x)v^\varepsilon(x-y)G(x-y)\Psi(y))dydx - 6b^\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} :|\Psi(x)|^2: dx\right) \mathcal{D}\Psi, \quad (1.6)$$

with the nonlocal counterterm  $\int \operatorname{Re}(\bar{\Psi}(x)v^\varepsilon(x-y)G(x-y)\Psi(y))dydx$ . However, only (1.5) allows us to make a rigorous connection to the many-body quantum problem (since we can only alter the chemical potential).

Mathematically, defining the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure from the Hartree measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  requires that the measure is tight as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , whose proof turns out to be quite demanding. We will prove this uniform bound

and related estimates for  $d\nu^\varepsilon$  by using the stochastic quantization approach. More precisely, we will employ the fact that the Hartree measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  in (1.4) is the invariant measure of the equation

$$(\partial_t - \Delta + 1)\Psi^\varepsilon = -(v^\varepsilon * :|\Psi^\varepsilon|^2:)\Psi^\varepsilon + (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon + 1 - m)\Psi^\varepsilon + \xi, \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\xi$  denotes complex-valued space-time white noise on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ .

The construction of  $\Phi_3^4$  theory by SPDE method has been a subject of many works in the last decades. In two spatial dimensions, the dynamical  $\Phi_2^4$  model was previously analyzed in [JLM85, AR91, DD03, MW17a]. However, the more irregular three-dimensional case ( $\Phi_3^4$ ) remained unsolved for much longer, as it required fundamentally new ideas. A breakthrough was achieved with Hairer's theory of regularity structures [Hai14], which for the first time gave meaning to the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model. Now, local well-posedness for the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model can also be established using other methods such as paracontrolled calculus [GIP15, CC18], renormalization group methods [Kup16, Duc21, DGR24], or the diagram-free approach [LOT23, LOTT24, OSSW18, OW19]. These theories enable the treatment of a wide class of singular subcritical SPDEs (see [BHZ19, CH16, BCCH21]), including the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang (KPZ) equation, the generalized parabolic Anderson model, and the stochastic quantization equations for quantum fields such as Yang–Mills model, Sine-Gordon model (see [Hai14, CC18, GP17, CCHS22, CCHS24, CHS18, GM24, She21, BC23, BC24, BC24a] and references therein).

For the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model, global well-posedness has been established due to the strong damping term  $-\Phi^3$ , as demonstrated in [MW17, AK20, GH19, MW20, JP23]. Additionally, a new PDE-based construction of the  $\Phi_3^4$  field was developed in [GH21]. Recent progress has also been made in the construction of subcritical  $\Phi^4$  fields [DGR24], the Abelian-Higgs model [BC24], the Sine-Gordon model [CFW24, BC24a], and the large  $N$  limit of the  $O(N)$  linear sigma model [SSZZ22, SZZ22, SZZ23], all through stochastic quantization.

We also mention the variational approach developed by Barashkov and Gubinelli in [BG20]. Based on this technique the Hartree-type classical field for general potential  $v$  has been constructed in [Bri22, OOT24]. Since the variational approach is very helpful in the quantum problem [LNR15, LNR18, LNR21], it would be very interesting to apply and develop this approach to give uniform bounds on the correlation functions of the classical model.

Now we go back to the quantum model (1.2). Given the insights from the classical field theory, we will choose the chemical potential in  $\mathbb{H}_\lambda$  as

$$\frac{\zeta\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)}{(4\pi)^{3/2}}\lambda^{-1/2} + a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon \quad (1.8)$$

with  $\zeta$  being the Riemann zeta function, plus a correction of order 1 to adjust the shift of the mass term in the limiting  $\Phi_3^4$  measure. Here  $(4\pi)^{-3/2}\zeta\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) = (2\pi)^{-3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (e^{|\rho|^2} - 1)^{-1}$  is the critical density of the ideal gas, which goes back to the computation of Einstein [Ein24].

Using the variational approach in [LNR15, LNR18, LNR21], we compare the correlation functions of  $\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1}e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}$  with those of the Hartree measure in (1.5). In this aspect, we will use another characterization of the Hartree measure, namely it is the unique minimizer for the variational problem

$$-\log \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon = \min_{\nu \text{ proba. meas.}} \left\{ \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\nu', \mu_0) + \int \mathcal{D}[u] d\nu'(u) \right\} \quad (1.9)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\nu', \mu_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \frac{d\nu'}{d\mu_0}(u) \log \left( \frac{d\nu'}{d\mu_0}(u) \right) d\mu_0(u) \geq 0$$

is the classical relative entropy between the probability measure  $\nu'$  and the Gaussian free field  $\mu_0$ , and

$$\mathcal{D}[u] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{T}^3} :|u(x)|^2 : v^\varepsilon(x-y) :|u(y)|^2 : dx dy - (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - m + 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} :|u(x)|^2 : dx \quad (1.10)$$

is the renormalized interaction associated with (1.5). This classical variational problem can be related to its quantum analogue in finite dimensions by using semiclassical techniques. Heuristically, the effect of the interaction should be only visible in low momenta. In high momenta, the particles move too fast and they do not really interact with the others, and hence the behavior of the interacting system is simply comparable to the non-interacting one. The main mathematical challenge in this approach is justifying the finite dimension reduction, namely removing the contribution from high momenta.

For the interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ , controlling the interaction contribution from high momenta requires second-order moment estimates on the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ . This task cannot be achieved by a standard perturbation method (since we cannot deal with a perturbation that is not bounded by the original Hamiltonian). The key idea from [LNR21] is that second-order moment estimates on the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$  can be obtained via first-order moment estimates on a family of perturbed Gibbs states, and the latter can be handled by a Hellmann–Feynman argument. Rigorously, this was captured by an abstract correlation inequality in [LNR21, Theorem 7.1], where second-order moments of  $\Gamma_\lambda$  are estimated via Duhamel two-point functions with perturbations. In the present paper, we will use a new correlation inequality from the recent work [DNN25], which is a considerably improved version of the previous one and is built on a sharp estimate of Duhamel two-point functions via Stahl’s theorem [Sta13] (also known as the Bessis–Moussa–Villani conjecture). This allows us to simplify and refine the analysis. We will derive quantitative error estimates in terms of  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and prove the convergence of the correlation functions in the strong Hilbert–Schmidt topology:

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \left| n! \lambda^n \Gamma_\lambda^{(n)} - \int |\Psi^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle \Psi^{\otimes n}| d\nu^\varepsilon(\Psi) \right|^2 \right) = 0, \quad \forall n \geq 1 \quad (1.11)$$

provided that  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$  is chosen appropriately. Putting together with the convergence from the Hartree measure to the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory, we thus conclude the proof.

The precise mathematical setting and statements will be given in the next section.

**Acknowledgments.** P.T.N. would like to thank Nguyen Viet Dang, Mathieu Lewin, and Nicolas Rougerie for various helpful discussions and Quoc Hung Nguyen for his warm hospitality during a visit to Chinese Academy of Sciences in 2024, when the project was initiated. P.T.N. was supported by the European Research Council via the ERC Consolidator Grant RAMBAS (Project No. 10104424). R.Z. and X.Z. are grateful to the financial supports by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1006300). R.Z. is grateful to the financial supports of the NSFC (No. 12426205, 12271030). X.Z. is grateful to the financial supports in part by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2020YFA0712700) and the NSFC (No. 12090014, 12288201) and the support by key Lab of Random Complex Structures and Data Science, Youth Innovation Promotion Association (2020003), Chinese Academy of Science and the financial supports by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 317210226–SFB 1283.

## 2. MAIN RESULTS AND STRUCTURE OF THE PROOF

**2.1. Main result on the quantum Gibbs state.** We consider a homogeneous system of bosons in the torus  $\mathbb{T}^3 = [0, 2\pi]^3$ . The underlying many-body Hilbert space is the (complex) *bosonic Fock space*

$$\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}(L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)) = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{H} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{H}^n \oplus \dots, \quad \mathfrak{H}^n = L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{T}^{3n}). \quad (2.1)$$

We are interested in the Gibbs state on Fock space

$$\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}, \quad \mathcal{Z}_\lambda = \text{Tr} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}, \quad (2.2)$$

with the many-body interacting Hamiltonian

$$\mathbb{H}_\lambda = 0 \oplus (\lambda(-\Delta - \vartheta)) \bigoplus_{n=2}^{\infty} \left( \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n (-\Delta_{x_j} - \vartheta) + \lambda^2 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} v^\varepsilon(x_j - x_k) \right) \quad (2.3)$$

Here  $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$  is a semiclassical parameter, which plays the same role of the inverse temperature. We will choose  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\lambda) \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $\vartheta = \vartheta(\lambda) \rightarrow +\infty$  appropriately. The interaction potential  $v^\varepsilon : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  will be chosen such that it is a positive-type interaction, namely  $\widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) \geq 0$  and  $\widehat{v^\varepsilon}(0) = 1$ , and it converges to the delta function  $\delta_0$  when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . More concrete assumptions will be given later. Under these conditions,  $\mathbb{H}_\lambda$  is bounded from below and it can be defined as a self-adjoint operator by Friedrichs' method. In fact, for any given  $\lambda > 0$ , the partition function  $\mathcal{Z}_\lambda$  is finite and  $\Gamma_\lambda$  is well defined quantum state, namely a nonnegative trace class operator on  $\mathfrak{F}$  with  $\text{Tr}[\Gamma_\lambda] = 1$ .

*Reduced density matrices.* In the above grand canonical setting, the number of particles is not fixed and its expectation in a given quantum state  $\Gamma$  is given by  $\text{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma]$  with the *number operator*  $\mathcal{N} = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} n \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{H}^n}$ . If  $\Gamma$  commutes with  $\mathcal{N}$ , then it can be written in the diagonal form  $\Gamma = \bigoplus_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (\Gamma)_\ell$ , and we can define the *reduced density matrices* (also called the correlation functions) of  $\Gamma$  via partial traces:

$$\Gamma^{(n)} = \sum_{\ell \geq n} \binom{\ell}{n} \text{Tr}_{n+1 \rightarrow \ell}[(\Gamma)_\ell], \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Thus the  $n$ -body density matrix  $\Gamma^{(n)}$  of a state  $\Gamma$  is a nonnegative trace class operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^n$  with

$$n! \text{Tr}[\Gamma^{(n)}] = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{N} - 1) \cdots (\mathcal{N} - n + 1)\Gamma].$$

The reader may think of the reduced density matrices as the quantum analogue of the marginal probability density functions, since for every self-adjoint operator  $A_n$  on  $\mathfrak{H}^n$  we have

$$\text{Tr}[A_n \Gamma^{(n)}] = \text{Tr}[\mathbb{A}_n \Gamma],$$

where  $\mathbb{A}_n$  is the second quantization of  $A_n$ , given by

$$\mathbb{A}_n = 0 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_n \oplus \bigoplus_{\ell=n+1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n \leq \ell} (A_n)_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \right). \quad (2.4)$$

*The ideal Bose gas.* In the non-interacting case, the Gaussian quantum state  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{Z}_0^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_0}$  with

$$\mathbb{H}_0 = 0 \oplus \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n (-\Delta_{x_j} + 1) \right) \quad (2.5)$$

is exactly solvable. It can be interpreted as the quantum analogue of the Gaussian free field

$$d\mu_0(u) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_0} \exp \left( - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|\nabla u(x)|^2 + |u(x)|^2) dx \right)$$

over complex valued distributions  $u$ . In fact, for all  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$n! \lambda^n \Gamma_0^{(n)} = n! \left( \frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda(-\Delta+1)} - 1} \right)^{\otimes n} \rightarrow n! \left( \frac{1}{-\Delta+1} \right)^{\otimes n} = \int |u^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes n}| d\mu_0(u) \quad (2.6)$$

strongly in the Hilbert–Schmidt topology when  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ . Here in the last expression in (2.6),  $|u^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes n}|$  is an operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^n$  given by the quadratic form  $\langle f, (|u^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes n}|)g \rangle = \langle f, u^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes n}g \rangle$ , which explains the reasoning of the bra–ket notation. Here  $|u^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes n}|$  is *unbounded*  $\mu_0$ -almost surely, but the expression can be interpreted in a distributional sense. Moreover, since the system is translation-invariant, the one-body density  $\varrho_0 = \Gamma_0^{(1)}(x, x)$  is just a constant, namely

$$\varrho_0 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \frac{1}{e^{\lambda(|p|^2+1)} - 1} = \frac{\zeta(\frac{3}{2})}{(4\pi\lambda)^{3/2}} + \frac{C_0}{\lambda} + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda^{1/2}}\right) \quad (2.7)$$

with

$$C_0 = -\frac{1}{4\pi} + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{3/2}} \sum_{\ell \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{e^{-|\ell|}}{|\ell|}. \quad (2.8)$$

Here in the leading term, the factor  $(4\pi)^{-3/2}\zeta(\frac{3}{2})$ , with  $\zeta$  being the Riemann zeta function, is the critical density of the ideal Bose gas in the infinite-volume limit [Ein24]. The second order term is a finite-volume correction since we are working on the fixed torus  $\mathbb{T}^3$ . Since we fix the chemical potential of the ideal gas as 1, we place the corresponding Gibbs state just slightly above the critical point of the Bose–Einstein phase transition, where the number of particles in each (zero or nonzero) momentum mode is of order  $\lambda^{-1}$ . We refer to Appendix C for a more detailed discussion of the ideal Bose gas.

*The interacting case.* We will establish a picture similar to (2.6), where the limit of the reduced density matrices of the interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$  is described by the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure

$$d\nu(\Phi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp\left(-\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \left(|\nabla\Phi|^2 + m_0|\Phi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\Phi(x)|^4\right) dx\right) \mathcal{D}\Phi \quad (2.9)$$

over  $\mathbb{C}$  valued fields  $\Phi$ , where  $\mathcal{Z}$  is normalization constant (partition function). It is important to note that the formula (2.9) is only formal, as  $\nu$  is singular with respect to the Gaussian free field. A rigorous construction can be obtained via stochastic quantization (see Theorem 3.7 below).

We will need the following concrete assumption on the interaction potential. To this end, we introduce the following notations: The Fourier transform and the inverse of the Fourier transform which are defined by

$$\mathcal{F}f = \hat{f} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(x)e^{-ix \cdot k} dx, \quad \mathcal{F}^{-1}f = (2\pi)^{-3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(x)e^{ix \cdot k} dx.$$

**Assumption (Hv).** Let  $v \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be a nonnegative function whose Fourier transform satisfies

$$\hat{v}(0) = 1, \quad 0 \leq \hat{v}(k) \lesssim \frac{1}{1 + |k|^{3+\delta_0}}, \quad |D^m \hat{v}(k)| \lesssim \frac{1}{1 + |k|^m}, \quad \text{for } m \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (2.10)$$

where the constant  $\delta_0 > 0$  and the implicit constants are independent of  $k$ , and  $|D^l v| = \sup_{|\alpha|=l} |\partial^\alpha v|$  for  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For  $\varepsilon > 0$  we define  $v^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-3}v(\varepsilon^{-1}\cdot)$  which approximates the Dirac measure  $\delta_0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . By an abuse of notation we periodize  $v^\varepsilon$  so that  $v^\varepsilon$  is treated as periodic function defined on  $\mathbb{T}^3$ . In fact

$$v^\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{v}(\varepsilon k) e^{ik \cdot x}. \quad (2.11)$$

The first condition in (2.10) essentially means that  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{v}(k)(1 + |k|)^{\delta_0-} < \infty$ , while the second condition in (2.10) imposes some weak decay requirement for  $v$ . Examples satisfying conditions (Hv) include the Bessel potential, where  $\hat{v}(k) = (1 + |k|^2)^{-\beta/2}$  with  $\beta > 3$ , and  $\hat{v}(k) = e^{-c|k|^\beta}$  for some  $c > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 2]$ , as well as convex combinations of these functions.

Moreover, to renormalize the interaction in the limit, we choose the chemical potential  $\vartheta$  in  $\Gamma_\lambda$  in terms of the following *counterterms* from the classical field theory:

$$\begin{aligned} a^\varepsilon &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v^\varepsilon(y) G(y) dy, \quad 6b^\varepsilon = b_1^\varepsilon + 2b_2^\varepsilon + 2b_3^\varepsilon + b_4^\varepsilon, \\ b_1^\varepsilon &= \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 + k_2)^2 b(k_1, k_2), \quad b_2^\varepsilon = \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 + k_2) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1) b(k_1, k_2), \\ b_3^\varepsilon &= \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)^2 b(k_1, k_2), \quad b_4^\varepsilon = \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2) b(k_1, k_2), \\ b(k_1, k_2) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6 (|k_1|^2 + 1)(|k_2|^2 + 1)(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_1 + k_2|^2 + 3)}, \\ C_1 &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6} \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{\hat{v}(x)(\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y) - x \cdot \nabla \hat{v}(y))}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6} \int_{|x|>1} \frac{\hat{v}(x)(\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y))}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy, \\
C_2 = & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6} \left( \int_{|x|\leq 1} \frac{\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y) - x \cdot \nabla \hat{v}(y)}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy + \int_{|x|>1} \frac{\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y)}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy \right). \quad (2.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Here in the definition of  $a^\varepsilon$ , we used the Green function  $G(x-y) = (1-\Delta)^{-1}(x,y)$ . Note that  $G(x,y) \simeq (4\pi)^{-1}|x-y|^{-1}$  when  $|x-y| \rightarrow 0$  (see, e.g., [RS16, Lemma 5.4]), and hence  $a^\varepsilon \simeq \varepsilon^{-1}$ . This term comes from Wick normal order. The term  $6b^\varepsilon \simeq |\log \varepsilon|$  is the correction to the Wick renormalization, which is crucial to construct the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory. The two constants  $C_1, C_2$  are finite thanks to our condition on  $v$ . The derivation of these terms will be explained later.

Now we are ready to state the main result of the paper.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Consider the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}$  in (2.2) with  $v^\varepsilon$  in (Hv) and the chemical potential*

$$\vartheta = \frac{\zeta(\frac{3}{2})}{(4\pi)^{3/2}} \lambda^{-1/2} + C_0 + a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon + 2C_1 + 2C_2 - m_0. \quad (2.13)$$

Here  $C_0$  is given in (2.7),  $a^\varepsilon, 6b^\varepsilon, C_1, C_2$  are given in (2.12), and  $m_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\nu$  be the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure associated with  $m_0$  as in (2.9). When  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$  and  $|\log \lambda|^{-\eta} \leq \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  for a constant  $0 < \eta < 1/2$ , then for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$n! \lambda^n \Gamma_\lambda^{(n)} \rightarrow \int |u^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes n}| d\nu(u)$$

in the distributional sense. That is, for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $\varphi$  in the Schwartz space  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ , we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} n! \lambda^n \langle \varphi^{\otimes n}, \Gamma_\lambda^{(n)} \varphi^{\otimes n} \rangle = \int |\langle \varphi, \Phi \rangle|^{2n} d\nu(\Phi). \quad (2.14)$$

**Remark 2.2.** *Here we add  $C_1 + C_2$  in the chemical potential. If we do not put them there, then we will see a new mass term in the limiting measure (see Remark 3.1 below).*

**Remark 2.3.** *We can also interpret the complex-valued  $\Phi^4$  model as an  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -valued  $\Phi^4$  model, i.e., as an  $O(2)$  model. From the proof below, we see that Theorem 2.1 holds for any  $N$  complex components. In other words, the convergence of the many body quantum Gibbs states with  $\mathbb{R}^{2N}$ -valued components to the  $O(2N)$  model follows (see [SSZZ22, SZZ22] for the large- $N$  limit of the  $O(N)$  model via stochastic quantization).*

As we mentioned in the introduction, our result is inspired by a series of works [LNR15, FKSS17, LNR18, FKSS19, LNR21, FKSS22, FKSS23] where nonlinear Gibbs measures are derived from many-body quantum mechanics. The initial work [LNR15] already contained a derivation of the  $\Phi_1^4$  measure. In this case, there is no renormalization needed to construct the measure, and the main difficulty lies in the implementation of semiclassical techniques in infinite dimensions. The  $\Phi_2^4$  theory, which requires Wick renormalization, was derived recently in [FKSS23]. Based on the earlier work [FKSS22] which handled the derivation of the Hartree-type measure, the paper [FKSS23] made the analysis quantitative to allow  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and then resolved the rigorous connection between the nonlocal field theory and the local one in two dimensions. The problem in three dimensions is significantly harder since Wick renormalization is insufficient. Nevertheless, our proof of Theorem 2.1 follows the same overall strategy, namely the  $\Phi_3^4$  measure and the many-body problem are related via an  $\varepsilon$ -dependent Hartree measure. On one hand we refine the approach in [LNR21] to derive the Hartree measure from the quantum Gibbs state, and on the other hand we use an approach via stochastic quantization inspired by the SPDE method in [AK20, GH21, SSZZ22, SZZ22] to establish the convergence to the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory. These two ingredients are of independent interest and will be explained separately in the next subsections.



**2.2. Convergence of Hartree measure to  $\Phi_3^4$ .** Let  $v, v^\varepsilon$  as in **(Hv)** and  $a^\varepsilon, b^\varepsilon$  as in (2.12). We consider the following Hartree measure

$$\begin{aligned} d\nu^\varepsilon(\Psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon} \exp \left( - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|\nabla\Psi|^2 + m|\Psi|^2) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int :|\Psi(x)|^2: v^\varepsilon(x-y) :|\Psi(y)|^2: dx dy \right. \\ \left. + (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} :|\Psi(x)|^2: dx \right) \mathcal{D}\Psi, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

over  $\mathbb{C}$  valued fields  $\Psi$ , with  $m \in \mathbb{R}$  (the reader may think of  $m = m_0 - 2C_1 - 2C_2$ ). Here  $:|\Psi|^2:$  denotes the Wick renormalization, formally defined

$$:|\Psi(x)|^2: = |\Psi(x)|^2 - \langle |\Psi(x)|^2 \rangle_{\mu_0}, \quad (2.16)$$

and  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon$  represents the normalization constant (partition function).

For fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  can be rigorously constructed as a probability measure that is absolutely continuous with respect to the Gaussian free field, provided that  $v$  satisfies condition **(Hv)** (cf. [LNR21] and Theorem 3.8 below). As  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we expect that the limit of  $\nu^\varepsilon$  corresponds to the  $\Phi_3^4$  field, which is formally expressed as

$$d\nu(\Phi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp \left( - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|\nabla\Phi|^2 + (m + 2C_1 + 2C_2)|\Phi|^2) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int |\Phi(x)|^4 dx \right) \mathcal{D}\Phi \quad (2.17)$$

over  $\mathbb{C}$  valued fields  $\Phi$ , where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are finite constants depending on  $v$ , as given (2.12), and  $\mathcal{Z}$  is normalization constant (partition function). Recall that the formula (2.17) is only formal and a rigorous construction can be found in Theorem 3.7 below.

To state the main result of this subsection, for  $n \geq 1$ , we define  $n$ -point correlation function of  $\nu^\varepsilon$  and  $\nu$  given by

$$(\gamma_n^\varepsilon)_{\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \overline{\Psi}(\tilde{x}_1) \dots \overline{\Psi}(\tilde{x}_n) \Psi(x_1) \dots \Psi(x_n) d\nu^\varepsilon(\Psi),$$

and

$$(\gamma_n)_{\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \overline{\Phi}(\tilde{x}_1) \dots \overline{\Phi}(\tilde{x}_n) \Phi(x_1) \dots \Phi(x_n) d\nu(\Phi).$$

Note that  $\nu^\varepsilon$  and  $\nu$  are supported on  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  for  $\kappa > 0$ . Hence,  $\Phi(x_i)$ ,  $\Psi(x_i)$  and  $\overline{\Phi}(\tilde{x}_j)$ ,  $\overline{\Psi}(\tilde{x}_j)$  are understood in the distributional sense.

The following key result allows us to approximate the singular  $\Phi_3^4$  measure in (2.17) by the Hartree measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  in (2.15), which is more regular and easier to connect to the quantum model.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Assume that  $v$  satisfies condition **(Hv)**. As  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the probability measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  in (2.15) converges weakly to  $\nu$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ ,  $\kappa > 0$ , where  $\nu$  represents the  $\Phi_3^4$  field (2.17). Moreover, any correlation function  $\gamma_n^\varepsilon$  associated with  $\nu^\varepsilon$  converges to the  $n$ -point correlation function  $\gamma_n$  of the  $\Phi_3^4$  field in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^{6n})$ .*

**Remark 2.5.** *If we consider the following measure*

$$\begin{aligned} d\nu^\varepsilon(\Psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon} \exp \left( - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (|\nabla\Psi|^2 + m|\Psi|^2) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int :|\Psi(x)|^2: v^\varepsilon(x-y) :|\Psi(y)|^2: dx dy \right. \\ \left. + \int \text{Re}(\overline{\Psi}(x)v^\varepsilon(x-y)G(x-y)\Psi(y)) dy dx - 6b^\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} :|\Psi(x)|^2: dx \right) \mathcal{D}\Psi, \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

with a natural Wick renormalization counterterm  $\int \text{Re}(\overline{\Psi}(x)v^\varepsilon(x-y)G(x-y)\Psi(y)) dy dx$ , then its limit measure is given by the following  $\Phi_3^4$  measure without new mass term  $C_1 + C_2$  in (2.17):

$$d\nu(\Phi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp \left( - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\nabla\Phi|^2 + m|\Phi|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int |\Phi(x)|^4 dx \right) \mathcal{D}\Phi \quad (2.19)$$

over  $\mathbb{C}$  valued fields  $\Phi$ , where  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}$  are normalization constants (partition functions). For further explanation, see Remark 3.1 below.

The main reason for considering the measure (2.15) instead of (2.18) is that (2.15) is more directly related to the quantum many-body problem. The renormalization counterterm  $(a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon)\Psi^\varepsilon$  can be understood as the limit of the chemical potential in quantum many-body problems. As we explained in the introduction, the chemical potential is the only parameter we can adjust in the quantum problem, and hence having a mass renormalization instead of the nonlocal renormalization keeps the model more physically relevant.

**2.3. From quantum model to Hartree measure.** Recall the Hartree measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  in (2.15) with  $m = m_0 - 2C_1 - 2C_2$ . We have the following connection from the quantum Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$  to the classical Hartree measure.

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $v^\varepsilon : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as in (2.11) with  $0 \leq \hat{v}(k) \lesssim (1 + |k|^{3+\delta_0})^{-1}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\delta_0 > 0$  and  $\hat{v}(0) = 1$ . When  $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $\varepsilon \geq |\log \lambda|^{-\eta}$  for a constant  $0 < \eta < 1/2$ , the reduced density matrices of the interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}$  satisfy*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \left| n! \lambda^n \Gamma_\lambda^{(n)} - \int |\Psi^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle \Psi^{\otimes n}| d\nu^\varepsilon(\Psi) \right|^2 \right) = 0, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (2.20)$$

The strong Hilbert–Schmidt convergence in Theorem 2.6 implies the weak convergence

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left[ B_n \left( n! \lambda^n \Gamma_\lambda^{(n)} - \int |\Psi^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle \Psi^{\otimes n}| d\nu^\varepsilon(\Psi) \right) \right] = 0 \quad (2.21)$$

for every Hilbert–Schmidt operator  $B_n$  on  $\mathfrak{H}^n$ , for every  $n \geq 1$ . Choosing  $B_n = |\varphi^{\otimes n}\rangle \langle \varphi^{\otimes n}|$  with  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ , we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \left( n! \lambda^n \langle \varphi^{\otimes n}, \Gamma_\lambda^{(n)} \varphi^{\otimes n} \rangle - \int |\langle \varphi, \Phi \rangle|^{2n} d\nu^\varepsilon(\Phi) \right) = 0, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (2.22)$$

From this and Theorem 2.4 we obtain the desired result in Theorem 2.1.

**Remark 2.7.** *Theorem 2.6 is comparable to [FKSS23, Proposition 5.2] and both extend previous results with  $\varepsilon \simeq 1$  in [LNR21, FKSS22]. While the proof in [FKSS23] is based on a refinement of the functional integral approach in [FKSS23], we employ the variational approach in [LNR21]. The latter approach is notably general; in particular, we will see that the proof does not rely on specific properties of the counter terms, except that they are all bounded by  $O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ . The precise choice of the counter terms is more relevant to the convergence from the Hartree measure to the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory at the classical field level, as established in Theorem 2.4.*

#### 2.4. Ideas of the proof and structure of the paper.

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proofs of Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 2.4. Let us first explain the proof strategy of Theorem 2.4. We consider the stochastic quantization of the measure (3.1), given by:

$$\mathcal{L}\Psi^\varepsilon = -(v^\varepsilon * :|\Psi^\varepsilon|^2: )\Psi^\varepsilon + (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon + 1 - m)\Psi^\varepsilon + \xi, \quad (2.23)$$

and the stochastic quantization of the measure (2.17) formally given by

$$\mathcal{L}\Phi = -|\Phi|^2\Phi - (2C_1 + 2C_2 - 1 + m)\Phi + \xi. \quad (2.24)$$

Here and in the following, we define  $\mathcal{L} = \partial_t - \Delta + 1$ , with  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\xi$  denotes complex-valued space-time white noise on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ . We refer to Section 3.1 and (3.28) for more explain on the Wick renormalization  $:|\Psi^\varepsilon|^2:$ .

The core idea behind the proof of Theorem 2.4 is to use the dynamics of (2.23) and (2.24) to establish the convergence of the stationary measures (2.15) associated with the dynamics of (2.23) to the stationary measure (2.17) corresponding to equation (2.24). To this end, we first prove the convergence of the solutions to equation (2.23) to the solutions of equation (2.24) if the initial data

converges in suitable Besov space  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ ,  $\kappa > 0$ . We then focus on deriving uniform in  $\varepsilon$  estimates (coming down from infinity) for stationary solutions to (2.23). This is done by decomposing the equation into its low-frequency and high-frequency components, and then combining an  $L^2$ -energy bound with Schauder estimates. Then, using the uniform in  $\varepsilon$  moments bounds for the stationary solutions, we establish tightness of the quantum fields (2.17) in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . Finally, by leveraging the convergence of the dynamics and the uniqueness of the invariant measure for equation (2.24), as provided by the theory of singular SPDEs, we identify the tight limit as the  $\Phi_3^4$  field, completing the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Concerning the uniform in  $\varepsilon$  moments bounds for the stationary solutions, the term  $-|\Phi|^2\Phi$  plays a crucial role in the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model. In that case, we can apply  $L^p$ -energy estimates or the maximum principle to obtain uniform control of the solutions. However, in our modified setting, the nonlinear term  $-v^\varepsilon * |\Psi|^2\Psi$  only provides a weaker damping effect in  $L^2$ -energy estimates. As a result, we need to present a more refined analysis of the nonlinearity to achieve uniform control (see Remark 4.4 below).

In Section 3, we begin by analyzing the stochastic quantization equations via paracontrolled calculus and demonstrate that if the initial data converges in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ , then the solutions to the corresponding dynamics also converge (see Theorem 3.17 below). Section 4 is focused on deriving global in  $\varepsilon$  estimates for stationary solutions to (3.1) and establishing the convergence of the fields, which leads to the proof of Theorem 2.4. All stochastic estimates are collected in Section 5 below.

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 2.6. We will use the variational approach proposed in [LNR15, LNR18, LNR21], and also a correlation inequality from the recent work [DNN25] to refine the analysis. On one hand, the Hartree measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  in (2.15) is the unique minimizer for the variational problem

$$-\log \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon = \min_{\nu} \text{proba. meas.}_{\nu' \ll \mu_0} \left\{ \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\nu', \mu_0) + \int \mathcal{D}[u] d\nu'(u) \right\} \quad (2.25)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\nu', \mu_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \frac{d\nu'}{d\mu_0}(u) \log \left( \frac{d\nu'}{d\mu_0}(u) \right) d\mu_0(u) \geq 0$$

is the classical relative entropy between the probability measure  $\nu'$  and the Gaussian free field  $\mu_0$ , and

$$\mathcal{D}[u] = \frac{1}{2} \int :|u(x)|^2 : v^\varepsilon(x-y) :|u(y)|^2 : dx dy - (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - m + 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} :|u(x)|^2 : dx \quad (2.26)$$

is the Wick renormalization of the interaction term. On the other hand, the interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}$  in (2.2) is the *unique minimizer* for the variational problem

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} = \min_{\substack{\Gamma \geq 0 \\ \text{Tr } \Gamma = 1}} \left\{ \mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0) + \text{Tr} [\mathbb{W}\Gamma] \right\}. \quad (2.27)$$

Here

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0) = \text{Tr}[\Gamma(\log \Gamma - \log \Gamma_0)] \geq 0$$

is the relative entropy between a quantum state  $\Gamma$  and the non-interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{Z}_0^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_0}$  in (2.5), and  $\mathbb{W}$  is the renormalized interaction in  $\mathbb{H}_\lambda$ . We have chosen the chemical potential in  $\mathbb{H}_\lambda$  such that  $\mathbb{W}$  is exactly the second quantized version of the classical term  $\mathcal{D}[u]$  in (2.26).

In this approach, we will derive upper and lower bound for the (relative) free energy, and then use the minimizing property of  $\Gamma_\lambda$  to deduce desired properties of the state. Similarly to [LNR21], we will estimate the energy by splitting to low and high momenta. In this approach, the most challenging part of the analysis is the high-momentum estimate, for which we use a new abstract correlation inequality from [DNN25] to improve the analysis and obtain good quantitative estimates in terms of  $\varepsilon$ . This will be explained in Section 6. Finally, in Section 7, we perform a semiclassical approximation in finite dimensions, where the nonlinear classical field theory naturally emerges from a quantitative

quantum de Finetti theorem. In particular, from the free energy estimates, we can extract a norm approximation for the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$  as well as its reduced density matrices.

The rest of the paper is devoted to proving Theorems 2.6 and 2.4 as outlined above.

**2.5. Notations.** Throughout the paper, we use the notation  $a \lesssim b$  if there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $a \leq cb$ , and we write  $a \simeq b$  if  $a \lesssim b$  and  $b \lesssim a$ . We will denote by  $C$  a general positive constant independent of relevant variables, whose value may change from line to line.

We use the convention that the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  of a (complex) Hilbert space is linear in the second argument and antilinear in the first. In particular, we set  $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \overline{f}g dx$  for  $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$  and we write  $L^p = L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)$ . We also set  $e_k(x) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{ix \cdot k}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$ .

For index variables  $i$  and  $j$  of Littlewood-Paley decomposition we write  $i \lesssim j$  if  $2^i \lesssim 2^j$ , meaning there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , independent of  $j$  such that  $i \leq j + N$ , and we use  $i \sim j$  to denote both  $i \lesssim j$  and  $j \lesssim i$ . Given a Banach space  $E$  with norm  $\|\cdot\|_E$  and  $T > 0$ , we write  $C_T E = C([0, T]; E)$  for the space of continuous functions from  $[0, T]$  to  $E$ , equipped with the supremum norm  $\|\cdot\|_{C_T E}$ . For  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  we also define  $C_T^\alpha E$  as the space of  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous functions from  $[0, T]$  to  $E$ , endowed with the seminorm  $\|f\|_{C_T^\alpha E} = \sup_{s, t \in [0, T], s \neq t} \frac{\|f(s) - f(t)\|_E}{|t - s|^\alpha}$ .

We have for  $\mathcal{F}^{-1}m \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$

$$\sum_k m(k) \langle f, e_k \rangle e_k = \mathcal{F}^{-1}m * f. \quad (2.28)$$

Here and in what follows, the convolution is taken on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , and we consider  $f$  as a periodic function on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha$  the Besov spaces on the torus, with general indices  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ . Additionally, we use the notations  $\mathbf{C}^\alpha = \mathbf{B}_{\infty, \infty}^\alpha$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_p^\alpha = \mathbf{B}_{p, \infty}^\alpha$ , and  $H^\alpha = \mathbf{B}_{2,2}^\alpha$ . The definition of Besov spaces and some useful lemmas are provided in Appendix A.

Our proof in Sections 3 through 5 is based on the paracontrolled calculus introduced in [GIP15]. This calculus relies on Bony's paraproducts [Bon81], specifically  $f \prec g$ ,  $f \succ g$ , and the resonant term  $f \circ g$ . For the definitions and basic estimates related to paracontrolled calculus, we refer to Appendix A.

### 3. CONVERGENCE OF THE DYNAMICS ASSOCIATED WITH (2.15)

We now consider the system of SPDEs arising from the stochastic quantization of the measure (2.15), given by:

$$\mathcal{L}\Psi^\varepsilon = -(v^\varepsilon * :|\Psi^\varepsilon|^2:) \Psi^\varepsilon + (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon + 1 - m)\Psi^\varepsilon + \xi. \quad (3.1)$$

Here and in the following, we define  $\mathcal{L} = \partial_t - \Delta + 1$ , with  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\xi$  denotes complex-valued space-time white noise on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ . More precisely, we write  $\xi = \xi_1 + i\xi_2$ , where  $(\xi_1, \xi_2)$  are independent, real-valued space-time white noises. The term  $:|\Psi^\varepsilon|^2:$  refers to Wick renormalization, as defined in Section 3.1 and (3.28) below.

In this section, we assume condition **(Hv)**. Under this assumption, we obtain that  $(1 + |x|^\kappa)v \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $\kappa \in [0, 1/2)$ . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 + |x|^\kappa)v\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} &= \|(1 + |x|^\kappa)\mathcal{F}^{-1}\hat{v}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|(1 + |x|^2)\mathcal{F}^{-1}\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(I - \Delta)\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|(I - \Delta)\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The stochastic quantization of the measure (2.17) is formally given by

$$\mathcal{L}\Phi = -|\Phi|^2\Phi - (2C_1 + 2C_2 - 1 + m)\Phi + \xi. \quad (3.3)$$

Here

$$C_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6} \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{\hat{v}(x)(\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y) - x \cdot \nabla \hat{v}(y))}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy$$

$$+ \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{\hat{v}(x)(\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y))}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy < \infty, \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$C_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6} \left( \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y) - x \cdot \nabla \hat{v}(y)}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy + \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{\hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x-y)}{2|x|^4|y|^2} dx dy \right) < \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

We use **(Hv)** to derive the finiteness of  $C_1, C_2$ .

Equation (3.3) is referred to as the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model. Due to the singular nature of the space-time white noise, the nonlinear term  $|\Phi|^2\Phi$  from (3.3) does not have a classical interpretation. Instead, it must be understood through advanced frameworks such as regularity structures [Hai14] or paracontrolled calculus [GIP15], which introduce a specific structure for the solutions and allow the analytically ill-defined products to be made sense of using probabilistic tools and renormalization techniques.

The primary objective of this section is to demonstrate the convergence of the stochastic quantization (3.1) of the measure (2.15) to the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3), as stated in Theorem 3.17 below. The main strategy is to compare the respective nonlinear terms:  $v^{\varepsilon*} : |\Psi^\varepsilon|^2 : \Psi^\varepsilon$  from equation (3.1), and  $|\Phi|^2\Phi$  from the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3), using paracontrolled calculus. To this end, we express the convolution  $v^\varepsilon * f$  in terms of a shift operator  $\tau_y f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\cdot - y)$  as  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y f$ , which allows us to apply paracontrolled calculus to equation (3.1).

**Remark 3.1.** *An interesting aspect is the appearance of a new linear term  $2(C_1 + C_2)\Phi$  in the limiting equation (3.3), where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  depend on  $v$ . We can also consider the stochastic quantization of the measure (2.18) given by*

$$\mathcal{L}\Psi^\varepsilon = -(v^{\varepsilon*} : |\Psi^\varepsilon|^2 : )\Psi^\varepsilon + (v^\varepsilon G) * \Psi^\varepsilon + (1 - m - 6b^\varepsilon)\Psi^\varepsilon + \xi. \quad (3.6)$$

The nonlocal term  $(v^\varepsilon G) * \Psi^\varepsilon$  arises from the Wick renormalization for  $(v^{\varepsilon*} : |\Psi^\varepsilon|^2 : )\Psi^\varepsilon$ , which is the natural renormalization for the Hartree  $\Phi_3^4$  model and also appears as a renormalization term in [Bri22, OOT24].

As  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the limit of equation (3.6) corresponds to equation (3.1) with  $C_1 = C_2 = 0$ . The transition from the Wick renormalization term  $(v^\varepsilon G) * \Psi^\varepsilon$  in (3.6) to  $a^\varepsilon \Psi^\varepsilon$  in equation (3.1) creates a new mass term  $(2C_1 + 2C_2)\Phi$  in the limiting equation (3.3). Formally, this transition introduces a new term  $\mathcal{R}\Psi^\varepsilon \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{3}{2}-\kappa}$  (see Lemma 3.9) in the equation, which leads to new renormalization terms  $c_1^\varepsilon$  and  $c_2^\varepsilon$  when dealing with products involving  $\mathcal{R}\Psi^\varepsilon$ , similar to the appearance of  $b^\varepsilon$  (see Proposition 3.12 Proposition 3.10 below). Through direct computation, these renormalization terms converge to finite constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , owing to the special structure of the operator  $\mathcal{R}$ .

The basic idea to analyze equations (3.1) and (3.3) is to decompose them into an irregular part and a regular part. The most irregular part of the equation is given by the solution to the following linear equation:

$$\mathcal{L}Z = \xi, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $Z$  denotes the stationary solution to the linear equation (3.7). Since space-time white noise is a random distribution with space-time regularity  $-\frac{5}{2} - \kappa$  (for  $\kappa > 0$  under parabolic scaling), we obtain  $Z \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{2}} \cap C_T^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{3}{2}+2\sigma-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s., for every  $\kappa, \sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . Here,  $T \in (0, \infty)$  represents an arbitrary finite time. By substituting  $Z$  into the nonlinear terms of equations (3.1) and (3.3), the singularity of  $Z$  causes the products involving  $Z$  to lose their meaning in the classical analytical framework. Renormalization and probabilistic tools are required for these terms.

In the following, we first introduce the stochastic objects required for the rigorous formulation of the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3) and the approximation equation (3.1). Then, we present the paracontrolled solution framework, incorporating the paracontrolled ansatz for (3.3) and (3.1). Finally, we prove the convergence of equation (3.1) to equation (3.3).

**3.1. Stochastic Objects and Renormalization.** In this section we introduce the renormalized terms. To begin, we define some useful notations. Let  $P_t f = e^{t(\Delta^{-1})} f$  and  $\mathcal{I}f = \mathcal{L}^{-1}f = \int_0^\cdot P_{\cdot-s} f ds$ . Let  $Z_\delta$  be the stationary solution to  $\mathcal{L}Z_\delta = \xi_\delta$  with  $\xi_\delta$  being  $\xi$  mollified with a bump function.

We also introduce graph notation as follows. We use  $\mathcal{Z}^\bullet$  to denote space-time white noise  $\xi$  and use  $\mathcal{Z}^\star$  to denote the conjugate of space-time white noise  $\bar{\xi}$ . We use  $\mathcal{Z}^\uparrow$  to denote  $Z$  and use  $\mathcal{Z}^\downarrow$  to denote  $\bar{Z}$ . After subtracting the  $Z$ -term from equation (3.3), we encounter terms involving the square and cubic powers of  $Z$  in the remainder equation. These terms are defined through the Wick product, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangledown} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangledown} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (|Z_\delta|^2 - a_\delta), & \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} Z_\delta^2, \\ \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleleft} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangledown}), & \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleleft} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright}), \\ \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangledown\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{I}(|Z_\delta|^2 Z_\delta - 2a_\delta Z_\delta), & \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{I}(|Z_\delta|^2 \bar{Z}_\delta - 2a_\delta \bar{Z}_\delta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where  $a_\delta = \mathbf{E}[|Z_\delta|^2(t)] \sim \frac{1}{\delta}$  is a divergent constant independent of  $t$  due to stationarity. In the remainder equation for  $\Phi - Z$  the most irregular part is the third Wick power and we need to continue with the decomposition in the same spirit to cancel it (see (3.23) below).

We further introduce the corresponding  $\varepsilon$  dependent stochastic objects from the nonlinear term of equation (3.1):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangledown\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (v_\varepsilon * \bar{Z})Z - a^\varepsilon, & \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v_\varepsilon * ZZ, \\ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (v_\varepsilon * \bar{Z})\bar{Z}, & \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleleft\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v_\varepsilon * \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright}, \\ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleleft\blacktriangledown} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright}), & \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangledown}), \\ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright}), & \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangledown\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} Z - (v^\varepsilon G) * Z, \quad \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright}),$$

where we recall  $a^\varepsilon = \mathbf{E}[v_\varepsilon * \bar{Z}Z]$  and  $G(x-y) = \mathbf{E}Z(x)\bar{Z}(y)$ .

The renormalization described in (3.8) is insufficient for handling the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3). Even further expansions do not completely resolve the issue, as ill-defined products persist. To address this, we employ paracontrolled calculus, which requires the construction of the following stochastic objects:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright} - \tilde{b}_\delta), & \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright}), \\ \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\mathcal{I}(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright} - 2\tilde{b}_\delta), & \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright}), \\ \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \circ Z_\delta, & \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \circ Z_\delta, \\ \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \circ \bar{Z}_\delta, & & \\ \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright} - 2\tilde{b}_\delta Z_\delta), & \mathcal{Z}^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright} - 2\tilde{b}_\delta Z_\delta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

with  $\tilde{b}_\delta = \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\blacktriangleright})$ . Here  $\tilde{b}_\delta$  depends on  $t$  and satisfies  $\sup_{t \geq 0} |\tilde{b}_\delta(t)| \lesssim |\log \delta|$ .

We further introduce the corresponding  $\varepsilon$ -dependent renormalization terms:

$$\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} - \tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon, \quad \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon, \quad \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright}, \quad (3.11)$$

use the condition  $\mathbf{E}ZZ = 0$  to ensure that several renormalization constants vanish. Specifically, we define  $\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon = \mathbf{E}\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright}$  and  $\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon = \mathbf{E}\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright}$ . Additionally, we introduce  $\tilde{b}_4^\varepsilon = \mathbf{E}\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright} \circ \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\blacktriangleright}$ ,  $\tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon =$

$\mathbf{E}Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla}, \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon = \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon - \tilde{b}_4^\varepsilon$ , which will be used below. Note that  $\tilde{b}_i^\varepsilon$  is given as  $b_i^\varepsilon$  in (2.12) with  $b(k_1, k_2)$  in (2.12) replaced by  $\tilde{b}_i(k_1, k_2)$

$$\tilde{b}_i(k_1, k_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b(k_1, k_2)(1 - e^{-t(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_1 + k_2|^2 + 3)}). \quad (3.12)$$

We have for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$  and  $\kappa > 0$

$$\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} |\tilde{b}_i^\varepsilon(t) - b_i^\varepsilon| \lesssim t^{-\kappa}.$$

We also introduce the following  $\varepsilon$ -dependent renormalization terms:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (v^\varepsilon * Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla}) \circ Z, & Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (v^\varepsilon * \overline{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla}) \circ Z, \\ Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ \overline{Z}, & Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ Z, \\ Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ v^\varepsilon * \overline{Z}, & Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ v^\varepsilon * Z, \\ Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} - (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)Z. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

We also set

$$Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} + Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} (\prec + \succ) Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla}.$$

The nonlinearity in equation (3.1) involves convolution with  $v^\varepsilon$ . To apply paracontrolled calculus to this term, we introduce the following shift operator for  $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ :

$$\tau_y f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\cdot - y), \quad (3.14)$$

and express  $v^\varepsilon * f = \int v(y) \tau_y f dy$ . Using this shift operator, we define the following random fields that depend on  $y$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Z_y^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} : \tau_y \overline{Z} Z : \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\tau_y \overline{Z}_\delta Z_\delta - \mathbf{E}[\tau_y \overline{Z}_\delta Z_\delta]) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\tau_y \overline{Z}_\delta Z_\delta - G_\delta(y)), \\ Z_y^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} : \tau_y Z Z : \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\tau_y Z_\delta Z_\delta), & Z_y^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{Z}_y^{\nabla} \\ Z_y^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(Z_y^{\nabla}), & Z_y^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(Z_y^{\nabla}), & Z_y^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(Z_y^{\nabla}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

with the limit in  $L^p(\Omega; C_T \mathbf{C}^{-1-\kappa})$  for  $p \geq 1, \kappa > 0$ . Here  $G_\delta$  is  $G$  mollified with a bump function. As in (3.10) we also define the following  $y$ -dependent random fields and the related renormalization counterterms:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\tau_y Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla}) \circ Z, & Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\tau_y \overline{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla}) \circ Z, \\ Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ \tau_y \overline{Z}, & Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ \tau_y Z, \\ Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_y^{\nabla} \circ Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(t, y), & Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_y^{\nabla} \circ Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla}, \\ Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_y Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla} - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(t, y), & Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_y Z_\varepsilon^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla}, \\ Z_{y,y_1}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_y Z_{y_1}^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla}, & Z_{y,y_1}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_y Z_{y_1}^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla} - \tilde{b}_3(t, y, y_1), \\ Z_{y,y_1}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_y \overline{Z}_{y_1}^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla}, & Z_{y,y_1}^{\nabla} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_y Z_{y_1}^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla} - \tilde{b}_5(t, y, y_1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where the RHS of the last two lines can be defined as in (3.10) via probabilistic estimates and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(t, y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E}[\tau_y Z_y^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla}] = \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k_1 + k_2) b_t(k_1, k_2) e^{-i k_1 y}, \\ \tilde{b}_3(t, y, y_1) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E}[\tau_y Z_{y_1}^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla}] = \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3} b_t(k_1, k_2) e^{-i k_1 (y + y_1)}, \\ \tilde{b}_5(t, y, y_1) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E}[\tau_y Z_{y_1}^{\nabla} \circ Z_y^{\nabla}] = \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3} b_t(k_1, k_2) (e^{-i(k_1 y + k_2 y_1)} + e^{-i k_1 (y + y_1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Here  $\tilde{b}_3(y, y_1)$  and  $\tilde{b}_5(y, y_1)$  can be viewed as  $L^2$  function in  $y, y_1$ . We also introduce the following random fields through  $y$ -dependent random fields:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \tau_y \mathbf{Z}_{y_1}^{\heartsuit} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1, \\ \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \tau_y \mathbf{Z}_{y_1}^{\heartsuit} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1 - \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy, \\ \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \tau_y \mathbf{Z}_{y_1}^{\heartsuit} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \tau_y \mathbf{Z}_{y_1}^{\heartsuit} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1 - \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

For  $y$ -dependent random fields in (3.16) and  $\varepsilon$ -dependent random fields in (3.11), (3.13) and (3.18) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy, \\ \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy, \\ \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy, \\ \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) \mathbf{Z}_y^{\heartsuit} dy, \\ \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \mathbf{Z}_{y,y_1,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \mathbf{Z}_{y,y_1,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1, \\ \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \mathbf{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1, & \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \mathbf{Z}_{y,y_1,\varepsilon}^{\heartsuit} dy dy_1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(t, y) dy = \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(t), \quad \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \tilde{b}_i(t, y, y_1) dy dy_1 = \tilde{b}_i^\varepsilon(t), \quad (3.20)$$

for  $i = 3, 5$ .

We then recall the following moments bounds for the stochastic terms from [CC18], [Hos18]. To this end we also introduce  $|\tau|$  for every  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$  in the following table.

|                    |                                   |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$ | $\mathcal{Z}$                     | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ |
| $ \tau $           | $-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{2}$ | $-1 - \kappa$              | $-1 - \kappa$              | $\frac{1}{2} - \kappa$     | $\frac{1}{2} - \kappa$     | $-\kappa$                  | $-\kappa$                  |
| $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$        | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ | $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ |
| $ \tau $           | $-\kappa$                         | $-\kappa$                  | $-\kappa$                  | $-\kappa$                  | $-\kappa$                  | $-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa$    | $-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa$    |

TABLE 1. Regularity of stochastic objects:  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$

**Lemma 3.2.** *It holds that for every  $p \geq 1, \kappa > 0$  and every  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$  from Table 1*

$$\mathbf{E} \|\mathcal{Z}^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|}}^p + \mathbf{E} \|\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{8}} L^\infty}^p \lesssim 1.$$

The convergence in (3.8) and (3.10) hold in  $L^p(\Omega; C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|})$ .

We use  $\mathbb{Z} = (\mathcal{Z}^\tau)$  for the tree  $\tau$  appear in Lemma 3.2 and  $\|\mathbb{Z}\|$  to denote the smallest number bigger than 1 and  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|}$ -norm of  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$  from Table 1 and  $C_T^{\frac{1}{8}} L^\infty$ -norm of  $\mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}$ .

By probabilistic calculation as in [CC18, ZZ18] we can prove the following convergence of the corresponding renormalized terms. We collect  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  and the corresponding limit  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$  in the following table.

**Proposition 3.3.** *For every  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  and corresponding  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$  in Table 2 it holds that for every  $\kappa > 0$  and  $p \geq 1$*

$$\mathbf{E} \|\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon} - \mathcal{Z}^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau| - \kappa}}^p + \mathbf{E} \|\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\heartsuit} - \mathcal{Z}^{\heartsuit}\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{8}} L^\infty}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\kappa p},$$



|                                    |                              |                              |                              |                              |                              |                              |                              |                              |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| $Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\uparrow}$   | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ |
| $Z^\tau$                           | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               |
| $Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ |                              |
| $Z^\tau$                           | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               |                              |

 TABLE 2. Convergence of stochastic objects  $Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  to  $Z^\tau$ 

and

$$\mathbf{E} \|Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|}}^p + \mathbf{E} \|Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{8}} L^\infty}^p \lesssim 1,$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows the same probabilistic calculations as in [CC18, ZZ18], utilizing the chaos expansion of the stochastic terms, Gaussian hypercontractivity and Besov embedding Lemma A.1. The only difference is the appearance of the additional term  $v^\varepsilon$ , which introduces a Fourier multiplier  $\hat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \rightarrow 1$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We replace 1 with  $\hat{v}^\varepsilon(k)$ , and by applying  $|\hat{v}^\varepsilon(k) - 1| \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa |k|^\kappa$  we derive the result using the same approach.  $\square$

We collect  $Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  and the corresponding limit  $Z^\tau$  in the following table.

|                                    |                              |                              |                              |                              |                              |                              |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| $Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ | $Z_\varepsilon^{\downarrow}$ |
| $Z^\tau$                           | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               | $Z^\downarrow$               |

 TABLE 3. Convergence of stochastic objects  $Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  to  $Z^\tau$ 

**Proposition 3.4.** For every  $Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  and corresponding  $Z^\tau$  in Table 3 it holds that for every  $\kappa > 0$  and  $p \geq 1$

$$\mathbf{E} \|Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon} - Z^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|-\kappa}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\kappa p},$$

and

$$\mathbf{E} \|Z_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|}}^p + \mathbf{E} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^3} \|Z_y^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-1-\kappa}}^p \lesssim 1,$$

for  $Z_y^\tau \in \{Z_y^\downarrow, Z_y^\downarrow\}$  and

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^3} \|Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\tau_\varepsilon}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}}^p + \mathbf{E} \sup_{y, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \|Z_{y, y_1}^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}}^p \lesssim 1,$$

for  $Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\tau_\varepsilon} \in \{Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\downarrow}\}$  and  $Z_{y, y_1}^\tau \in \{Z_{y, y_1}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y, y_1}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y, y_1}^{\downarrow}, Z_{y, y_1}^{\downarrow}\}$ , where the proportional constants are independent of  $\varepsilon$ . Moreover, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^3} \left( \frac{\|Z_y^{\downarrow} - Z^\downarrow\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}} + \|Z_y^{\downarrow} - Z^\downarrow\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}}}{|y|^\kappa} \right)^p \lesssim 1.$$

*Proof.* The convergence results follow exactly as in Proposition 3.3. For further details, we also refer to the proof of Proposition 3.12 below. Regarding the uniform bounds in  $y$  for  $Z_y^\tau$ ,  $Z_{y,\varepsilon}^{\tau_\varepsilon}$ , and  $Z_{y, y_1}^\tau$ , we can use the estimate

$$|e^{-iky_1} - e^{-iky_2}| \lesssim |y_1 - y_2|^\lambda |k|^\lambda, \quad (3.21)$$

for  $0 < \lambda < 1$ , and apply Kolmogorov's continuity criterion to conclude the result for  $y \in \mathbb{T}^3$ . Since  $\mathcal{Z}_y^\tau$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\tau_\varepsilon}$ , and  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^\tau$  are periodic in  $y$ , we extend this result to  $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . For the final result, we also use (3.21) to deduce that it holds for  $\sup_{y \in [-\pi, \pi]^3}$  by the same argument, which can be easily extended to  $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , thereby implying the last result.  $\square$

We set

$$\mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon} = (\mathcal{Z}_y^\tau, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\tau_\varepsilon}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^\tau),$$

for  $\mathcal{Z}_y^\tau \in \{\mathcal{Z}_y^\vee, \mathcal{Z}_y^\nabla\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\tau_\varepsilon} \in \{\mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla\blacktriangleright}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\vee\blacktriangleleft}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla\blacktriangleleft}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\vee\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\vee\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft\blacktriangleright}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft\blacktriangleright}\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^\tau \in \{\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\nabla\blacktriangleright}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\vee\blacktriangleleft}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\nabla\blacktriangleleft}\}$ . We also use  $\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon = (\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}, \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}, \mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon})$  for the tree  $\tau_\varepsilon$ , which appears in Propositions 3.3, 3.4 and  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  to denote the smallest number bigger than 1 and  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|}$ -norm of  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon}$  from Table 2 and Table 3. Additionally,  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  is also greater than  $\sup_y \|\mathcal{Z}_y^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-1-\kappa}}$  and  $\sup_y \|\mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\tau_\varepsilon}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}}$  and  $\sup_{y,y_1} \|\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}}$ .

In the following we fix  $\kappa > 0$  small enough.

**3.2. Paracontrolled calculus for equations.** In this section we apply paracontrolled calculus for the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3) and equation (3.1).

**3.2.1. Paracontrolled calculus for equation (3.3).** At the level of approximation, equation (3.3) can be viewed as the limiting case of the following equations as  $\delta$  approaches 0:

$$\mathcal{L}\Phi_\delta = -(|\Phi_\delta|^2 \Phi_\delta - (2a_\delta - 6b_\delta)\Phi_\delta) - (2C_1 + 2C_2 + m - 1)\Phi_\delta + \xi_\delta, \quad (3.22)$$

where  $a_\delta$  is given in Section 3.1,  $b_\delta = \mathbf{E}(\int_{-\infty}^\cdot P_{-\cdot} \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\vee\blacktriangleright} ds \circ \mathcal{Z}_\delta^{\vee\blacktriangleright})$  is a constant, and  $\xi_\delta$  is the mollification of  $\xi$  with a bump function. Since both  $a_\delta$  and  $b_\delta$  diverge to infinity as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , directly analyzing equation (3.22) becomes challenging. To address this, we decompose equation (3.3) into an irregular part and a regular part as follows:

$$\Phi = Z - \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \varphi, \quad (3.23)$$

with  $\varphi$  solving the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\varphi = & 2\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} - 2\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}\varphi - \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}\bar{\varphi} - |\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \varphi|^2 Z - |\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \varphi|^2 (-\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \varphi) \\ & + \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} - 2\text{Re}[(-\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \varphi)\bar{Z}](-\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \varphi) \\ & - (2C_1 + 2C_2 + m - 1 + 6b)(Z - \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \varphi), \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}(\prec + \succ)\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}, \quad \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} + \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}(\prec + \succ)\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright},$$

with  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$  being random objects introduced in Section 3.1. From (3.10)  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$  evolve renormalization from  $\tilde{b}_\delta$  and

$$b(t) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (b_\delta - \tilde{b}_\delta(t)) = \sum_{k_1, k_2} e^{-(|k_1+k_2|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + 3)t} b(k_1, k_2) \lesssim t^{-\kappa}$$

for any  $\kappa > 0$ . Note that the Wick renormalization part  $2a_\delta\Phi_\delta$  from the approximation (3.22) has been incorporated into  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$  in equation (3.24), whereas  $6\tilde{b}_\delta\Phi_\delta$  appears in the definition of  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$  in (3.10), as well as in the definition of  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} \circ \varphi$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright} \circ \bar{\varphi}$  below. Additionally, in (3.22) and the construction of the  $\Phi_3^4$  field in (2.17) we use the renormalization constant  $b_\delta$ , while in the definition of  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$  we use renormalization involving  $\tilde{b}_\delta$  to ensure that  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}$  stay in  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.. As a result, we have an additional  $b$  term in the last line of equation (3.24).

The main difficulty to understand equation (3.24) comes from  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\blacktriangleright}\bar{\varphi}$ . In fact these two terms are not well-defined in the classical sense as the expected sum of their regularities is not strictly

positive for the resonant product  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \varphi$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \bar{\varphi}$  to be well-defined, cf. Lemma A.5. Collecting the terms which makes  $\varphi$  too irregular leads to the following paraproduct ansatz

$$\varphi = 2(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + (\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + \varphi^\sharp. \quad (3.25)$$

Then  $\varphi^\sharp$  becomes more regular than  $\varphi$  since

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^\sharp &= \varphi + 2\mathcal{I}[(\varphi - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}] + \mathcal{I}[(\bar{\varphi} - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}] \\ &\quad - 2[\mathcal{I}, (\varphi - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) \prec] \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - [\mathcal{I}, (\bar{\varphi} - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) \prec] \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $[\mathcal{I}, f \prec]g$  denotes the commutator between  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $f \prec$  given by

$$[\mathcal{I}, f \prec]g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(f \prec g) - f \prec \mathcal{I}(g).$$

Here the second and the third terms on the right hand side cancel the irregular terms in  $\varphi$  whereas the last two terms have better regularity by Lemma A.8. Using (3.25) and the commutator Lemma A.7 we define  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \varphi, \bar{\varphi} \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2[(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}] \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + [(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}] \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + \varphi^\sharp \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \\ \bar{\varphi} \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2[(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}] \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + [(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi) \prec \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\mathbf{V}}] \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + \bar{\varphi}^\sharp \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) + (\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi) \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \\ ((\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) + (\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}) \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \\ ((\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) + (\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \bar{\varphi}) \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \\ ((\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi) \prec \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\mathbf{V}}) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi, \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\mathbf{V}}, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}) + (\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi) \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

where  $C$  is the commutator from Lemma A.7. Note that the stochastic terms  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}, \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  defined in (3.10) require the renormalization  $\tilde{b}_\delta$ .

Let us now formulate the definition of paracontrolled solution to (3.24). We also note that  $|\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + \varphi|^2 \mathcal{Z}$  and  $2\text{Re}[(-\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + \varphi)\bar{\mathcal{Z}}]\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}$  also evolve terms not well-defined in the classical sense and will be defined in Lemma 3.19 and Lemma 3.21 below using stochastic objects introduced in (3.10). We introduce the following solution space: for a small number  $\kappa > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} = \{(\varphi, \varphi^\sharp) \in (C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa})^2, \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\varphi(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} t^{\frac{1+3\kappa}{2}} \|\varphi(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \\ + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} t^{\frac{3+8\kappa}{4}} \|\varphi^\sharp(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1+3\kappa}} < \infty.\} \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 3.5.** *We say that a pair  $(\varphi, \varphi^\sharp) \in \mathcal{D}$  is a paracontrolled solution to equation (3.24) provided  $\varphi^\sharp$  given by (3.25) and  $\varphi$  satisfies (3.24) in the analytic weak sense with  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \varphi$  and  $\bar{\varphi} \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}$  given by (3.26).*

Based on this definition we also call  $\Phi$  is a solution to the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model if  $\Phi$  satisfies (3.23) with  $\varphi$  in (3.23) is a solution to equation (3.24) in the sense of Definition 3.5.

We recall the following result from [CC18, MW17].

**Theorem 3.6.** *For any  $\Phi(0) \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  there exists a global in time unique solutions  $(\varphi, \varphi^\sharp) \in \mathcal{D}$  P-a.s. to equation (3.24).*

We take solution  $\varphi$  from Theorem 3.6 and define

$$\Phi = Z - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} + \varphi,$$

which gives a unique solution to the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3). According to [HM18], these solutions also constitute a Markov process within the space  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . By leveraging the uniform estimates provided in [MW17] or [GH21], one can utilize the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3) to offer a novel construction of the  $\Phi_3^4$  field  $\nu$ . This can be achieved through the Krylov-Bogoliubov method applied to the Markov semigroup or via lattice approximation (c.f. [GH21]). Additionally, we employ general ergodicity results from [HM18, HS22] along with lattice approximation techniques from [GH21, HM18a, ZZ18] to establish the following conclusion.

**Theorem 3.7.** *There exists a unique invariant measure to the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model (3.3) given by  $\nu$  from (2.17).*

3.2.2. *Paracontrolled calculus for equation (3.1).* In equation (3.1)  $:\Psi^\varepsilon|^2$ : denotes the Wick renormalization, which is understood as follows: More precisely, we decompose  $\Psi^\varepsilon = Z + u^\varepsilon$ , where  $u^\varepsilon$  satisfies the equation:

$$\mathcal{L}u^\varepsilon = -(v^\varepsilon * (\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} + 2\text{Re}(u^\varepsilon \bar{Z}) + |u^\varepsilon|^2))(Z + u^\varepsilon) + (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - m + 1)(Z + u^\varepsilon). \quad (3.28)$$

In this equation we interpret  $:\Psi^\varepsilon|^2$ : as  $\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} + 2\text{Re}(u^\varepsilon \bar{Z}) + |u^\varepsilon|^2$ , where the Wick renormalization counterpart is encapsulated in  $\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}$ . For fixed  $\varepsilon$ , due to the smoothing effect of  $v$ , we obtain local well-posedness of solutions to equation (3.28) and also (3.1), similar to the approach used for the dynamical  $\Phi_2^4$  model (c.f. [DD03, MW17a]). We first state the following result by using Bourgain's argument [Bou94].

**Theorem 3.8.** *For fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $\Psi^\varepsilon(0) \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  there exist a unique solution to equation (3.1) in  $C([0, T]; \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa})$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. Moreover,  $\nu^\varepsilon$  from (2.15) is the unique invariant measure of the solutions to equation (3.1).*

The proof of this result is standard and we put it in appendix.

As we need to prove the solution to equation (3.1) converges to the solution of equation (3.3), paracontrolled calculus is required to further analyze equation (3.1). To facilitate this, we need a more detailed decomposition of equation (3.28). Notably the renormalized random field  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla}$  for  $v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} Z$  corresponds to the Wick renormalization  $(v^\varepsilon G) * Z$ , while in equation (3.3) we transform this Wick renormalization to mass renormalization  $a^\varepsilon \Psi^\varepsilon$ , as explained in Remark 3.1. To this end, we rewrite equation (3.1) as

$$\mathcal{L}\Psi^\varepsilon = -(v^\varepsilon * :|\Psi^\varepsilon|^2:) \Psi^\varepsilon + (v^\varepsilon G) * \Psi^\varepsilon + \mathcal{R}\Psi^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon \Psi^\varepsilon - (m - 1)\Psi^\varepsilon + \xi, \quad (3.29)$$

with the operator  $\mathcal{R}f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a^\varepsilon f - (v^\varepsilon G) * f$ . Compared with (3.6) we have an additional term  $\mathcal{R}\Psi^\varepsilon$ , which depends linearly on the solution. For fixed  $\varepsilon$ , the operator  $\mathcal{R}f$  has the same regularity as  $f$ , but this regularity is dependent on  $\varepsilon$ . The following lemma regarding  $\mathcal{R}f$  demonstrates that this operator uniformly reduces regularity by one in  $\varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $f \in \mathbf{B}_p^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$ . Then for  $\eta \in (0, 1)$*

$$\|\mathcal{R}f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{\alpha-1-\eta}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\eta \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^\alpha}.$$

Here the implicit constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

We put the proof of this lemma in Subsection 3.4.

To address the singular SPDE (3.29) as well as the new term  $\mathcal{R}\Psi^\varepsilon$ , we introduce the following decomposition for equation (3.1), omitting  $\varepsilon$  in  $\Psi$  and renormalized terms for simplicity in the sequel:

$$\Psi = Z - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} + \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) + \psi. \quad (3.30)$$

Since  $Z \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1+\kappa}{2}}$ , by Lemma 3.9 we have  $\mathcal{R}Z \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{3}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. and  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \rightarrow 0$  in  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.. We can then easily check that  $\psi$  satisfies the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\psi &= \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla \nabla} - \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} \psi - 2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \bar{Z}]) Z : \\ &\quad - 6\tilde{b}^\varepsilon(Y + \psi) - (\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + 2\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_4^\varepsilon) Z \\ &\quad - (v^\varepsilon * |Y + \psi|^2) Z - (v^\varepsilon * |Y + \psi|^2)(Y + \psi) - 2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) \bar{Z}]) (Y + \psi) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{R}Y + \mathcal{R}\psi + (6\tilde{b}^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - m + 1)\Psi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

where  $6\tilde{b}^\varepsilon = \tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + 2\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + 2\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_4^\varepsilon$  and  $b^\varepsilon$  given in (2.18)

$$Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} + \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z). \quad (3.32)$$

Here and in the following we used the notation for the Wick product over  $\bar{Z}$ :

$$2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[f : \bar{Z}]) Z : \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[f \bar{Z}]) Z - (v^\varepsilon G) * f. \quad (3.33)$$

Regarding the renormalization counterterms  $(v^\varepsilon G) * \Psi$  and  $6b^\varepsilon \Psi$  in equation (3.29) we have

- $(v^\varepsilon G) * Z$  is incorporated into  $\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}$ , while  $(v^\varepsilon G) * (Y + \psi)$  from (3.29) is incorporated into  $2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \bar{Z}]) Z :$ , respectively;
- By (3.13)  $(\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon) Z$  is incorporated into  $\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}$  and  $(\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + 2\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_4^\varepsilon) Z$  serves as the renormalization counterterm for  $2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[Y : \bar{Z}]) Z :$ ;
- The term  $6\tilde{b}^\varepsilon(Y + \psi)$  serves as the renormalization counterterm for  $\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} \psi$  and  $2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[\psi : \bar{Z}]) Z :$ .

Using Lemma 3.9 we know that  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \in \mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. uniform in  $\varepsilon$ . Hence, we note that the convergence of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ Z$  and several new stochastic terms involving  $\mathcal{R}Z$  requires renormalization (c.f. Lemma A.5). We employ probabilistic calculations to prove that they converge to zero in suitable spaces, after subtracting suitable renormalization counterterms.

**Proposition 3.10.** *It holds that for  $\kappa > 0$  and  $p \geq 1$*

$$\mathbf{E} \|(v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z)) \circ Z\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p + \mathbf{E} \|(v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{I}(\bar{\mathcal{R}}Z)) \circ Z - c_1^\varepsilon\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p\kappa}, \quad (3.34)$$

and

$$\mathbf{E} \|(v^\varepsilon * \bar{Z}) \circ \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) - c_1^\varepsilon\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p + \mathbf{E} \|(v^\varepsilon * Z) \circ \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z)\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p\kappa}, \quad (3.35)$$

$$\mathbf{E} \|\text{Re}[\bar{Z} \circ \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z)] - c_2^\varepsilon\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p\kappa}, \quad (3.36)$$

where

$$c_1^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E} [(v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{I}(\bar{\mathcal{R}}Z)) \circ Z] = \mathbf{E} [(v^\varepsilon * \bar{Z}) \circ \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z)], \quad c_2^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E} \text{Re}[\bar{Z} \circ \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z)] \quad (3.37)$$

depending on  $t$ . Moreover,

$$|c_1^\varepsilon(t) - C_1| \lesssim (t^{-\kappa} + 1)\varepsilon^\kappa, \quad |c_2^\varepsilon(t) - C_2| \lesssim (t^{-\kappa} + 1)\varepsilon^\kappa.$$

Here  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are defined in (3.4) and (3.5), respectively, and the proportional constants are independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

The proof of Proposition 3.10 is given in Section 5.1.

**Remark 3.11.** *From Proposition 3.10, we deduce that the renormalization constants from  $\mathcal{R}Z$  converge to finite values  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , which correspond to the newly introduced mass term in the limiting equation (3.3). Furthermore, we will observe the emergence of such new mass terms in the limiting behavior of the nonlinear terms  $(v^\varepsilon * |Y + \psi|^2) Z$ ,  $(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) \bar{Z}]) (Y + \psi)$ , and  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}$ ,  $v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \bar{Z}] Z :$  (see Proposition 3.13, Lemmas 3.19 and 3.21 below).*

Similar as (3.24) to obtain uniform in  $\varepsilon$  estimates for  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}\psi, 2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \bar{Z}])Z$ : requires paracontrolled calculus. The latter term  $2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \bar{Z}]Z$ : involving the convolution with  $v^\varepsilon$ . We use paraproduct decomposition and the random fields introduced in (3.15) to write it as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \bar{Z}]Z : \\
&= \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y(Y + \psi)\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y\overline{(Y + \psi)}\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy \\
&= \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y(Y + \psi) \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y\overline{(Y + \psi)} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy \\
&\quad + \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y(Y + \psi) \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y\overline{(Y + \psi)} \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

Here for fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $Y, \psi \in \mathbf{C}^{\frac{3}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s., and each term on both sides is well-defined. For the first equality, we can rigorously deduce it by approximating  $Z$  with  $Z_\delta$ . To prove convergence to the corresponding terms in the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model, we need to introduce renormalization counterterms for the terms involving the paraproduct  $\circ$ . For the purely stochastic term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y Y \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \bar{Y} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy \\
&= - \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy - \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy \\
&\quad + \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z)} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy.
\end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3.12.** *It holds that for  $\kappa > 0, p \geq 1$*

$$\left( \mathbf{E} \left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy - (\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon)Z - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{2}},$$

and

$$\left( \mathbf{E} \left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy - \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon Z - \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\mathbf{V}} \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{2}},$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

The proof of this result is purely probabilistic, and we will provide the proof of Proposition 3.12 in Section 5.2.

Using Lemma 3.9 we know that  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \in \mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.. Hence, we note that  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ Z$  and several new stochastic terms involving  $\mathcal{R}Z$  do not make sense in the classical setting (c.f. Lemma A.5). We employ probabilistic calculations to prove that they converge to zero in suitable spaces, after subtracting suitable renormalization counterterms.

**Proposition 3.13.** *It holds that for  $\kappa > 0$  and  $p \geq 1$*

$$\mathbf{E} \left\| \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - c_1^\varepsilon Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{p\kappa}{2}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} \left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy - c_2^\varepsilon Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa p}{2}}, \\
& \mathbf{E} \left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy - c_1^\varepsilon Z - c_2^\varepsilon Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa p}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $c_1^\varepsilon, c_2^\varepsilon$  are defined in (3.37) and the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ . Moreover, it holds that

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_y \left\| \tau_y \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z)} \circ Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p + \mathbf{E} \sup_y \left\| \tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p \lesssim 1,$$

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_y \left\| \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \tau_y \bar{Z} \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p + \mathbf{E} \sup_y \left\| \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \tau_y Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p \lesssim 1.$$

The proof of Proposition 3.13 is given in Section 5.1.

By Lemma A.5 the worst part of the RHS of (3.31) is

$$-(\psi + Y) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} - \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y (Y + \psi) \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy - \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \overline{(Y + \psi)} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy,$$

which leads to the following paracontrolled ansatz:

$$\psi = -(\psi + Y) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} - \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y (Y + \psi) \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy - \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \overline{(Y + \psi)} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy + \psi^\sharp. \quad (3.39)$$

Similar to the discussion after (3.25),  $\psi^\sharp$  exhibits better regularity compared to  $\psi$ . Specifically, we have  $\psi^\sharp \in \mathbf{B}_p^{1+2\kappa}$ . As with the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model, the paracontrolled ansatz (3.39) can be used to decompose the terms  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} \circ \psi$ ,  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy$ ,  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{\psi} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy$  and give uniform in  $\varepsilon$  bounds after renormalization.

For  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} \circ \psi$  we have the following result.

**Lemma 3.14.** *It holds that for any  $p \geq 1$  and  $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$*

$$\|\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} \circ \psi + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} (\varepsilon^{\kappa/2} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| + \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2) + \|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{1+2\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|.$$

*Proof.* Similar to (3.26), we substitute the paracontrolled ansatz (3.39) into  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} \circ \psi$  and have the following decomposition :

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} \circ \psi + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi) = - \sum_{i=1}^3 J_i + \psi^\sharp \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}, \quad (3.40)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [(Y + \psi) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}] \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon(Y + \psi), \\ J_2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) [\tau_y (Y + \psi) \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}}] \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} dy - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(Y + \psi), \\ J_3 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) [\tau_y \overline{(Y + \psi)} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}}] \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 we have that

$$\|\psi^\sharp \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{1+2\kappa}} \|\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-\kappa}}.$$

Furthermore  $J_i$  can be decomposed as follows by using the classical commutator from Lemma A.7:

$$J_1 = C(\psi + Y, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}, \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}) + (Y + \psi) \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y} \circ \mathbf{Y}},$$

where  $\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon(Y + \psi)$  is incorporated into  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y} \circ \mathbf{Y}}(Y + \psi)$  from (3.11). Using Lemma A.7 and Proposition 3.3, we obtain

$$\|J_1\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2.$$

For  $J_2$  further refinement is required. In fact, we use the  $y$ -dependent random fields introduced in (3.16) to have

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) C(\tau_y(Y + \psi), \mathcal{Z}_y^\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{Z}^\mathbf{Y}) dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y(Y + \psi) \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}} dy \\ &\quad + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y(Y + \psi) \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(y) dy - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(Y + \psi) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 J_{2i}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_{21} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) C(\tau_y(Y + \psi), \mathcal{Z}_y^\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{Z}^\mathbf{Y}) dy + (Y + \psi) \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}} \\ J_{22} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) [\tau_y(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)] \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}} dy \\ J_{23} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) [\tau_y(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)] \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

for  $\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(y) = \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(t, y)$  defined in (3.17), where we used (3.19) and (3.20).

For  $J_{23}$  we have by Lemma A.9 and (3.2)

$$\|J_{23}\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int |v^\varepsilon(y)| |y|^\kappa \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{2\kappa}} dy \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{2\kappa}}, \tag{3.42}$$

where we used  $|\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 + k_2)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} |k_1 + k_2|^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$  to deduce  $|\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(y)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$ . For  $J_{22}$  we have by Lemma A.9 and Proposition 3.4 and (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \|J_{22}\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} &\lesssim \int |v^\varepsilon(y)| \|\tau_y(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{2\kappa}} \|\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}} dy \\ &\lesssim \int |v^\varepsilon(y)| |y|^\kappa \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} dy \sup_y \|\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

For  $J_{21}$  we use Lemma A.7 and Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 and (A.1) to have

$$\|J_{21}\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2. \tag{3.44}$$

For  $J_3$  in (3.40) we use similar decomposition to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) C(\tau_y(\overline{Y + \psi}), \mathcal{Z}_y^\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{Z}^\mathbf{Y}) dy + \overline{Y + \psi} \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}} \\ &\quad + \int v^\varepsilon(y) [\tau_y(\overline{Y + \psi}) - \overline{Y + \psi}] \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}} dy. \end{aligned}$$

The desired bounds for  $\|J_3\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}}$  follow the same line as that for  $J_{21}$  and  $J_{22}$ . Hence, the result follows.  $\square$

Before proceeding we introduce the following operator, which will be used in the sequel:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_k g(k) \langle f, e_k \rangle e_k,$$

with

$$g(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k_1, k_2} \tilde{b}_t(k_1, k_2) (\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k + k_1)^2 - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)^2), \tag{3.45}$$

for  $\tilde{b}_t$  defined in (3.12).

We have the following result for  $\mathcal{R}_1$ .



**Lemma 3.15.** *It holds that for  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$*

$$\|\mathcal{R}_1 f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^\kappa} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}},$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

We put the proof of this lemma in Section 3.4. Moreover, we have the following result for  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy + (\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi)$  and  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{\psi} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy + \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon(Y + \psi)$ .

**Lemma 3.16.** *It holds that for any  $p \geq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy + (\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi) \right\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} + \left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{\psi} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy + \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon(Y + \psi) \right\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} \\ & \lesssim \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} (\varepsilon^\kappa \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| + \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2) + \|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{1+2\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|, \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We start with the first term and substitute the paracontrolled ansatz (3.39) to obtain

$$\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy + (\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi) = - \sum_{i=1}^3 J_i + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi^\sharp \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy \quad (3.46)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) [\tau_y(Y + \psi) \prec \tau_y \mathcal{Z}^\vee] \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon(Y + \psi), \\ J_2 & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) [\tau_{y+y_1}(\overline{Y + \psi}) \prec \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_{y_1}^\vee] \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy dy_1, \\ J_3 & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) [\tau_{y+y_1}(Y + \psi) \prec \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_{y_1}^\vee] \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy dy_1 - \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon(Y + \psi). \end{aligned}$$

We use the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and Proposition 3.4 and (A.1) to have

$$\left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi^\sharp \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy \right\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^\kappa} \lesssim \|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{1+2\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|.$$

Furthermore, we use  $\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\vee\vee}$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\vee\vee}$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\vee\vee}$  introduced in (3.18) and  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\vee\vee}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\vee\vee}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\vee\vee}$  introduced in (3.16) to decompose  $J_1, J_2, J_3$  as in (3.41). We only give details for  $J_3$  and others follow the same line: Similar as in (3.41) we have

$$J_3 = \sum_{i=1}^3 J_{3i},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_{31} & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) C(\tau_{y+y_1}(Y + \psi), \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_{y_1}^\vee, \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee) dy dy_1 + (Y + \psi) \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\vee\vee}, \\ J_{32} & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) [\tau_{y+y_1}(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)] \mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\vee\vee} dy dy_1, \\ J_{33} & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) [\tau_{y+y_1}(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)] \tilde{b}_3(y, y_1) dy dy_1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{b}_3(y, y_1) = \tilde{b}_3(t, y, y_1)$  defined in (3.17) and we used (3.19) and (3.20).

For  $J_{31}$  we use Lemma A.7 and Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 as in (3.44) and (A.1) to have

$$\|J_{31}\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2.$$

We note that  $J_{33}$  cannot be bounded as in (3.42), since we cannot bound  $|\tilde{b}_3(y, y_1)|$  by  $\varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$ . Instead we use Fourier basis to have

$$J_{33} = \mathcal{R}_1(Y + \psi).$$

By using Lemma 3.15 we have

$$\|J_{33}\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^\kappa} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}}.$$

Similar as in (3.43) we have for  $J_{32}$  and  $p \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|J_{32}\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{-\kappa}} &\lesssim \int |v^\varepsilon(y)v^\varepsilon(y_1)| \|\tau_{y+y_1}(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{2\kappa}} \|\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\nabla}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}} dy dy_1 \\ &\lesssim \int |v^\varepsilon(y)v^\varepsilon(y_1)| (|y|^\kappa + |y_1|^\kappa) \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} dy dy_1 \sup_{y,y_1} \|\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\nabla}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{3\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

where in the second step we used Lemma A.9 and (3.2).

Similarly we can also use  $\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla}$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla}$  introduced in (3.18) and  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,\varepsilon}^{\nabla}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\nabla}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{y,y_1}^{\nabla}$  from (3.16) to decompose  $\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \bar{\psi} \circ (\mathcal{Z}_y^{\nabla}) dy + \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon(Y + \psi)$  and derive the same bounds. Thus the result follows.  $\square$

**3.3. Control the difference.** In this section, we will provide the proof of the convergence of the dynamics stated in Theorem 3.17. The main approach is to compare the corresponding terms in equations (3.31) and (3.24). We can estimate each term through paracontrolled calculus and employ similar arguments as in [ZZ18].

**Theorem 3.17.** *Suppose that  $\Psi^\varepsilon(0) \rightarrow \Phi(0)$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  for  $\kappa > 0$  and  $v$  satisfies (Hv). It holds that the unique solutions  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  and  $\Phi$  to equations (3.1) and (3.3) satisfy for any  $T > 0$*

$$\|\Psi^\varepsilon - \Phi\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 3.17 follows the same reasoning as in [ZZ18, Section 5], while accounting for the differences in the corresponding terms as given in Lemma 3.18– Lemma 3.21, as well as (3.49), (3.57)–(3.58), below. Further details can be found in Appendix B.

In the sequel we compare the corresponding terms on the RHS of equation (3.31) and equation (3.24). To this end, we introduce the following notations: We adjust  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  from Section 3.1 to be greater than the  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  from Section 3.1 and also larger than

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\|\mathcal{Z}_y^{\nabla} - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}} + \|\mathcal{Z}_y^{\nabla} - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}}}{|y|^\kappa}$$

and  $\|\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla}\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{8}} L^\infty}$ , as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_y \left\| \tau_y \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z)} \circ Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}, & \quad \sup_y \left\| \tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}, \\ \sup_y \left\| \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \tau_y \overline{Z} \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}, & \quad \sup_y \left\| \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \tau_y Z \right\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} \end{aligned}$$

from Proposition 3.13. Furthermore, we also use  $\|\mathbb{Z} - \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  to denote the smallest number bigger than  $\|\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon} - \mathcal{Z}^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|-\kappa}}$  from Proposition 3.3 and  $\|\mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon} - \mathbf{Z}^\tau\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|-\kappa}}$  from Proposition 3.4 and  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{|\tau|-\kappa}$ -norm of all the random fields  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon} - \mathcal{Z}^\tau$  from Propositions 3.10 and 3.12, and the first three terms in Proposition 3.13, and  $\|\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla} - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{8}} L^\infty}$ . Here, we also view the random fields from Propositions 3.10 and 3.12 and the first three terms in Proposition 3.13 as  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\tau_\varepsilon} - \mathcal{Z}^\tau$ .

Using Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 3.13 and Lemma 3.2 we also have for every  $p \geq 1$

$$\sup_\varepsilon \mathbf{E} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^p + \mathbf{E} \|\mathbb{Z}\|^p \lesssim 1, \quad (3.48)$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ . Using Proposition 3.3, Propositions 3.10 and 3.4 and 3.13, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\|^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{p\kappa}{2}}, \quad (3.49)$$

where the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

Now we analyze each term in equation (3.31) as follows. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} + \|\varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} + \|\mathbb{Z}\| + \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| + 1, \\ \mathbb{M}_\infty &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathbb{Z}\| + \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.50)$$

We first consider the terms  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}(Y + \psi)$  and  $2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \overline{\mathbb{Z}}])Z$  : from the first two lines of (3.31).

**Lemma 3.18.** *It holds that for  $t > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|2(v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \overline{\mathbb{Z}}])Z : + (\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon)(Z + Y + \psi) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}\varphi + \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}\overline{\varphi} - (C_1 + 2C_2)Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\|\mathbb{M}\|\mathbb{Z}\| + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}\|\mathbb{Z}\|^2 + \varepsilon^{\kappa/2}\mathbb{M}\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2(1 + t^{-\kappa}) \\ &\quad + \|\psi^\sharp - \varphi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1+2\kappa}}\|\mathbb{Z}\| + (\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\| + \varepsilon^\kappa)\|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1+3\kappa}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}(Y + \psi) + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Z + Y + \psi) + \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \varphi\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - C_1Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\|\mathbb{M}\|\mathbb{Z}\| + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}\|\mathbb{Z}\|^2 + \varepsilon^{\kappa/2}\mathbb{M}\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2(1 + t^{-\kappa}) \\ &\quad + \|\psi^\sharp - \varphi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1+2\kappa}}\|\mathbb{Z}\| + (\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\| + \varepsilon^\kappa)\|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1+3\kappa}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}\varphi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}(\prec + \succ)\varphi + \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \varphi, \quad \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}\overline{\varphi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}(\prec + \succ)\overline{\varphi} + \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \overline{\varphi},$$

with  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \varphi$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \overline{\varphi}$  defined in (3.26).

*Proof.* We only prove the first one and the second one is similar. Recall (3.38) and it suffices to prove

$$\left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y(Y + \psi)\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy + (\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Z + Y + \psi) + \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}\varphi - C_2Z \right\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}} \quad (3.52)$$

controlled by the RHS of (3.51), and the other part follows the same line. We first have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y(Y + \psi)(\prec + \succ)\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy \\ &= \int v^\varepsilon(y)[\tau_y(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)](\prec + \succ)\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy + (Y + \psi)(\prec + \succ) \int v^\varepsilon(y)\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy. \end{aligned}$$

By using the paraproduct estimates in Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.9 and (3.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y)[\tau_y(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)](\prec + \succ)\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy \right\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \int |v^\varepsilon(y)|\|\tau_y(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)\|_{\mathbf{C}^\kappa}\|\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-\kappa}}dy \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa\|Y + \psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{2\kappa}}\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|, \end{aligned}$$

which by Propositions 3.3, 3.4 and Lemma 3.9 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y(Y + \psi)(\prec + \succ)\mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}dy - \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}}(\prec + \succ)(-\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} + \varphi) \right\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\|\mathbb{M} + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{2\kappa}}\|\mathbb{Z}\| + \varepsilon^\kappa\mathbb{M}\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

Here we also used (3.2) and

$$\|\mathcal{Z}_y^\vee - \mathcal{Z}^\vee\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-2\kappa}} \lesssim |y|^\kappa \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|. \quad (3.54)$$

We then consider  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy + (\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi)$  and recall Lemma 3.16 and we only concentrate on  $J_3$  on the RHS of (3.46) and the bounds for the other terms are similar. From the proof of Lemma 3.16 we have  $J_3 = \sum_{i=1}^3 J_{3i}$  and we know that the  $\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}$ -norms of  $J_{32}, J_{33}$  are bounded by the RHS of (3.51). For  $J_{31}$  we write it as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) C(\tau_{y+y_1}(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi), \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_{y_1}^\vee, \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee) dy dy_1 \\ & + \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) C(Y + \psi, \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_{y_1}^\vee, \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee - \mathcal{Z}^\vee) dy dy_1 \\ & + C(Y + \psi, \int v^\varepsilon(y) v^\varepsilon(y_1) \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_{y_1}^\vee dy dy_1, \mathcal{Z}^\vee) + (Y + \psi) \mathbf{Z}_\varepsilon^{\vee\psi}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

Using Proposition 3.4 for  $\sup_{y, y_1} \|\tau_y \mathcal{Z}_{y_1}^\vee\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1-\kappa}}, \sup_y \|\mathcal{Z}_y^\vee\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1-\kappa}}$ , along with (3.54), Lemma A.9 for  $\tau_{y+y_1}(Y + \psi) - (Y + \psi)$ , Lemma A.7, and (3.2), we conclude that the  $\mathbf{C}^\kappa$ -norms of the first two terms on the RHS of (3.55) are bounded by the RHS of (3.51). Furthermore, the  $\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}$ -norm of the difference between the last term in (3.55) and  $C(-\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\psi} + \varphi, \mathcal{Z}^\vee, \mathcal{Z}^\vee) + (-\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\psi} + \varphi) \mathcal{Z}^{\vee\psi}$  in the definition of  $\mathcal{Z}^\vee \circ \varphi$  from (3.26) can also be bounded by the RHS of (3.51). Moreover,  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  can be bounded in a similar manner using Proposition 3.4, Lemma A.9, Lemma A.5, and Lemma A.7. Hence, we obtain

$$\left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy + (\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi) - \mathcal{Z}^\vee \circ \varphi \right\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}}$$

can be bounded by the RHS of (3.51).

It remains to consider  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y Y \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy - C_2 Z$ . We use Propositions 3.10 and 3.13 to obtain

$$\left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy - C_2 Z \right\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}} \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\| + \varepsilon^\kappa \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| (1 + t^{-\kappa}). \quad (3.56)$$

Thus, the conclusion that (3.52) is controlled by the RHS of (3.51) follows from the application of Proposition 3.12.  $\square$

We then consider the last line of equation (3.31).

**I.**  $(6b^\varepsilon - 6\tilde{b}^\varepsilon + m - 1)\Psi - (6b + m - 1)\Phi$ : By definition we know that

$$b_1^\varepsilon - \tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon(t) = \sum_{k_1, k_2} e^{-(|k_1+k_2|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + 3)t} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 + k_2)^2 b(k_1, k_2).$$

Thus  $|\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon - b_1^\varepsilon - b| \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa t^{-\kappa}$ . For other  $b_i^\varepsilon$  and  $\tilde{b}_i^\varepsilon$  we have similar bounds. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(6b^\varepsilon - 6\tilde{b}^\varepsilon + m - 1)\Psi - (6b + m - 1)\Phi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \\ & \lesssim (t^{-\kappa} + 1) (\varepsilon^\kappa (\|\mathbb{Z}\| + \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}) + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} + \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\|). \end{aligned} \quad (3.57)$$

**II.**  $\mathcal{R}Y$  and  $\mathcal{R}\psi$ : By Lemma 3.9 we know that

$$\|\mathcal{R}Y\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|, \quad \|\mathcal{R}\psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}. \quad (3.58)$$

Next, we analyze the contribution from the third line of equation (3.31) in the following lemmas. We begin by examining the difference between  $(v^\varepsilon * |Y + \psi|^2)Z$  from the RHS of equation (3.31) and  $|-\mathcal{Z}^{\vee\psi} + \varphi|^2 Z$  from equation (3.24).

**Lemma 3.19.** *It holds that for  $t > 0$*

$$\|(v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2)Z(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \lesssim (\|Z_\varepsilon\|^3 + 1)(t^{-\kappa} + 1), \quad (3.59)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v^\varepsilon * |Y + \psi|^2 Z - (|-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi|^2 Z + C_1(-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi))\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{M}_\infty (\|Z_\varepsilon - Z\| + \varepsilon^\kappa (\|Z\| + \|Z_\varepsilon\|)) (1 + t^{-\kappa}) + (\|\psi - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \mathbb{M}_\infty + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{L^\infty} \mathbb{M}) \|Z\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

where the proportional constants are independent of  $\varepsilon$  and

$$|-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi|^2 Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}|^2 Z - \varphi \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} - \overline{\varphi} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + |\varphi|^2 Z, \quad (3.61)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}|^2 \circ Z & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}) \circ Z + C(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, Z) + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + C(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, Z) + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \\ \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} (\prec + \succ) Z + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \quad \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} (\prec + \succ) Z + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $C$  is the commutator given by Lemma A.7 and all the  $\mathcal{Z}^\tau$  are introduced in (3.10).

*Proof.* First note that by Lemma 3.9

$$\|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \|Z\|. \quad (3.62)$$

We have the following decomposition

$$(v^\varepsilon * |Y + \psi|^2)Z = v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2 Z + v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 Z + 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[\psi \overline{Y}]Z. \quad (3.63)$$

We compare the RHS of (3.63) with the RHS of (3.61).

**I.** For the first term we decompose

$$v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2 Z = (v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2)(\prec + \succ)Z + (v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2) \circ Z. \quad (3.64)$$

By Lemmas A.5, A.9 and Proposition 3.3 and (3.62), we know that for the first term

$$\|(v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2)(\prec + \succ)Z - |\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}|^2(\prec + \succ)Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}$$

can be controlled by the RHS of (3.60).

For the second term on the RHS of (3.64) we have the decomposition

$$(v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2) \circ Z = (v^\varepsilon * (Y \prec \overline{Y})) \circ Z + (v^\varepsilon * (Y \succ \overline{Y})) \circ Z + (v^\varepsilon * (Y \circ \overline{Y})) \circ Z. \quad (3.65)$$

Using Lemmas A.5 and A.9 and Proposition 3.3 and (3.62), we know that for the last term on the RHS of (3.65)

$$\|(v^\varepsilon * (Y \circ \overline{Y})) \circ Z - (\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}) \circ Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa}}$$

can be bounded by the RHS of (3.60).

The first two terms on the RHS of (3.65) are similar and we only concentrate on the first one. We have

$$\begin{aligned} v^\varepsilon * (Y \prec \overline{Y}) \circ Z & = \int v^\varepsilon(y) (\tau_y Y \prec \tau_y \overline{Y}) \circ Z dy \\ & = \int v^\varepsilon(y) C(\tau_y Y, \tau_y \overline{Y}, Z) dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y Y (\tau_y \overline{Y} \circ Z) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

For the first term we use Lemmas A.7 and A.9 and (3.2) and (3.62) to have

$$\left\| \int v^\varepsilon(y) C(\tau_y Y, \tau_y \overline{Y}, Z) dy - C(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, Z) \right\|_{\mathbf{C}^\kappa}$$

controlled by the RHS of (3.60). For the second term we write it as

$$\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y Y (\tau_y \bar{Y} \circ Z) dy = \int v^\varepsilon(y) (\tau_y Y - Y) (\tau_y \bar{Y} \circ Z) dy + Y (v^\varepsilon * \bar{Y} \circ Z).$$

Here we used (3.19) to have

$$\begin{aligned} v^\varepsilon * \bar{Y} \circ Z &= -\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla\flat} + v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) \circ Z \\ &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) (-\mathcal{Z}_y^{\nabla\flat} + \tau_y \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) \circ Z) dy = \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{Y} \circ Z dy, \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

as the both sides are well-defined for fixed  $\varepsilon$ . Using Lemma A.9 and Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.13 and (3.2) we obtain that the first term is bounded by the RHS of (3.60). By Lemma A.5 and Propositions 3.3 3.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Y (v^\varepsilon * \bar{Y} \circ Z) + \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} C_1 - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla} \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla\flat}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \|Y\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \|\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla\flat} + v^\varepsilon * \bar{Y} \circ Z - C_1\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} + \|Y + \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} (\|\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla\flat}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} + C_1). \end{aligned}$$

In fact, we write

$$\|\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla\flat} + v^\varepsilon * \bar{Y} \circ Z - C_1\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla\flat} - \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla\flat}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} + \|v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) \circ Z - C_1\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}$$

and apply Proposition 3.3 and (3.34).

Thus using (3.62)  $\|v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2 Z - (|\mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}|^2 Z - C_1 \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla})\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}$  is bounded by the RHS of (3.60). (3.59) follows similarly.

**II.** Concerning the second term on the RHS of (3.63), using Lemmas A.5 and A.9 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 Z - |\varphi|^2 Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \left[ \|\psi - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} (\|\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty}) + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{L^\infty} (\|\psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} + \|\varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon^\kappa \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} \right] \|Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.68)$$

**III.** For the third term on the RHS of (3.63), we have

$$2v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \bar{Y}] Z = \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \tau_y \bar{Y} Z dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{\psi} \tau_y Y Z dy. \quad (3.69)$$

We only concentrate on the first one and the second one is similar. For the first one we have

$$\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \tau_y \bar{Y} Z dy = \int v^\varepsilon(y) (\tau_y \psi - \psi) \tau_y (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) - \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\nabla}) Z dy + \psi (v^\varepsilon * \overline{\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z})} Z - \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla\flat}), \quad (3.70)$$

with

$$\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla\flat} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (v^\varepsilon * \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\nabla}) (\prec + \succ) Z + \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla\flat},$$

for  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\nabla\flat}$  defined in (3.13). The  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  norm of the first term on the RHS of (3.70) is bounded by

$$\int |v^\varepsilon(y)| \|\tau_y \psi - \psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \sup_y \|\tau_y (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) - \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\nabla}) Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dy \lesssim \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \varepsilon^\kappa \|\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2.$$

Here in the last step we used Lemma A.9 and (3.2), and Lemma A.5, (A.1), Proposition 3.13 and Proposition 3.4, Lemma 3.9 to have

$$\sup_y \|\tau_y (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) - \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{\nabla}) Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sup_y \|\tau_y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) - \bar{Z}^{\Psi})\langle \cdot + \cdot \rangle Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1+\kappa}{2}}} + \sup_y \|\tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) \circ Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} + \sup_y \|\mathcal{Z}_y^{\Psi}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim (\|Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1+\kappa}{2}}} + \|\bar{Z}^{\Psi}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}})\|Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1+\kappa}{2}}} + \sup_y \|\tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}\bar{Z}) \circ Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} + \sup_y \|\mathcal{Z}_y^{\Psi}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and (3.62) we know that the  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ -norm of the difference between the second term on the RHS of (3.70) and  $\varphi(C_1 - \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi})$  can be controlled by the RHS of (3.60). Hence, we deduce the result.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.20.** *It holds that*

$$\|(v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2)Y\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^3 + 1, \quad (3.71)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(v^\varepsilon * |Y + \psi|^2)(Y + \psi) - |-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi|^2(-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{M}_\infty^2 (\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\| + \varepsilon^\kappa \mathbb{M} + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{L^\infty}), \end{aligned}$$

where the proportional constants are independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* Since  $Y \rightarrow -\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}$  in  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}$ , using the paraproduct estimates Lemmas A.5 and A.9, the bounds follow.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.21.** *It holds that for  $t > 0$*

$$\|v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y\bar{Z}]Y(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \lesssim (\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^3 + 1)(1 + t^{-\kappa}), \quad (3.72)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|2(v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[(Y + \psi)\bar{Z}])(Y + \psi) - 2\operatorname{Re}[(-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi)\bar{Z}](-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi) \\ &\quad - (C_1 + 2C_2)(-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{M}\mathbb{M}_\infty (\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\| + \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\mathbb{Z}\|)(1 + t^{-\kappa}) + (\|\psi - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \mathbb{M}_\infty + \|\psi - \varphi\|_{L^\infty} \mathbb{M})\|\mathbb{Z}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.73)$$

where the proportional constants are independent of  $\varepsilon$  and

$$\begin{aligned} &2\operatorname{Re}[(-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi)\bar{Z}](-\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \varphi) \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\bar{Z}]\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} - 2\operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}]\varphi + 2\operatorname{Re}[\varphi\bar{Z}]\varphi - (\varphi\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \bar{\varphi}\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.74)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} 2\operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\bar{Z}]\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\langle \cdot \rangle \bar{Z}]\langle \cdot + \cdot \rangle \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + 2\operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\rangle \bar{Z}]\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + (\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi})\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \bar{Z}, \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}) + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + C(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, Z, \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}) + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\langle \cdot + \cdot \rangle \bar{Z} + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \quad \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}\langle \cdot + \cdot \rangle Z + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}.$$

*Proof.* We have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} &(v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[(Y + \psi)\bar{Z}])(Y + \psi) \\ &= v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y\bar{Z}]Y + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y\bar{Z}]\psi + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi\bar{Z}]\psi + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi\bar{Z}]Y. \end{aligned} \quad (3.75)$$

**I.** We start with the first term on the RHS of (3.75) and by the paraproduct decomposition:

$$(v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y\bar{Z}]Y) = (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y\langle \cdot \rangle \bar{Z}])Y + (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y\rangle \bar{Z}])Y + (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \circ \bar{Z}])Y. \quad (3.76)$$

We have for the last term

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \circ \bar{Z}])Y + C_2 \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} - \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi})\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} \\ & \lesssim \| (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \bar{Z}])Y + C_2 \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}} + \| (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[-\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi}])Y - \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi})\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}, \end{aligned}$$

which by Propositions 3.3, 3.10, Lemmas A.5 and A.9 and (3.62) is bounded by the RHS of (3.73). For the second term  $(v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \succ \bar{Z}])Y$  we use Lemma A.5, Proposition 3.3 and (3.62) to have that

$$\| (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \succ \bar{Z}])Y - \operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \succ \bar{Z}]\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-3\kappa}}$$

is bounded by the RHS of (3.73). For the first term on the RHS of (3.76) we decompose it as

$$(v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \prec \bar{Z}])Y = (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \prec \bar{Z}])(\prec + \succ)Y + (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \prec \bar{Z}]) \circ Y.$$

By the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5, Lemma A.9 and (3.62) we have for the first term,

$$\| (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \prec \bar{Z}])(\prec + \succ)Y - \operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \prec \bar{Z}](\prec + \succ)\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}$$

is bounded by the RHS of (3.73). For the resonant term we have

$$\begin{aligned} (v^\varepsilon * [Y \prec \bar{Z}]) \circ Y &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) (\tau_y Y \prec \tau_y \bar{Z}) \circ Y dy \\ &= \int v^\varepsilon(y) C(\tau_y Y, \tau_y \bar{Z}, Y) + \int v^\varepsilon(y) (\tau_y Y - Y)(\tau_y \bar{Z} \circ Y) dy - Y \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi} + Y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ v^\varepsilon * \bar{Z}, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi}$  introduced in (3.13), where we also used (3.19) and similar calculation as (3.67) to have  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{Z} \circ Y dy = -\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi} + \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ v^\varepsilon * \bar{Z}$ . Using similar argument as that for (3.66) in the proof of Lemma 3.19, we know that the difference between these terms and  $C(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}, \bar{Z}, \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}) + \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} - C_1 \mathcal{Z}^{\Psi}$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}$  is bounded by the RHS of (3.73). For  $(v^\varepsilon * [\bar{Y} \prec Z]) \circ Y$  the required bounds follow exactly the same way. Thus we obtain that  $\| v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \bar{Z}]Y - \operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \bar{Z}]\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} + (\frac{1}{2}C_1 + C_2)\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi} \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}$  is bounded by the RHS of (3.73). (3.72) follows by a similar argument.

**II.** For the second term on the RHS of (3.75), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \| v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[Y \bar{Z}]\psi + \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi})\varphi - C_2 \varphi \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \\ & \lesssim \| v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \bar{Z}]\psi - C_2 \varphi \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} + \| -v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi}]\psi + \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{Z}^{\Psi})\varphi \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi}(\prec + \succ)\bar{Z} + \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\Psi},$$

which by Lemmas A.5 A.9 and Proposition 3.3 and (3.36), (3.62) can be bounded by the RHS of (3.73).

**III.** For the third term  $v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \bar{Z}]\psi$  on the RHS of (3.75)

$$v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \bar{Z}]\psi = v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \prec \bar{Z}]\psi + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \succ \bar{Z}]\psi.$$

Then by Lemmas A.5 and A.9 we have

$$\| v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \bar{Z}]\psi - \operatorname{Re}[\varphi \bar{Z}]\varphi \|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}$$

can be bounded by the RHS of (3.73).

**IV.** We have that for the fourth term on the RHS of (3.75)

$$2v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \bar{Z}]Y = \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \tau_y \bar{Z} Y dy + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{\psi} \tau_y Z Y dy. \quad (3.77)$$



Using similar argument as **III.** in the proof of Lemma 3.19 we obtain  $\|v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \bar{Z}]Y + \frac{1}{2}(\varphi \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}) + \bar{\varphi} \mathcal{Z}^{\nabla}) - \frac{1}{2}C_1\varphi\|_{\mathbb{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}$  is bounded by the RHS of (3.73).  $\square$

**3.4. Proof of Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.15.** We first recall the following notations from Appendix A. We will use the dyadic partition of unity  $(\chi, \theta)$  in the proofs, and refer to Appendix A for its definition. We write  $\theta_j = \theta(2^{-j}\cdot)$  for  $j \geq 0$ . Let  $\Delta_j$  be the Littlewood-Paley blocks. Let  $\tilde{\theta} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with support in an annulus such that  $\tilde{\theta}\theta = \theta$ . Define  $K_j = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\theta_j$ ,  $\tilde{K}_j = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{\theta}_j$  with  $\tilde{\theta}_j = \tilde{\theta}(2^{-j}\cdot)$ . We recall the following result from [ZZ15].

**Lemma 3.22.** ([ZZ15, Lemma 3.10]) *Let  $0 < l, m < d, l + m - d > 0$ . Then we have for  $k \neq 0$*

$$\sum_{k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}, |k - k_1| \geq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|k_1|^l |k - k_1|^m} \lesssim \frac{1}{|k|^{l+m-d}}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.9.* We use (2.28) to have for  $j \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j(\mathcal{R}f) &= \sum_{k_1} \theta_j(k_1) F^{vG}(k_1) \langle f, e_{k_1} \rangle e_{k_1} = \sum_{k_1} \theta_j(k_1) \tilde{\theta}_j(k_1) F^{vG}(k_1) \langle f, e_{k_1} \rangle e_{k_1} \\ &= \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j F^{vG}) * \Delta_j f, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F^{vG}(k_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_k \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} \left( \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) - \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k_1 - k) \right).$$

We then obtain

$$\|\Delta_j(\mathcal{R}f)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j F^{vG})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}.$$

It remains to bound  $\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j F^{vG})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ , which equals to

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta} F^{vG}(2^j \cdot))\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|(1 + |x|^2) \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta} F^{vG}(2^j \cdot))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(I - \Delta)(\tilde{\theta} F^{vG}(2^j \cdot))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|(I - \Delta)(\tilde{\theta} F^{vG}(2^j \cdot))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$F^{vG}(2^j k_1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_k \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} \left( \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) - \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(2^j k_1 - k) - \nabla \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) \cdot 2^j k_1 \right), \quad (3.78)$$

where we used the fact that  $\nabla \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k)$  is odd in  $k$ . Recall that  $\tilde{\theta}$  is support on an annulus. Subsequently, we employ **(Hv)** to have for  $k_1$  on the support of  $\tilde{\theta}$

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) - \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(2^j k_1 - k) - \nabla \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) \cdot 2^j k_1| &\lesssim (2^j |k_1|)^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\nabla^2 \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k - su2^j k_1)| \, du \, ds \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^2 |2^j k_1|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2 |su2^j k_1 - k|^2} \, du \, ds, \end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 3.22 implies that for  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  and for  $k_1$  on the support of  $\tilde{\theta}$

$$\begin{aligned}
|F^{vG}(2^j k_1)| &\lesssim \varepsilon^2 |2^j k_1|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{1}{1 + |k|^2} \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2 |su2^j k_1 - k|^2} dud s + \varepsilon^\eta |2^j k_1|^\eta \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon^\eta |2^j k_1|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{k \neq 0, |su2^j k_1 - k| \geq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} \frac{1}{|su2^j k_1 - k|^{2-\eta}} dud s \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 |2^j k_1|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{k \neq 0, |su2^j k_1 - k| < \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} dud s + \varepsilon^\eta |2^j k_1|^\eta \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon^\eta |2^j k_1|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{1}{|su2^j k_1|^{1-\eta}} dud s + \varepsilon^\eta |2^j k_1|^\eta \lesssim \varepsilon^\eta 2^{(1+\eta)j} |k_1|^{1+\eta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.79}$$

In the first line, the last term arises from the calculation for  $k = 0$ . Additionally, we utilized the fact that when  $|k| \geq 1$ ,  $|su2^j k_1 - k| < \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $|su2^j k_1| \simeq |k|$  in the third step. Moreover, we have

$$\nabla F^{vG}(2^j \cdot)(k_1) = \frac{2^j}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_k \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} (\nabla \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k - 2^j k_1) - \nabla \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k)). \tag{3.80}$$

Thus using (3.80) and similar as (3.79) we obtain on the support of  $\tilde{\theta}$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla F^{vG}(2^j \cdot)(k_1)| &\lesssim 2^{2j} \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \sum_{k \neq 0, |2^j k_1 s - k| \geq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2-\eta} |2^j k_1 s - k|^{2-\eta}} ds \\
&\quad + 2^{2j} \varepsilon^2 \int_0^1 \sum_{k \neq 0, |2^j k_1 s - k| < \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} ds + \varepsilon 2^j \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon^\eta 2^{(1+\eta)j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.81}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\nabla^2 F^{vG}(2^j \cdot)(k_1) = - \frac{2^{2j}}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_k \frac{1}{|k|^2 + 1} \nabla^2 \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(2^j k_1 - k).$$

We then apply Lemma 3.22 and (Hv) and similar as (3.79) to have on the support of  $\tilde{\theta}$

$$|\nabla^2 F^{vG}(2^j \cdot)(k_1)| \lesssim 2^{2j} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{k \neq 0, |2^j k_1 - k| \geq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{(|k|^2 + 1) |\varepsilon(2^j k_1 - k)|^{2-\eta}} + \varepsilon^\eta 2^{j(1+\eta)} \lesssim \varepsilon^\eta 2^{j(1+\eta)}. \tag{3.82}$$

Combining (3.79), (3.81) and (3.82) we obtain for  $j \geq 0$

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j F^{vG})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \varepsilon^\eta 2^{j(1+\eta)}.$$

Moreover, since  $\chi$  is supported in a ball, we employ the Bernstein-type lemma along with (3.79) to have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_{-1}(\mathcal{R}f)\|_{L^p}^2 &\lesssim \|\Delta_{-1}(\mathcal{R}f)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \sum_{k_1} |F^{vG}(k_1)|^2 \chi(k_1)^2 |\langle f, e_{k_1} \rangle|^2 \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon^{2\eta} \sum_{k_1} \chi(k_1)^2 |\langle f, e_{k_1} \rangle|^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{2\eta} \|\Delta_{-1}(f)\|_{L^p}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.83}$$

which implies Lemma 3.9.  $\square$

**Remark 3.23.** We can also prove Lemma 3.9 using the properties of the Green function  $G(x - y)$ . Here we use the Fourier analysis-based proof, as we will later rely on some estimates established in the lemma.

*Proof of Lemma 3.15.* We have for  $j \geq 0$

$$\Delta_j \mathcal{R}_1 f = \sum_k g(k) \theta_j(k) \langle f, e_k \rangle e_k = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j g) * \Delta_j f.$$

We then obtain

$$\|\Delta_j(\mathcal{R}_1 f)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j g)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^p}.$$

It remains to bound  $\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j g)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ , which equals to

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j g)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\lesssim \|(1 + |x|^2) \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\theta}_j g)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(I - \Delta)(\tilde{\theta}_j g)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \|(I - \Delta)(\tilde{\theta}_j g)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$|\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(2^j k + k_1)^2 - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)^2| \lesssim \varepsilon^{2\kappa} 2^{2j\kappa} |k|^{2\kappa} \left( \frac{1}{|\varepsilon(2^j k + k_1)|^\kappa} + \frac{1}{|\varepsilon k_1|^\kappa} \right),$$

which by Lemma 3.22 and similar argument as (3.79) implies that

$$|g(2^j k)| \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa 2^{2j\kappa} \sum_{k_1 \neq 0, |2^j k + k_1| \geq 1/2} \frac{1}{|k_1|^3 + 1} \frac{1}{|2^j k + k_1|^\kappa} + \varepsilon^\kappa 2^{2j\kappa} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa 2^{2j\kappa},$$

Moreover,  $m$ -th ( $|m| \leq 2$ ) derivative of  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(2^j k + k_1)^2 - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)^2$  is bounded by

$$\varepsilon^{m} 2^{jm} \frac{1}{|\varepsilon(2^j k + k_1)|^{m+1}}.$$

Using Lemma 3.22 and similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.9 we obtain the result.  $\square$

#### 4. UNIFORM IN $\varepsilon$ ESTIMATES AND CONVERGENCE OF THE MEASURES $\nu^\varepsilon$

In this section, we prove the convergence of the measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  given in (2.15) to the  $\Phi_3^4$  field  $\nu$  from (2.17). The first aim of this section is to derive the following uniform in  $\varepsilon$  moment bounds for  $\nu^\varepsilon$  via the uniform estimates from the dynamic (3.1). In this section we assume that  $v \geq 0$  and satisfies (Hv).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  be the stationary solution to equation (3.1). Then it holds that for any  $t \geq 0$  and  $p \geq 2$*

$$\sup_\varepsilon \mathbf{E} \|\Psi^\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^2 + \sup_\varepsilon \mathbf{E} \|\Psi^\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \lesssim 1.$$

As  $\nu^\varepsilon$  from (2.15) is the unique invariant measure of the solutions to equation (3.1) (c.f. Lemma 4.17 below), Theorem 4.1 is enough to derive tightness of  $\nu^\varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . Furthermore, based on Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 3.17 we can further identify the limit of  $\nu^\varepsilon$  and derive the convergence of  $\nu^\varepsilon$  to the  $\Phi_3^4$  field  $\nu$  and the convergence of the related  $n$ -point functions.

**Theorem 4.2.** *As  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\nu^\varepsilon$  converges weakly to  $\nu$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  with  $\nu$  being the  $\Phi_3^4$  field given by the unique invariant measure of the solutions to equation (3.3). Furthermore, any correlation function  $\gamma_n^\varepsilon$  of  $\nu^\varepsilon$  converge to the  $n$ -point correlation function  $\gamma_n$  of  $\Phi_3^4$  field in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^{6n})$ .*

The main idea of the proof of Theorem 4.1 is to establish uniform in  $\varepsilon$  moment bounds for the stationary solutions  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  through the dynamics (3.1). By the decomposition (3.30), equation (3.1) can be reduced to equation (3.31). Hence, in the sequel we mainly concentrate on equation (3.31). To this end, we rewrite (3.31) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\psi &= -v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \psi - (Y + \psi) \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} - 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[(Y + \psi) : \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \mathcal{Z} : \\ &\quad - 6\tilde{b}^\varepsilon(Z + Y + \psi) + f_2(\psi) + f_1(\psi) + f_0, \\ \psi(0) &= \Psi^\varepsilon(0) - Z(0). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}
f_0 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2(Z+Y) - 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[Y\bar{Z}]Y + \mathcal{R}Y \\
&\quad + (6(\tilde{b}^\varepsilon - b^\varepsilon) - m + 1)(Z+Y), \\
f_1(\psi) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[\psi\bar{Y}]Z - 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}(\psi\bar{Y})Y - v^\varepsilon * |Y|^2\psi \\
&\quad - 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[Y\bar{Z}]\psi - 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[\psi\bar{Z}]Y + \mathcal{R}\psi \\
&\quad + (6(\tilde{b}^\varepsilon - b^\varepsilon) - m + 1)\psi, \\
f_2(\psi) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -Zv^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 - 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}(\psi\bar{Y})\psi - v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2Y - 2v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[\psi\bar{Z}]\psi.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that  $f_0$  arises from the purely stochastic terms in the third and fourth lines of equation (3.31), while  $f_1(\psi)$  corresponds to the linear part of these lines, and  $f_2(\psi)$  depends quadratically on  $\psi$ . Fix  $T > 0$ . For fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  by Theorem 3.8 there exists a unique solution  $\psi \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  to (4.1) for any  $\Psi^\varepsilon(0) \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . In the following we will prove global and uniform in  $\varepsilon$  estimates for the solution  $\psi$ .

We adjust  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  from Section 3.3 to represent the smallest number greater than both  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  and  $\|\mathbb{Z} - \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  in Section 3.3. Similar as in Section 3.3 we know that for any  $r \geq 1$

$$\sup_\varepsilon \mathbf{E} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^r \lesssim 1. \quad (4.2)$$

We also use  $K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|)$  to denote a generic polynomial depending on  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$  for the stochastic terms. The coefficients of  $K$  are independent of  $\varepsilon$  and may change from line to line.

Using (3.59), (3.71), (3.72) and (3.58), (3.57), we find that  $f_0 \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}$  and for  $t > 0$

$$\|f_0(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}} \lesssim (\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^3 + 1)(1 + t^{-\kappa}). \quad (4.3)$$

In the following we decompose  $\psi$  into  $\psi_l + \psi_h$ , as detailed in (4.5) and (4.6) below. To this end, we introduce the localizers in terms of Littlewood–Paley expansions. Let  $J \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . For  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$  we define

$$\Delta_{>J}f = \sum_{j>J} \Delta_j f, \quad \Delta_{\leq J}f = \sum_{j \leq J} \Delta_j f.$$

Then, in particular, for  $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma$ , it holds

$$\|\Delta_{>J}f\|_{\mathbf{C}^\alpha} \lesssim 2^{-J(\beta-\alpha)} \|f\|_{\mathbf{C}^\beta}, \quad \|\Delta_{\leq J}f\|_{\mathbf{C}^\gamma} \lesssim 2^{J(\gamma-\beta)} \|f\|_{\mathbf{C}^\beta}, \quad (4.4)$$

where the proportional constants are independent of  $f$ .

Now we decompose  $\psi = \psi_l + \psi_h$  with  $\psi_l$  and  $\psi_h$  satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}\psi_h = \mathcal{G}_{\prec, >R}(Y + \psi), \quad (4.5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}\psi_l = -v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2\psi + f_2(\psi) + f_1(\psi) + f_0 + \mathcal{G}_{\prec, \leq R}(Y + \psi) + F_{\succ} + \mathcal{G}_{\succ}, \quad (4.6)$$

with initial condition  $\psi_l(0) = \psi(0)$ ,  $\psi_h(0) = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_{\succ} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\left(\psi \succ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi)\right) - \left(\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \psi \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy + (\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi)\right) \\
&\quad - \left(\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \bar{\psi} \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy + \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon(Y + \psi)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\succ} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\left(Y \succ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)Z\right) - \left(\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y Y \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy + (\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon)Z\right) \\
&\quad - \left(\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \bar{Y} \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy + \tilde{b}_5^\varepsilon Z\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{\prec, >R}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -f \prec \Delta_{>R} \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} - \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y f \prec \Delta_{>R} \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy - \int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y \bar{f} \prec \Delta_{>R} \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy,$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{\prec, \leq R}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -f \prec \Delta_{\leq R} \mathcal{Z}^{\vee} - \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y f \prec \Delta_{\leq R} \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} dy - \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \bar{f} \prec \Delta_{\leq R} \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} dy.$$

Here  $\Delta_{>R}$  and  $\Delta_{\leq R}$  are localizers introduced in (4.4) with  $R$  depends on time given later and we used (3.38).

In the following we will prove the following coming down from infinity result for the solutions obtained by Theorem 3.8.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Suppose that  $\psi(0) \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . For every  $t \in (0, T]$ , we have*

$$\|\psi_h(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_4^{\frac{1}{T}}} + \|\psi_l(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|)(1+t^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (4.7)$$

Here the implicit constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$  and initial value.

Note that the RHS of (4.7) is independent of the initial data  $\psi(0)$ . In the following we will prove Theorem 4.3 under assumption that  $\psi(0) \in L^2 \cap \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . Since the solution is continuous w.r.t. the initial data in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ , as established in Section 3, we can deduce that (4.7) holds for general initial data  $\psi_0 \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  by approximating the initial data (see [MW17, Remark 2.4]).

The idea to prove Theorem 4.3 is to combine  $L^2$ -energy estimates for the low frequency part of  $\psi$  (i.e.  $\psi_l$ ) and smoothing effect of heat operators to establish uniform in  $\varepsilon$  estimates for  $\psi$ . When performing the  $L^2$ -energy estimate for  $\psi_l$ , we encounter a useful term  $\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)$  from the nonlinearity, which is defined for  $f \in L^2$

$$\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int v^\varepsilon(x-y) |f|^2(x) |f|^2(y) dx dy.$$

We have a useful lower bound for  $\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f)$ :

$$\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f) = \sum_k \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) |\langle |f|^2, e_k \rangle|^2 \gtrsim \|f\|_{L^2}^4, \quad (4.8)$$

where in the last step we used  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \geq 0$ , and when  $k = 0$  in the Fourier transform, we obtain  $\|f\|_{L^2}^4$ . Using condition (Hv) we can also derive

$$\|v^\varepsilon * |f|^2\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_k \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k)^2 |\langle |f|^2, e_k \rangle|^2 \lesssim \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f). \quad (4.9)$$

**Remark 4.4.** *For the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model, one can use the strong damping term  $-|\varphi|^2\varphi$  and the maximum principle (see [GH19, MW20]) or  $L^p$ -energy estimates (see [MW17]) to obtain global estimates. However, for  $v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2\psi$ , it appears that only the  $L^2$ -energy estimate is effective. In [GH21], the authors proved a global estimate using only the  $L^2$ -energy estimate, without relying on Schauder estimates for the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model, through a duality argument between the paraproducts  $\prec$  and  $\circ$ . The technique used there may also apply here (see also [SZZ22]), but our proof combines Schauder estimates and the  $L^2$ -energy estimate, which simplifies such kind of argument in [AK20, MW17] by introducing localizers. We believe this proof is of independent interest and is more compatible with the analysis in Section 3, so we have chosen to present it this way.*

In the following, we employ localizer and smoothing effect of heat operator to derive regularity estimates for  $\psi_h$ , and  $\psi^\sharp$  in Sections 4.1-4.2. We then perform  $L^2$ -energy estimates for  $\psi_l$  in Section 4.3 and make use of the dissipation effect from the cubic nonlinearity to derive uniform estimates. The proof of Theorems 4.1-4.3 are given in Section 4.4.

**4.1. Estimates of  $\psi_h$ .** In this section we use Duhamel's formula and the smoothing effect of heat operator to derive a priori estimate for  $\psi_h$ . We make use of the localizers  $\Delta_{>R}$  present in the equation for  $\psi_h$  in (4.5). Namely, by an appropriate choice of  $R$  we can always apply (4.4) to get a small constant in front of terms which contain  $\psi$ . We are therefore able to obtain a bound independent of  $\psi_l$  (see (4.10) below).

We use Duhamel's formula to write for  $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$\psi_h(t) = \int_0^t P_{t-s} \mathcal{G}_{\leftarrow, \rightarrow R}(Y + \psi) ds.$$

We then use the smoothing effect of heat operator Lemma A.3 and the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and (A.1) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_h(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_4^{\frac{1}{17}}} &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \int_0^t (t-s)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi\|_{L^4} \left( \sup_y \|\Delta_{>R} \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{33}{17}+\kappa}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sup_y \|\Delta_{>R} \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{33}{17}+\kappa}} + \|\Delta_{>R} \mathcal{Z}^\vee\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{33}{17}+\kappa}} \right) ds \\ &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_0^t (t-s)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi(s)\|_{L^4} 2^{-R(s)(\frac{16}{17}-2\kappa)} ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the localizer estimate (4.4) in the last step.

We choose  $2^{R(s)(\frac{16}{17}-2\kappa)} = \|\psi(s)\|_{L^4} + 1$  and obtain for  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|\psi_h(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_4^{\frac{1}{17}}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \quad (4.10)$$

Hence we also derive for  $s \in [0, T]$

$$2^{R(s)(\frac{16}{17}-2\kappa)} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^4}. \quad (4.11)$$

Moreover, we further apply the smoothing effect of heat operator to derive improved regularity estimates for  $\psi_h$  in different Besov spaces  $\mathbf{B}_p^{1-2\kappa}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_p^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}$  in terms of  $\psi_l$ , which will be used for the estimates of  $\psi_l$  below. More precisely, we use Duhamel's formula to express the solution for  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_h(t) &= P_{t-s} \psi_h(s) + \int_s^t P_{t-r} \mathcal{G}_{\leftarrow, \rightarrow R}(Y + \psi) dr \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_h^{(1)}(t) + \psi_h^{(2)}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

We also use the smoothing effect of heat operator Lemma A.3 and the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 to obtain for  $1 \leq p \leq 4$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_h^{(2)}(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{1-2\kappa}} &\lesssim \int_s^t (t-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} (\|\psi\|_{L^p} + \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| dr \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_s^t (t-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi(r)\|_{L^p} dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \\ &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( 1 + \int_s^t (t-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l(r)\|_{L^p} dr \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where we used (4.10). Furthermore we use the smoothing effect of heat operator Lemma A.3 for  $\psi_h^{(1)}$  to have for  $1 \leq p \leq 4$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_h(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{1-2\kappa}} &\lesssim (t-s)^{-\frac{8}{17}+\kappa} \|\psi_h(s)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{\frac{1}{17}}} \\ &\quad + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( 1 + \int_s^t (t-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l(r)\|_{L^p} dr \right), \end{aligned}$$

which combined with (4.10) implies that for  $1 \leq p \leq 4$

$$\|\psi_h(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{1-2\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( (t-s)^{-\frac{8}{17}+\kappa} + \int_s^t (t-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l(r)\|_{L^p} dr \right). \quad (4.14)$$

Similarly we have

$$\|\psi_h(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{4}} + \int_s^t (t-r)^{-\frac{3}{4}-2\kappa} \|\psi_l(r)\|_{L^2} dr \right). \quad (4.15)$$

**4.2. Estimate of  $\psi^\sharp$ .** The main aim of this section is to prove a uniform in  $\varepsilon$  bound for  $\psi^\sharp$ , which is defined in (3.39). Our main technique is also the smoothing effect of heat operator Lemma A.3 and the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.8. By (3.39) we have

$$\psi^\sharp = \psi_1^\sharp + \psi_2^\sharp, \quad (4.16)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1^\sharp &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \int v^\varepsilon(y) \left( [\mathcal{I}, \tau_y \bar{Y} \prec] \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee + [\mathcal{I}, \tau_y Y \prec] \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} \right) dy - [\mathcal{I}, Y \prec] \mathcal{Z}^{\vee}, \\ \psi_2^\sharp &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi - \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}_\prec(Y)) + \psi \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\vee} + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \left( \tau_y \psi \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} + \tau_y \bar{\psi} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} \right) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_\prec \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{G}_{\prec, \leq R} + \mathcal{G}_{\prec, > R}$  and we recall  $[\mathcal{I}, f \prec]g$  denotes the commutator between  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $f \prec$  given by

$$[\mathcal{I}, f \prec]g = \mathcal{I}(f \prec g) - f \prec \mathcal{I}(g).$$

In the following we concentrate on proving the following uniform in  $\varepsilon$  estimates for  $\psi^\sharp$ .

**Proposition 4.5.** *It holds that for any  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$*

$$\|\psi_1^\sharp\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{1+3\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$\int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.19)$$

$$\int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{3}{2}+2\kappa}} dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.20)$$

where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is a small number and the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* The first result follows from Lemma A.8 and Proposition 3.3. We then concentrate on the second result. We have

$$\mathcal{L}\psi_2^\sharp = \mathcal{G} + \mathcal{G}_1 - \mathcal{G}_2,$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} = -v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \psi + f_2(\psi) + f_1(\psi) + f_0 + F_{\neq} + \mathcal{G}_{\neq}, \quad (4.21)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{L}\psi \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\vee} + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \left( \tau_y \mathcal{L}\psi \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} + \tau_y \bar{\mathcal{L}\psi} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} \right) dy, \quad (4.22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_2 &= 2\nabla\psi \prec \nabla\mathcal{Z}^{\vee} + 2 \int v^\varepsilon(y) \left( \tau_y \nabla\psi \prec \nabla\mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} + \tau_y \bar{\nabla\psi} \prec \nabla\mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} \right) dy \\ &\quad + \psi \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\vee} + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \left( \tau_y \psi \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} + \tau_y \bar{\psi} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee} \right) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

We use Duhamel's formula to have for  $s \leq r \leq t$

$$\psi_2^\sharp(r) = P_{r-s} \psi_2^\sharp(s) + \mathcal{I}_s(\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{G}_1 - \mathcal{G}_2)(r),$$

with  $\mathcal{I}_s(f) = \int_s^r P_{r-s} f dr$ . We first use the smoothing effect of heat kernel Lemma A.3 to have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t \|P_{r-s} \psi_2^\sharp(s)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr &\lesssim \int_s^t (r-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-12\kappa} \|\psi_2^\sharp(s)\|_{L^2} dr \lesssim \|\psi_2^\sharp(s)\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \lesssim \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \end{aligned}$$

where we used the definition of  $\psi_2^\sharp$  given in (4.17), (4.10), and Proposition 3.3, the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 in the last step.

Using Lemma 4.6, Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 below we obtain that  $\int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr$  is bounded by

$$\delta \int_s^t (\|\psi_2^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} + \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Then we choose  $\delta$  small enough such that  $\delta \int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr$  can be absorbed by the LHS, which implies the second result.

For the third result, we use interpolation to derive it. To this end, we give a  $\mathbf{B}_2^{1-2\kappa}$ -norm bound of  $\psi_2^\sharp$  using the definition of  $\psi_2^\sharp$ . More precisely, we use the smoothing effect of heat operator Lemma A.3 and the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and (4.10) and (4.14) to estimate each term on the RHS of (4.17) and have for any  $t \geq s$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_2^\sharp(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1-2\kappa}} &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( 1 + \|\psi_l(t)\|_{L^2} + \int_s^t (t-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2} dr \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (t-s)^{-\frac{8}{17}+\kappa} \right) + \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1-2\kappa}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we use the interpolation Lemma A.2 and Young's inequality to have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+2\kappa}}^{\frac{3}{2}} dr &\lesssim \int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}}^{\frac{3}{13}} \|\psi_2^\sharp(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1-2\kappa}}^{\frac{33}{26}} dr \\ &\lesssim \delta \int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr + \int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1-2\kappa}}^{\frac{33}{20}} dr \\ &\lesssim \delta \int_s^t \|\psi_2^\sharp(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where we use (4.8) in the last step. Thus the third result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *It holds that*

$$\int_s^t \|(\mathcal{I}_s \mathcal{G})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\|\psi_2^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} + \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \quad (4.25)$$

where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is a small number and the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* We start with the pure stochastic term  $f_0 + F_{\geq}$  on the RHS of (4.21). They stay in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}$ . We use (4.3), Lemma A.3 and Propositions 3.3, 3.12–3.13 and the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 to find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(f_0 + F_{\geq})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \\ &\lesssim \int_s^t \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{3}{4}-13\kappa} (\tau^{-\kappa} + 1) K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) d\tau dr \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \end{aligned}$$

**Step I.** In this step we derive that the contribution from  $\mathcal{G}_{\geq}$  on the RHS of (4.21) can be controlled by the RHS of (4.25).

We first consider  $\psi \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi)$ . Using Besov embedding Lemma A.1 and the smoothing effect of heat operator Lemma A.3 we have

$$\|\mathcal{I}_s(\psi \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi))(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} \lesssim \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}-13\kappa} \|\psi \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\kappa}} d\tau.$$



Using Lemma 3.14, (4.10) and take integration w.r.t.  $r$  we obtain the following terms:

$$K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( \int_s^t \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}-13\kappa} (\|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+2\kappa}} + 1 + \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{3\kappa}}) d\tau dr \right). \quad (4.26)$$

We first take integration w.r.t.  $r$  and reduce these terms to the following terms:

$$K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( \int_s^t \|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+2\kappa}} dr + \int_s^t \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{3\kappa}} dr + 1 \right),$$

which can be estimated by the RHS of (4.25) using (4.24) and (4.18).

We then consider  $\psi \succ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ . By the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{I}_s(\psi \succ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} &\lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{33}{34}-13\kappa} \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{7}}} d\tau \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{33}{34}-13\kappa} (\|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{7}}} + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Thus, by (4.10), and by changing the order of integration, we deduce that  $\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(\psi \succ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr$  is bounded by the RHS of (4.19). Regarding the other two terms in  $\mathcal{G}_{\neq}$ , for those involving the paraproduct  $\circ$ , we employ Lemma 3.16 and (A.1) to ensure that their  $\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}$ -norm is controlled by (4.26). Consequently, the same reasoning applies, yielding identical bounds. For the terms involving the paraproduct  $\succ$ , the required bounds follow a similar approach as in (4.27), utilizing paraproduct estimates and (A.1).

**Step II.** In this step we derive that the contribution from the first three terms on the RHS of (4.21) can be controlled by the RHS of (4.25).

**II.1** We start with  $-v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \psi$ . We also use Besov embedding Lemma A.1 and the smoothing effect of heat operator Lemma A.3 to have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \psi)(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} &\lesssim \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \psi)(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{7}{4}+24\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{7}{8}-12\kappa} \|v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \psi\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}} d\tau \lesssim \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{7}{8}-12\kappa} \|v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2\|_{L^2} \|\psi\|_{L^4} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We then separate  $\psi = \psi_l + \psi_h$  and use Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$  and the interpolation Lemma A.2, (4.10), (4.8), (4.9) to have it bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{7}{8}-12\kappa} (\|v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2\|_{L^2} + \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} + \|\psi_h\|_{L^4}^2) (\|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|)) d\tau \\ &\lesssim \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{7}{8}-12\kappa} \left( \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)^{\frac{9}{16}} (\|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} + 1) + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) d\tau + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \\ &\lesssim \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{7}{8}-12\kappa} \delta[\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2] d\tau + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \end{aligned}$$

Thus taking integral w.r.t.  $r$  we obtain  $\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \psi)(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr$  is bounded by the RHS of (4.19).

**II.2** We then consider  $f_2(\psi)$ . We also have two type of terms from  $f_2(\psi)$  given by  $v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \mathcal{Z}$  and  $v^\varepsilon * \text{Re}[\psi \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \psi$  with  $\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$ . For the first type  $v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \mathcal{Z}$ , we use the paraproduct decomposition to have

$$v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \mathcal{Z} = (v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2) \prec \mathcal{Z} + (v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2) \succ \mathcal{Z}. \quad (4.28)$$

For the first term from the RHS of (4.28) by using Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.5 we have

$$\|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \prec \mathcal{Z})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{3}{4}-13\kappa} \|\psi\|_{L^4}^2 d\tau. \quad (4.29)$$

We then take integral w.r.t.  $r$  and obtain

$$\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \prec \mathcal{Z})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left(1 + \int_s^t \|\psi\|_{L^4}^2 dr\right).$$

We then decompose  $\psi = \psi_l + \psi_h$  and use (4.10) and Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$  and (4.8) to obtain that  $\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \prec \mathcal{Z})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+\kappa}} dr$  is bounded by the RHS of (4.25). For the contribution from the second term of (4.28) we use Besov embedding Lemma A.1, followed by Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.5 to have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \succ \mathcal{Z})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} \\ & \lesssim \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \succ \mathcal{Z})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{4}{3}}^{\frac{7}{4}+24\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{7}{8}-12\kappa} \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{4}{3}}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2 d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We also first take integration w.r.t.  $r$  and by Lemma A.5 have

$$\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \succ \mathcal{Z})(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_s^t \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{4}{3}}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2 dr \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_s^t \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \|\psi\|_{L^4} dr$$

We also decompose  $\psi = \psi_l + \psi_h$  and use (4.10) and Lemma A.2 and Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$  to have it controlled by

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_s^t (\|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}) (\|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|)) dr \\ & \lesssim \int_s^t \left( \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2 + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (\|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{5}{4}+2\kappa} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{4}-2\kappa}) \right) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \end{aligned}$$

We then use Young's inequality and (4.8) and (4.15) to have it bounded by the RHS of (4.25).

On the other hand, for the second type term  $v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \psi$  from  $f_2(\psi)$  we use the paraproduct decomposition to have

$$\begin{aligned} v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \psi &= v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \prec \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \psi + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \succ \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \psi \\ &= v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \prec \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] (\prec + \succ) \psi + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \prec \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \circ \psi + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \succ \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Using Lemma A.5 we easily find that the contribution from the first term on the RHS of (4.30) can be controlled by the RHS of (4.29), which can be bounded the same way as  $(v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2) \prec \mathcal{Z}$ . For the last two terms on the RHS of (4.30) we also use the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.3 to find

$$\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \prec \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \circ \psi + v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \succ \overline{\mathcal{Z}}] \psi)(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \int_s^t \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \|\psi\|_{L^4} dr,$$

which can be bounded exactly the same way as that for  $v^\varepsilon * |\psi|^2 \succ \mathcal{Z}$ .

**II.3** We then consider  $f_1(\psi)$ . We note that we have three type of terms:

- (1)  $v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \overline{Y}] Z$  and  $v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \overline{Z}] Y$ ;
- (2)  $\mathcal{R}\psi$  and  $(6(\tilde{b}^\varepsilon - b^\varepsilon) - m + 1)\psi$ ;
- (3)  $\psi \mathcal{Z}$  with  $\|\mathcal{Z}(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| (t^{-\kappa} + 1)$  and  $v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi \overline{Y}) Y$ .

For the first type, we recall that the  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ -norm of the purely stochastic terms  $\tau_y \overline{Y} Z$ ,  $\tau_y Y Z$ ,  $\tau_y \overline{Z} Y$  and  $\tau_y Z Y$  on the RHS of (3.69), (3.77) can be bounded by  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|^2$  using paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and Propositions 3.3, 3.4 and Propositions 3.10, 3.13. Hence, we have by (A.1)

$$\|v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \overline{Y}] Z(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} + \|v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}[\psi \overline{Z}] Y\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|).$$

We then use Lemma 3.9 and (3.57) for the second type, and the paraproduct estimates from Lemma A.5 for the third type to deduce

$$\|f_1(\psi)(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|)(t^{-\kappa} + 1), \quad (4.31)$$

which implies that

$$\|\mathcal{I}_s(f_1(\psi))(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{3}{4}-13\kappa} (\tau^{-\kappa} + 1) \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} d\tau.$$

Using (4.15) and changing the order of integral as before, we obtain that  $\int_s^t \|\mathcal{I}_s(f_1(\psi))(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr$  is bounded by

$$K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \int_s^t r^{-\kappa} \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} dr \lesssim \int_s^t \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2 dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|),$$

which, by (4.15), is bounded by the RHS of (4.25).

Combining the above calculations, the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *It holds that*

$$\int_s^t \|(\mathcal{I}_s \mathcal{G}_1)(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\|\psi_2^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} + \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \quad (4.32)$$

where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is a small number and the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* From (4.22) and  $\mathcal{L}\psi = \mathcal{G} + \mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi)$  we know

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1 &= (\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi)) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} \\ &\quad + \int v^\varepsilon(y) \left( \tau_y(\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi)) \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} + \tau_y(\overline{\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi)}) \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} \right) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since the regularity of the terms  $\mathcal{G} \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}$  and  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{G} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy$ ,  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \overline{\mathcal{G}} \prec \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy$ , which involve  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ , is enhanced compared with  $\mathcal{G}$  due to the paraproduct estimates provided by Lemma A.5, they can be bounded in the same manner as demonstrated in the proof of Lemma 4.6. For the other terms involving  $\mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi)$  we use the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and (A.1) to have

$$\|\mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-1-\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \|Y + \psi\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.33)$$

Hence, we have by (4.10)

$$\|\mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-2\kappa}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \|Y + \psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (1 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}),$$

which implies that

$$\|(\mathcal{I}_s(\mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi) \prec \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}))(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}-13\kappa} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (1 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}) d\tau.$$

Taking integral w.r.t  $r$  we obtain that it is bounded by the RHS of (4.32). For the other two terms involving  $\mathcal{G}_\prec(Y + \psi)$  we use (4.33) and (A.1), and Proposition 3.4 to have the same bound and the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.8.** *It holds that*

$$\int_s^t \|(\mathcal{I}_s \mathcal{G}_2)(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \quad (4.34)$$

where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is a small number and the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* Recall (4.23) and we use the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and (A.1) to have

$$\|\mathcal{G}_2\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-3\kappa}} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1-2\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|),$$

which implies that

$$\|\mathcal{I}_s(\mathcal{G}_2)(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1+24\kappa}} dr \lesssim \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}-14\kappa} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (\|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{1-2\kappa}} + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}) d\tau.$$

Taking integral w.r.t  $r$  and using (4.14) we obtain it is bounded by the RHS of (4.34).  $\square$

**4.3. Energy estimates for  $\psi_l$ .** In this section, we undertake  $L^2$ -energy estimates for  $\psi_l$ . Our objective is to derive energy estimates for  $\psi_l$  that are uniform in  $\varepsilon$ , specifically Proposition 4.10, by leveraging the dissipative impact of the nonlinearity. It's worth noting that when we compute the  $L^2$ -inner product of  $\psi_l$  on both sides of equation (4.6), the cubic nonlinearity yields  $\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)$ . Thanks to the lower bounds provided by (4.8) and (4.9),  $\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)$  exhibits a dissipative effect, enabling us to gain uniform control over the other nonlinear terms. However, the dissipative effect from  $\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)$  is not as potent as  $\|\varphi\|_{L^4}^4$  in the context of energy estimates for the classical  $\Phi^4$  model (refer to [GH21] for details). To obtain a finer control over the nonlinearity, we must exploit the specific structure of  $\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon$ .

Consider the energy estimates for  $\psi_l$ , we first have the following result.

**Lemma 4.9.** *It holds that*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) = \Theta + \Xi,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\langle v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l + \psi_h|^2 \psi_h + v^\varepsilon * (2\text{Re}(\psi_l \overline{\psi_h}) + |\psi_h|^2) \psi_l, \psi_l \rangle, \\ \Xi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \mathcal{G}_{\neq} + F_{\neq}, \psi_l \rangle + \langle f_2(\psi) + f_1(\psi) + f_0, \psi_l \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_{\leq R}, (Y + \psi), \psi_l \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The result follows by taking  $L^2$ -inner product on both sides of equation (4.6). We also use  $\langle v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2 \psi_l, \psi_l \rangle = \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)$ .  $\square$

The aim of this section is to prove the following uniform in  $\varepsilon$  estimate of  $\psi_l$ .

**Proposition 4.10.** *It holds that for  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$*

$$\|\psi_l(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_s^t \|\nabla \psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 dr + \int_s^t \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) dr \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* The idea of the proof is to bound  $\int_s^t (\Theta + \Xi) dr$  by

$$\delta \left( \int_s^t \|\nabla \psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 dr + \int_s^t \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) dr \right) + C_\delta \left( K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \right),$$

for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $C_\delta$  independent of  $\varepsilon$ , which follows by Lemma 4.11– Lemma 4.16 and (4.35) below. The result then follows by choosing  $\delta$  small and applying Lemma 4.9.  $\square$

To derive Proposition 4.10 we start with the control of  $\Theta$  in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.11.** *It holds that*

$$|\Theta| \lesssim \delta \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \delta \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|),$$

for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , where the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* For  $\Theta$  we use (4.10), (4.9) and Besov embedding Lemma A.1 to have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Theta| &\lesssim (\|v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2\|_{L^2} + \|v^\varepsilon * |\psi_h|^2\|_{L^2}) \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} + \|v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2\|_{L^2} \|\psi_h\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)^{\frac{1}{2}} + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \right) \left( \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used  $\langle v^\varepsilon * f, g \rangle = \langle f, v^\varepsilon * g \rangle$ . We then use (4.8) to bound

$$\|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \lesssim \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)^{\frac{1}{16}},$$

which combined with Young's inequality implies the result.  $\square$

We then continue with the more complicated term  $\Xi$ . We will consider each term separately.

Using (4.3), we have for  $0 < \delta < 1$

$$|\langle f_0, \psi_l \rangle| \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+3\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (t^{-\kappa} + 1) \lesssim \delta \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (t^{-2\kappa} + 1). \quad (4.35)$$

We then consider  $\langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2) \psi_l, \mathcal{Z} \rangle$  from  $f_2(\psi)$ , which follows essentially the same argument as in the proof of [OOT24, Lemma 6.1]. Here we use the fact that  $v \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 4.12.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{Z} \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$  with  $\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|)$ . It holds that for  $\delta > 0$*

$$|\langle (v^\varepsilon * |f|^2) f, \mathcal{Z} \rangle| + |\langle (v^\varepsilon * |f|^2) \bar{f}, \mathcal{Z} \rangle| \lesssim \delta (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f) + \|f\|_{H^1}^2) + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \quad (4.36)$$

where the implicit constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* We only consider the first term, as the second term follows in exactly the same way. We use [SSZZ22, Lemma A.5] to have

$$|\langle g, \mathcal{Z} \rangle| \lesssim (\|\nabla g\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} \|g\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} + \|g\|_{L^1}) \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}. \quad (4.37)$$

We take  $g = (v^\varepsilon * |f|^2) f$  and use (4.8) and (4.9) to have

$$\|(v^\varepsilon * |f|^2) f\|_{L^1} \leq \|v^\varepsilon * |f|^2\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f)^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

On the other hand, we use (4.9) to have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla g\|_{L^1} &\leq \int v^\varepsilon * |f|^2 |\nabla f| dx + \int v^\varepsilon * (|\nabla f| |f|) |f| dx \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{H^1} + \| |f| v^\varepsilon * |f| \|_{L^2} \|f\|_{H^1} \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used integration by parts in the second step and used Hölder's inequality to have

$$\int |f|^2 (v^\varepsilon * |f|)^2 dx \leq \int |f|^2 (v^\varepsilon * |f|^2) dx = \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(f)$$

in the last step. Substituting the above two estimates into (4.37) and applying Young's inequality, we derive the result.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.13.** *It holds that for  $\delta > 0$  and  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$*

$$\int_s^t |\langle f_2(\psi), \psi_l \rangle| dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \quad (4.38)$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* We have the following decomposition:

$$\langle f_2(\psi), \psi_l \rangle = \langle v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2 \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle + 2 \langle v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2, \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{Z}_1 \psi_l) \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^4 J_i, \quad (4.39)$$

with  $\mathcal{Z} = -Z - Y$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_1 = -\overline{Z} - \overline{Y} \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{2}}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2 \langle v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi_l \overline{\psi_h}) \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle, & J_2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle v^\varepsilon * |\psi_h|^2 \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle, \\ J_3 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2 \langle v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi \mathcal{Z}_1) \psi_h, \psi_l \rangle, & J_4 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2 \langle v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi_h \mathcal{Z}_1) \psi_l, \psi_l \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We know that

$$\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{2}}} + \|\mathcal{Z}_1\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|.$$

Concerning the first two terms on the RHS of (4.39) we use Lemma 4.12 to derive the desired estimates. It remains to consider  $J_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ .

**I.** For  $J_1$  we use the paraproduct decomposition to have

$$\frac{1}{2} J_1 = \langle (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi_l \overline{\psi_h})) \prec \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle + \langle (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi_l \overline{\psi_h})) \succ \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle.$$

By Lemma A.6 and the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi_l \overline{\psi_h})) \prec \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle| &\lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} \|\psi_l\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2} + \kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ &\lesssim \delta \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \lesssim \delta \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + \delta \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \end{aligned}$$

where we used interpolation Lemma A.2 and Young's inequality in the second step and (4.8) in the last step.

For the remaining part we need a more delicate estimate for  $\psi_h$ . More precisely, we recall the decomposition in (4.12). In the following we estimate  $\psi_h^{(1)}$  and  $\psi_h^{(2)}$  separately. By the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5, Lemma A.6 and (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\overline{\psi_l \psi_h^{(1)}})) \succ \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle| &\lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\overline{\psi_l \psi_h^{(1)}}\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{4}{3}}^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ &\lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \left( \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{2}{3}}^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\kappa}} \|\psi_h^{(1)}\|_{L^4} + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2} \|\psi_h^{(1)}\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{4}{3}}^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\kappa}} \right) \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ &\lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{5}{4} + 2\kappa} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{4} - 2\kappa} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2} (r - s)^{-\frac{15}{68} - \kappa} \|\psi_h(s)\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{4}{17}}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

where we also used Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$ , the interpolation Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.3 in the last step. By applying Young's inequality, the first term on the RHS of (4.40) can be bounded by  $\delta(\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|)$ . Using (4.10) and Young's inequality with exponents  $(\frac{8}{5}, \frac{16}{5}, \frac{16}{5})$  we obtain that the second term on the RHS of (4.40) can be bounded by

$$\|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{5}{4}} (r - s)^{-\frac{15}{68} - \kappa} \lesssim \delta(\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) + (r - s)^{-\frac{12}{17} - 4\kappa} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|).$$

For the term including  $\psi_h^{(2)}$  we also use the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.6, Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$  and the interpolation Lemma A.2 to have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\overline{\psi_l \psi_h^{(2)}})) \succ \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle| &\lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\overline{\psi_l \psi_h^{(2)}}\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{4}{3}}^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ &\lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \left( \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{2}{3}}^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\kappa}} \|\psi_h^{(2)}\|_{L^4} + \|\psi_l\|_{L^3} \|\psi_h^{(2)}\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{12}{5}}^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\kappa}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{5}{4} + 2\kappa} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{4} - 2\kappa} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_l\|_{L^3} \|\psi_h^{(2)}\|_{L^4}^{1 - \sigma} \|\psi_h^{(2)}\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{2}{5}}^{1 - 2\kappa}}^\sigma \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Here  $\sigma = \frac{1+4\kappa}{2-4\kappa}$  and we used (4.10). The first term on the RHS can be bounded the same as the first term in (4.40). Using (4.13), (4.10) and Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{1}{2}} \subset L^3, H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$ , we obtain that the second term on the RHS of (4.41) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{5}{4}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(1 + \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l(\tau)\|_{L^2} d\tau\right)^\sigma K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \\ & \lesssim \delta(\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left(1 + \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l(r)\|_{L^2}^{6\sigma} d\tau\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (4.8) and Young's inequality with exponents  $(\frac{8}{5}, \frac{16}{3}, \frac{16}{3})$ . Taking integration w.r.t.  $r$  we use  $6\sigma < 4$  to obtain

$$\left| \int_s^t \langle (v^\varepsilon * \operatorname{Re}(\psi_l \bar{\psi}_h)) \rhd \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle dr \right| \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|).$$

**II.** For  $J_2$  we also use the paraproduct decomposition to have

$$J_2 = \langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_h|^2) \prec \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle + \langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_h|^2) \rhd \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle.$$

By the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and (4.10), (4.8), the interpolation Lemma A.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_h|^2) \prec \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle| \lesssim \|\psi_h\|_{L^4}^2 \|\psi_l\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ & \lesssim \delta \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + \delta \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_h|^2) \rhd \mathcal{Z}, \psi_l \rangle| \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}^2 \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ & \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4}^2 + \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}^2 K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be bounded by Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$  and Young's inequality. By (4.15) we have

$$\|\psi_h(r)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2 \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( (r-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \int_s^r (r-\tau)^{-\frac{3}{4}-2\kappa} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right), \quad (4.42)$$

which implies that after integration w.r.t.  $r$ ,  $\int_s^t J_2 dr$  can be bounded by the RHS of (4.38).

**III.** For  $J_3$  we use  $\psi = \psi_l + \psi_h$  to have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} J_3 = \langle v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h), \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{Z}_1 \psi) \rangle \\ & = \langle v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h), \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{Z}_1 \psi_l) \rangle + \langle v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h), \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{Z}_1 \psi_h) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be estimated exactly the same way as  $J_1$ . For the second term we focus on  $\langle v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h), \mathcal{Z}_1 \psi_h \rangle$ ; the other terms can be handled similarly. Using the paraproduct decomposition, we obtain

$$\langle v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h), \mathcal{Z}_1 \psi_h \rangle = \langle (v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h)) \prec \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle + \langle (v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h)) \rhd \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle.$$

We use Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.6, (4.10) to have

$$|\langle (v^\varepsilon * (\bar{\psi}_l \psi_h)) \prec \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle| \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|),$$

which can be estimated similarly as the second term in  $J_2$ . Similarly we use Lemma A.5 and (4.10) to have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle (v^\varepsilon * (\psi_l \psi_h)) \rhd \mathcal{Z}_1, \psi_h \rangle| \lesssim \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} \|\psi_l \psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ & \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} + \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which can be estimated as  $J_2$  by using Young's inequality and (4.42).

**IV.** For  $J_4$  we focus on  $\langle v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2 \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle$  and the other part follows similarly. We use the paraproduct decomposition to obtain

$$\langle v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2 \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle = \langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2) \prec \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle + \langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2) \succ \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle.$$

For the first term we use Lemma A.5 and (4.9) to have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2) \prec \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle| &\lesssim \|v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2\|_{L^2} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \lesssim \delta \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}^2 K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|), \end{aligned}$$

which can be estimated by using (4.42). For the second term we use Lemma A.5, Lemma A.6 and Sobolev embedding  $H^{\frac{3}{4}} \subset L^4$  and the interpolation Lemma A.2 to have

$$|\langle (v^\varepsilon * |\psi_l|^2) \succ \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_1, \psi_h \rangle| \lesssim \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^4} \|\psi_h\|_{L^4} \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\| \lesssim \delta \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|),$$

which by (4.8) implies the desired bound.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.14.** *It holds that for  $\delta > 0$  and  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$*

$$\int_s^t |\langle \mathcal{G}_\succ + F_\succ, \psi_l \rangle| dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) dr + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.43)$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* By Propositions 3.3, 3.12 and 3.13 and (A.1) we have

$$|\langle F_\succ, \psi_l \rangle| \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \|\psi_l\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+3\kappa}} (r^{-\kappa} + 1),$$

which implies the desired bound for it by Lemma A.2 and Young's inequality. For the term involving the paraproduct  $\succ$  from  $\mathcal{G}_\succ$  we use the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5 and Proposition 3.3 to have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \psi \succ \mathcal{Z}^\vee, \psi_l \rangle| &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (\|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} + \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}) \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \delta \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

which can be bounded using (4.42). For  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy$  and  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \overline{\psi} \succ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy$ , we use (A.1), Proposition 3.4 and exactly the same argument to conclude the desired estimates.

Moreover, by Lemma 3.14 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}^\vee + (\tilde{b}_1^\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon)(Y + \psi), \psi_l \rangle| \\ &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( (\|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}+\kappa}} + 1) \|\psi_l\|_{H^{2\kappa}} + \|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \|\psi_l\|_{H^{2\kappa}} \right) \\ &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi^\sharp\|_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^{\frac{3}{2}} + \delta (\|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^4), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (4.10) and Young's inequality in the last step. By integrating with respect to time and applying Proposition 4.5, the desired estimate follows for  $\psi \circ \mathcal{Z}^\vee$ . The desired bounds for the terms involving  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \psi \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy$  and  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \overline{\psi} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^\vee dy$  follow the same arguments by Lemma 3.16.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.15.** *It holds that for  $\delta > 0$  and  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$*

$$\int_s^t |\langle f_1(\psi), \psi_l \rangle| dr \lesssim \delta \int_s^t (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) ds + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|),$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .



*Proof.* Using (4.31) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f_1, \psi_l \rangle| &\lesssim (1 + r^{-\kappa}) \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \\ &\lesssim \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2 + (1 + r^{-2\kappa}) \|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2 K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

We then use (4.42) for  $\|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2$  and the interpolation Lemma A.2, Young's inequality for  $\|\psi_l\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}}^2$  to obtain the desired estimates.

Combining these estimates the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.16.** *It holds that for  $\delta > 0$*

$$|\langle \mathcal{G}_{\prec, \leq R} + F_{\prec, \leq R}, \psi_l \rangle| \lesssim \delta (\mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) + \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2) + K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|),$$

with the proportional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* We use the paraproduct estimates Lemma A.5, Lemma A.6, Propositions 3.3, 3.4, (A.1) and the localizer estimate (4.4) to have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle \mathcal{G}_{\prec, \leq R} + F_{\prec, \leq R}, \psi_l \rangle| \\ &\lesssim (K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) + \|\psi\|_{L^2}) \left( \sup_y \|\Delta_{\leq R} \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee}\|_{\mathbf{C}^\kappa} + \sup_y \|\Delta_{\leq R} \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee}\|_{\mathbf{C}^\kappa} + \|\Delta_{\leq R} \mathcal{Z}^{\vee}\|_{\mathbf{C}^\kappa} \right) \|\psi_l\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (1 + \|\psi\|_{L^2}) 2^{R(r)(1+2\kappa)} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We then use (4.11) to have it bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2) (\|\psi_l\|_{L^4} + 1)^{\frac{1+2\kappa}{17-2\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2) (\|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} + 1)^{\frac{1+2\kappa}{17-2\kappa}} K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|). \end{aligned}$$

We then use Young's inequality and (4.8) to derive the desired result.  $\square$

**4.4. Proof of Theorems 4.1–4.3.** In this section we first give the proof of Theorem 4.3 based on the uniform estimates derived in Proposition 4.10.

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* The bound for  $\psi_h$  follows from (4.10). The result for  $\psi_l$  follows from the same argument as in the proof of [MW17, Theorem 7.1]. More precisely, let  $F(s) = \|\psi_l(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1$ , and by Proposition 4.10 we obtain

$$\int_s^t F(r)^2 dr \leq CK(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) F(s).$$

By the construction of solutions in Theorem 3.8,  $F$  is continuous. Using [MW17, Lemma 7.3] we obtain a sequence  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_N = T$ , such that for every  $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$

$$F(t_n) \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) t_{n+1}^{-1}.$$

The proportional constant is uniform in  $\varepsilon$ . Hence, for any  $t \in [0, T]$  we can find  $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$  such that  $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1}]$ . We then apply Proposition 4.10 to obtain

$$\|\psi_l(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( \|\psi_l(t_n)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1 \right) \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \left( t_{n+1}^{-1} + 1 \right) \lesssim K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) (t^{-1} + 1).$$

Thus the result follows.  $\square$

It will be convenient to have a stationary coupling of the linear and nonlinear dynamics (3.7) and (3.1), which is stated in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.17.** *There exists a stationary process  $(\Psi^\varepsilon, Z)$  such that the components  $\Psi^\varepsilon, Z$  are stationary solutions to (3.1) and (3.7) respectively.*

The proof follows essentially the same steps as in [SSZZ22, Lemma 5.7] and [SZZ22, Lemma 4.2] and we put it in Appendix B.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* We take  $(\Psi^\varepsilon, Z)$  to be the stationary process given in Lemma 4.17. As  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  is stationary solution, we only need to prove the result for  $t = 1$ . We then set

$$\psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi^\varepsilon - Z + \mathcal{Z}^{\check{Y}} - \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}(Z)). \quad (4.46)$$

We then know  $\psi$  satisfies equation (4.1) with  $\psi(0) \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . We can also decompose  $\psi = \psi_l + \psi_h$  with  $\psi_l, \psi_h$  satisfying (4.6) and (4.5), respectively, and then apply the uniform in  $\varepsilon$  estimate derived in Section 4.1–Section 4.3 to  $\psi$  and  $\psi_l, \psi_h$ . Using stationary of  $(\Psi^\varepsilon, Z)$  and (4.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\|\psi(0)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \mathbf{E}\|(\Psi^\varepsilon - Z)(0)\|_{L^2}^2 = \mathbf{E}\|(\Psi^\varepsilon - Z)(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{E}\|\psi_l(1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathbf{E}\|\psi_h(1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{Z}^{\check{Y}}(1)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}(Z))(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

Here we used Theorem 4.3 and (4.2) in the last step and the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

On the other hand, taking expectation on the both sides of inequality in Proposition 4.10 with  $s = 0$  we use (4.47) to obtain

$$\mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 ds + \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) ds \lesssim \mathbf{E}\|\psi(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1 \lesssim 1. \quad (4.48)$$

Thus we use Lemma A.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\|\Psi^\varepsilon(1)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^2 &\lesssim \mathbf{E}\|(\Psi^\varepsilon - Z)(1)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^2 + \mathbf{E}\|Z(1)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^2 \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \|(\Psi^\varepsilon - Z)(s)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^2 ds + 1 \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_4^{1-2\kappa}}^2 ds + \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 ds + 1 \lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

where we used stationary of  $(\Psi^\varepsilon, Z)$  in the second step and the proportional constant is independent of  $\varepsilon$ . Here we used (4.48) and (4.14) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_4^{1-2\kappa}}^2 ds &\lesssim 1 + \mathbf{E} \left( K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \int_0^1 \int_0^s (s-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l(r)\|_{L^4}^2 dr ds \right) \\ &\lesssim 1 + \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 ds + \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) ds \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the first result follows.

Using Theorem 4.3 and (4.2) we obtain for any  $p \geq 2$

$$\sup_\varepsilon (\mathbf{E}\|\psi_l^\varepsilon(1)\|_{L^2}^p + \mathbf{E}\|\psi_h^\varepsilon(1)\|_{L^2}^p) \lesssim 1.$$

We then use (4.46) to have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\|\Psi^\varepsilon(1)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p &\lesssim \mathbf{E}\|(\Psi^\varepsilon - Z)(1)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p + \mathbf{E}\|Z(1)\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{E}\|\psi_l^\varepsilon(1)\|_{L^2}^p + \mathbf{E}\|\psi_h^\varepsilon(1)\|_{L^2}^p + 1 \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the second result follows.  $\square$

We now give the proof of Theorem 4.2.

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* Using Theorem 4.1, we know that  $\nu^\varepsilon$ , for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , is tight in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . Suppose that a subsequence— still denoted by  $\nu^\varepsilon$  for simplicity— converges weakly to  $\tilde{\nu}$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . We begin with the unique solutions  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  to equation (3.3) with initial distribution  $\nu^\varepsilon$ , and the unique solutions  $\Phi$  to (3.3) with initial distribution  $\tilde{\nu}$ . By Theorem 3.17, we know that  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  converges to  $\Phi$  in  $C([0, T]; \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa})$  in probability. Since  $\nu^\varepsilon$  is an invariant measure for (3.1) by Theorem 3.8, we conclude that  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  is a stationary solution to equation (3.1). Hence,  $\Phi$  is a stationary solution to equation (3.3), and therefore,  $\tilde{\nu}$  is an invariant measure for equation (3.3). Given that the invariant measure for equation (3.3) is unique by Theorem 3.7 and is given by  $\nu$ , we deduce that  $\tilde{\nu} = \nu$ . Consequently, the entire sequence  $\nu^\varepsilon$  converges weakly to  $\nu$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . Furthermore, by Theorem 4.1, we obtain

$$\sup_\varepsilon \int \|\Psi\|_{\mathbf{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^p \nu^\varepsilon(d\Psi) \lesssim 1,$$

for any  $p \geq 1$ , which implies the convergence of  $p$ -point correlation functions by uniform integrability.  $\square$

## 5. STOCHASTIC CALCULATIONS

In this section, we prove the stochastic estimates required in Section 3, following the notations from [GP17, Section 9]. We express the complex-valued white noise through its spatial Fourier transform. More precisely, let  $E = \mathbb{Z}^3$  and let  $W(\cdot, k) = \langle \xi, e_k \rangle$  and  $\overline{W}(\cdot, k) = \langle \overline{\xi}, e_k \rangle$  for  $e_k(x) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{ix \cdot k}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$ . Note that  $\overline{W}(\cdot, k)$  is not the conjugate of  $W(\cdot, k)$ , but rather we have  $\overline{W}(\cdot, k) = \overline{W(\cdot, -k)}$  with  $\overline{W(\cdot, -k)}$  being the conjugate of  $W(\cdot, -k)$ . We view  $W(\cdot, k)$  as a Gaussian noise on  $\mathbb{R} \times E$  with covariance given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} f(\eta) W(d\eta) \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} g(\eta') \overline{W}(d\eta') \right) &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} g(\eta_1) f(\eta_{-1}) d\eta_1, \\ \mathbf{E} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} f(\eta) W(d\eta) \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} g(\eta') W(d\eta') \right) &= \mathbf{E} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} f(\eta) \overline{W}(d\eta) \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} g(\eta') \overline{W}(d\eta') \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\eta_a = (s_a, k_a)$ ,  $s_{-a} = s_a$ ,  $k_{-a} = -k_a$  and the measure  $d\eta_a = ds_a dk_a$  is the product of the Lebesgue measure  $ds_a$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  and of the counting measure  $dk_a$  on  $E$ .

We write

$$\begin{aligned} Z(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} e_k P_{t-s} W(d\eta), & \langle Z(t), e_k \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_{t-s}(k) dW(s, k), \\ \overline{Z}(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times E} e_k P_{t-s} \overline{W}(d\eta), & \langle \overline{Z}(t), e_k \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_{t-s}(k) d\overline{W}(s, k), \end{aligned}$$

with  $p_t(k) = e^{-(|k|^2+1)t} \mathbf{1}_{t \geq 0}$ . Hence, we use (5.1) to have for  $t \geq \sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \langle Z(t), e_k \rangle \langle \overline{Z}(\sigma), e_{k'} \rangle &= 2 \mathbf{1}_{\{k+k'=0\}} \int_{-\infty}^{\sigma} p_{t-s}(k) p_{\sigma-s}(k) ds = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{k+k'=0\}}}{|k|^2+1} e^{-(|k|^2+1)(t-\sigma)}, \\ \mathbf{E} \langle Z(t), e_k \rangle \langle Z(\sigma), e_{k'} \rangle &= 0, & \mathbf{E} \langle \overline{Z}(t), e_k \rangle \langle \overline{Z}(\sigma), e_{k'} \rangle &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

We will meet the random fields written as

$$\mathcal{Z}^\tau = \int_{(\mathbb{R} \times E)^{n+m}} H(t, x, \eta) \prod_{i=1}^n W(d\eta_i) \prod_{j=n+1}^{n+m} \overline{W}(d\eta_j),$$

which are easier to handle when decomposed into different chaos. We now introduce the following notations  $k_{[1\dots n]} = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$ ,  $\eta_{1\dots n} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in (\mathbb{R} \times E)^n$ ,  $d\eta_{1\dots n} = d\eta_1 \dots d\eta_n$ . Denote by

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R} \times E)^{n+m}} f(\eta_{1\dots n+m}) W(d\eta_{1\dots n}) \diamond \overline{W}(d\eta_{n+1\dots n+m})$$

a generic element of the  $n + m$ -th chaos of  $W$  on  $\mathbb{R} \times E$ . Since  $W$  is complex valued white noise, we need to consider the conjugate part here. We refer to [HIN17, Appendix A] for more details. By [GP17, Section 9.2] and [HIN17, Appendix A] we know that

$$\mathbf{E} \left( \left| \int_{(\mathbb{R} \times E)^{n+m}} f(\eta_{1\dots n+m}) W(d\eta_{1\dots n}) \diamond \overline{W}(d\eta_{n+1\dots n+m}) \right|^2 \right) \lesssim_{n,m} \int_{(\mathbb{R} \times E)^{n+m}} |f(\eta_{1\dots n+m})|^2 d\eta_{1\dots n+m}. \quad (5.3)$$

Hence for bounding the variance of the chaos it is enough to bound the  $L^2$  norm of the unsymmetrized kernels.

We introduce the following notation: for  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^3$

$$\psi_{\prec}(k_1, k_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j \geq -1} \sum_{i < j-1} \theta_i(k_1) \theta_j(k_2), \quad \psi_{\circ}(k_1, k_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{|i-j| \leq 1} \theta_i(k_1) \theta_j(k_2),$$

and  $\psi_{\succ} = 1 - \psi_{\prec}$ .

In the following  $\kappa > 0$  is any small number.

**5.1. Proof of Propositions 3.10 and 3.13.** In this subsection, we perform stochastic calculations for the random fields introduced in Propositions 3.10 and 3.13.

*Proof of Proposition 3.10.* We recall that for  $k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^3$

$$\langle \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{R}Z), e_{k_1} \rangle = \int_0^t F^{vG}(k_1) e^{-(t-s)(|k_1|^2+1)} \langle Z(s), e_{k_1} \rangle ds,$$

with  $F^{vG}(k) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_k \frac{1}{|k|^2+1} \left( \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 - k) \right)$ .

We first consider  $(v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{R}Z)) \circ Z$ . By chaos decomposition we have

$$(v^\varepsilon * \overline{\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{R}Z)}) \circ Z = c_1^\varepsilon + I^2,$$

with  $I^2$  in the second chaos and  $c_1^\varepsilon$  in the zeroth chaos.

**Terms in the zeroth chaos:** By direct calculation and (5.2) we find

$$\begin{aligned} c_1^\varepsilon &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{k_1} F^{vG}(k_1) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1) \frac{1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2+1)}}{2(|k_1|^2+1)^2} \psi_{\circ}(k_1, k_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6} \sum_{k, k_1} \frac{\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1) (\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 - k)) (1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2+1)})}{2(|k_1|^2+1)^2 (|k|^2+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Since  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) = \widehat{v}(\varepsilon k)$ , we use change of variable to have

$$c_1^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^6 \sum_{k, k_1 \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^3} \frac{\widehat{v}(k_1) (\widehat{v}(k) - \widehat{v}(k_1 - k)) (1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2 \varepsilon^{-2} + 1)})}{2 \cdot (2\pi)^6 (|k_1|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^2 (|k|^2 + \varepsilon^2)} = \sum_{i=1}^2 L_i,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon^6 \sum_{k, k_1 \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^3, |k_1| \leq 1} \frac{\widehat{v}(k_1) (\widehat{v}(k) - \widehat{v}(k_1 - k))}{2 \cdot (2\pi)^6 (|k_1|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^2 (|k|^2 + \varepsilon^2)} (1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2 \varepsilon^{-2} + 1)}), \\ L_2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon^6 \sum_{k, k_1 \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^3, |k_1| > 1} \frac{\widehat{v}(k_1) (\widehat{v}(k) - \widehat{v}(k_1 - k))}{2 \cdot (2\pi)^6 (|k_1|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^2 (|k|^2 + \varepsilon^2)} (1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2 \varepsilon^{-2} + 1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $C_1$ , given in (3.4), can be decomposed into  $C_{11} + C_{12}$ , where  $C_{11}$  and  $C_{12}$  correspond to the first and second terms on the RHS of (3.4), respectively. It is easy to see that

$$|L_2 - C_{12}| \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa (1 + t^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}).$$

For  $L_1$  we use  $\nabla \hat{v}(k) = -\nabla \hat{v}(-k)$  to have

$$L_1 = \varepsilon^6 \sum_{k, k_1 \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^3, |k_1| \leq 1} \frac{\hat{v}(k_1)(\hat{v}(k) - \hat{v}(k_1 - k) - k_1 \cdot \nabla \hat{v}(k))}{2 \cdot (2\pi)^6 (|k_1|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^2 (|k|^2 + \varepsilon^2)} (1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2 \varepsilon^{-2} + 1)}).$$

We first consider the term excluding  $e^{-2t(|k_1|^2 \varepsilon^{-2} + 1)}$  and compare it with  $C_{11}$ . We employ Taylor expansion and interpolation for the numerator from  $L_1$  and  $C_{11}$  to have it bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^\kappa \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|x|^4 |y|^2} |x|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{1}{(1 + |y - sux|^2)^{1-\kappa}} ds du dx dy \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{|x| \leq 1, |y| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|x|^2 |y|^2} dx dy ds du \\ & + \varepsilon^\kappa \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left( \int_{|y| > 1} \frac{1}{|y|^4} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{|y| > 1} \frac{1}{(1 + |y - sux|^2)^{2-2\kappa}} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dx ds du \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

For the term involving  $e^{-2t(|k_1|^2 \varepsilon^{-2} + 1)}$  the approach is similar, since we can bound it with an additional factor  $\varepsilon^\kappa t^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} |k_1|^{-\kappa}$ .

Thus we obtain

$$|c_1^\varepsilon - C_1| \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa (1 + t^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}). \tag{5.6}$$

**Terms in the second chaos:** By direct calculation we have

$$I_t^2 = (2\pi)^{-3} \sum_{k_1, k_2} \psi_\circ(k_1, k_2) \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k_1) \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)(|k_1|^2 + 1)} F^{vG}(k_1) : \langle \overline{Z}_s, e_{k_1} \rangle \langle Z_t, e_{k_2} \rangle : ds e^{ik_{[12]}x},$$

with  $: \langle \overline{Z}_s, e_{k_1} \rangle \langle Z_t, e_{k_2} \rangle :$  denoting Wick product of  $\langle \overline{Z}_s, e_{k_1} \rangle \langle Z_t, e_{k_2} \rangle$  given by

$$\langle \overline{Z}_s, e_{k_1} \rangle \langle Z_t, e_{k_2} \rangle - \mathbf{E}[\langle \overline{Z}_s, e_{k_1} \rangle \langle Z_t, e_{k_2} \rangle].$$

Thus we use (3.79) with  $\eta = \kappa$ , (5.2), (5.3) and Lemma 3.22 to obtain

$$\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q I^2|^2 \lesssim \sum_{k_1, k_2} \frac{\psi_\circ(k_1, k_2) \varepsilon^{2\kappa} \theta_q(k_{[12]})}{(|k_1| + 1)^{4-2\kappa} (|k_2| + 1)^2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{2\kappa} 2^{2q\kappa},$$

where we used  $i \sim j$  to have  $|k_1| \sim |k_2|$  in the last step. Since  $\Delta_q[(v^\varepsilon * \overline{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)}) \circ Z - c_1^\varepsilon]$  is a random variable with a finite chaos decomposition, we use Gaussian hypercontractivity to have for  $p \geq 2$

$$\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q((v^\varepsilon * \overline{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)}) \circ Z - c_1^\varepsilon)|^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p\kappa} 2^{qp\kappa},$$

which implies

$$\sup_q 2^{-pq\kappa} \mathbf{E} \|\Delta_q[v^\varepsilon * \overline{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)} \circ Z - c_1^\varepsilon]\|_{L^p}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p\kappa}.$$

Using Besov embedding Lemma A.1 we choose  $p$  large enough to obtain

$$\mathbf{E} \|(v^\varepsilon * \overline{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)}) \circ Z\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-2\kappa}}^p \lesssim \mathbf{E} \|(v^\varepsilon * \overline{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)}) \circ Z\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p, p}^{-\frac{3\kappa}{2}}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p\kappa}.$$

Furthermore, the second bound in (3.34) follows by considering the time difference

$$|1 - e^{-|t_1 - t_2||k|^2}| \lesssim (|t_1 - t_2||k|^2) \wedge 1,$$

and Kolmogorov's continuity criterion.

We now consider the remaining terms. For  $(v^\varepsilon * \overline{Z}) \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)$  the required bounds and convergence follow the same line. For  $(v^\varepsilon * \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)) \circ Z$  and  $(v^\varepsilon * Z) \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}Z)$ , the zeroth chaos part vanishes, and the terms in the second chaos are bounded in a similar manner.

In the case of  $\text{Re}[\overline{Z} \circ \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z)]$ , the terms in the second chaos are similarly bounded, and we focus only on the terms in the zeroth chaos, given by  $c_2^\varepsilon$ .

**Terms in the zeroth chaos:** By direct calculation

$$\begin{aligned} c_2^\varepsilon &= \sum_{k_1} F^{vG}(k_1) \frac{1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2+1)}}{2 \cdot (2\pi)^3 (|k_1|^2 + 1)^2} \psi_\circ(k_1, k_1) \\ &= \sum_{k, k_1} \frac{(\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 - k))(1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2+1)})}{2 \cdot (2\pi)^6 (|k_1|^2 + 1)^2 (|k|^2 + 1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Note that  $c_2^\varepsilon$  is the same as  $c_1^\varepsilon$ , with  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)$  replaced by 1. Therefore, we can apply a similar decomposition and follow the same steps as in the calculation for (5.6) to obtain

$$|c_2^\varepsilon - C_2| \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa (1 + t^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}).$$

Using Besov embedding Lemma A.1, Gaussian hypercontractivity, the bound in (3.36) follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.13.* We classify these calculations into the following two categories:

$$\text{I. } \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}, \quad \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy, \quad \int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}\overline{Z}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{Y}} dy,$$

and

$$\text{II. } \tau_y \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z)} \circ Z, \quad \tau_y \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ Z, \quad \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \tau_y \overline{Z}, \quad \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \tau_y Z.$$

**I.** We then consider  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ , which by chaos decomposition is given by

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{Y}} = I_t^3 + I_t^1,$$

with

$$I_t^3 = \int H(\eta_{123}) W(d\eta_{12}) \diamond \overline{W}(d\eta_3), \quad I_t^1 = \int H(\eta_{12(-1)}) W(d\eta_2),$$

for

$$H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_\circ(k_1, k_{[23]}) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[23]}) \int_0^t F^{vG}(k_1) e^{-(t-s)(|k_1|^2+1)} p_{s-s_1}(k_1) p_{t-s_2}(k_2) p_{t-s_3}(k_3) ds \prod_{i=1}^3 e_{k_i}.$$

**Terms in the third chaos:** Using (3.79) and (5.2), (5.3) we obtain by Lemma 3.22

$$\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q I_t^3|^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3} \psi_\circ(k_1, k_{[23]}) \frac{\theta_q(k_{[123]})}{(1 + |k_1|)^{4-\kappa} (1 + |k_2|)^2 (1 + |k_3|)^2} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa 2^{q(1+\kappa)},$$

where we used  $|k_{[23]}| \sim |k_1|$  in the last step.

**Terms in the first chaos:** We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^1 &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{k_1, k_2} \psi_\circ(k_1, k_2 - k_1) \frac{F^{vG}(k_1)}{2(1 + |k_1|^2)^2} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2 - k_1) \\ &\quad \times \langle Z_t, e_{k_2} \rangle e_{k_2} (1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2+1)}) \\ &= L_1 + c_1^\varepsilon Z, \end{aligned}$$

with  $c_1^\varepsilon$  is given by (5.4) and

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (2\pi)^{-3} \sum_{k_1, k_2} \frac{F^{vG}(k_1)}{2(1 + |k_1|^2)^2} [\psi_\circ(k_1, k_2 - k_1) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2 - k_1) - \psi_\circ(k_1, k_1) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)] \\ &\quad \times \langle Z_t, e_{k_2} \rangle e_{k_2} (1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

We then claim that  $L_1$  converge to zero in  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . In fact, we use interpolation to have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\psi_\circ(k_1, k_2 - k_1) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2 - k_1) - \psi_\circ(k_1, k_1) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)| \\ & \lesssim \psi_\circ(k_1, k_2 - k_1) (\varepsilon |k_2|)^{\frac{3\kappa}{4}} |\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2 - k_1) - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1)|^{1-\kappa} + (|k_1|^{-1} |k_2|)^{\frac{3\kappa}{4}} \\ & \lesssim (|k_1|^{-1} |k_2|)^{\frac{3\kappa}{4}} + \psi_\circ(k_1, k_2 - k_1) |k_2|^{\frac{3\kappa}{4}} (|k_2 - k_1|^{-\frac{3\kappa}{4}} + |k_1|^{-\frac{3\kappa}{4}}) \\ & \lesssim (|k_1|^{-1} |k_2|)^{\frac{3\kappa}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

which combined with (3.79) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} |\Delta_q L_1|^2 & \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \sum_{k_2} \frac{\theta_q(k_2)^2}{|k_2|^2 + 1} \left( \sum_{k_1} \frac{(|k_1|^{-1} |k_2|)^{\frac{3\kappa}{4}}}{1 + |k_1|^{3-\frac{5}{2}}} \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa \sum_{k_2} \frac{\theta_q(k_2)^2}{|k_2|^2 - \frac{3\kappa}{2} + 1} \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa 2^{q(1+\frac{3\kappa}{2})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Using Besov embedding Lemma A.1, Gaussian hypercontractivity, we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbf{V}} - c_1^\varepsilon Z \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}.$$

In the case of  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}} dy$ , we have the same chaos decomposition, with  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[23]})$  in  $H$  replaced by  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_1 + k_3)$ , which gives  $c_2^\varepsilon Z$  as the renormalization counterterm. The convergence of  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}} dy - c_2^\varepsilon Z$  in  $C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  follows the same reasoning. For  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\overline{Z}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}} dy$ , we have two terms in the first chaos, arising from  $k_1 + k_2 = 0$  and  $k_1 + k_3 = 0$ , which yield  $c_1^\varepsilon Z$  and  $c_2^\varepsilon Z$ , respectively. Thus, the convergence of  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\overline{Z}) \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}} dy - c_1^\varepsilon Z - c_2^\varepsilon Z$  follows the same approach.

**II.** For the second type, we employ a calculation akin to  $\text{Re}[\overline{Z} \circ \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z)]$  from the proof of Proposition 3.10. The  $\sup_y$  bound follows from  $|e^{iky_1} - e^{iky_2}| \lesssim (|k||y_1 - y_2|) \wedge 1$  and Kolmogorov's continuity criterion. In fact the calculation for the second order chaos follows the same line. The zeroth chaos components of  $\tau_y \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ Z$  and  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}Z) \circ \tau_y Z$  vanish, while the zeroth chaos part of  $\tau_y \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\overline{Z}) \circ Z$ ,  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{R}\overline{Z}) \circ \tau_y \overline{Z}$  is given by

$$c_2^\varepsilon(y) = \sum_{k_1} F^{vG}(k_1) \frac{1 - e^{-2t(|k_1|^2+1)}}{2 \cdot (2\pi)^3 (|k_1|^2 + 1)^2} \psi_\circ(k_1, k_1) e^{-ik_1 y}.$$

We bound  $e^{-ik_1 y}$  by 1 and use a similar calculation as in (5.5) to have  $\sup_y |c_2^\varepsilon(y)| \lesssim 1$ . The result then follows.  $\square$

**5.2. Proof of Proposition 3.12.** We focus on the first term  $\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}}$ , as the other term follows the same line. We also have chaos decomposition

$$\int v^\varepsilon(y) \tau_y \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{V}} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\mathbf{V}} = I_t^5 + I_t^3 + I_t^1,$$

with

$$I_t^5 = \int H(\eta_{12345}) W(d\eta_{135}) \diamond \overline{W}(d\eta_{24}),$$

where

$$H(\eta_{1\dots 5}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[45]}) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[1234]}) \int_0^t p_{t-s}(k_{[123]}) \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[12]}) \prod_{i=1}^3 p_{s-s_i}(k_i) ds \prod_{j=4}^5 p_{t-s_j}(k_j) \prod_{i=1}^5 e_{k_i}.$$

In the following we will solely demonstrate a uniform in  $\varepsilon$  bound for  $\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\vee} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee}$  and the required result for the difference of  $\int v^\varepsilon(y)\tau_y\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\vee} \circ \mathcal{Z}_y^{\vee}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\vee}$  can be derived analogously by applying

$$|\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) - 1| \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa |k|^\kappa.$$

**Terms in the fifth chaos:** Using Lemma 3.22, (5.2) and (5.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}|\Delta_q I_t^5|^2 &\lesssim \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5} \theta(2^{-q}k_{[12345]}) \prod_{i=1}^5 \frac{1}{|k_i|^2 + 1} \frac{\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[45]})}{(|k_{[123]}|^2 + 1)(|k_{[123]}|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_1|^2 + 3)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k_{[123]}, k_{[45]}} \theta(2^{-q}k_{[12345]}) \frac{1}{(|k_{[123]}|^{3-\kappa} + 1)(|k_{[45]}|^{2+\kappa} + 1)} \lesssim 2^q, \end{aligned}$$

where we used  $|k_{[45]}| \simeq |k_{[123]}|$  in the second step.

**Terms in the third chaos:** We have the following decomposition:

$$I_t^3 = \sum_{j=1}^3 I_t^{3j},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^{31} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int H(t, x, \eta_{123(-3)5}) d\eta_3 W(d\eta_{15}) \diamond \overline{W}(d\eta_2), & I_t^{32} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int H(t, x, \eta_{1234(-2)}) d\eta_2 W(d\eta_{13}) \diamond \overline{W}(d\eta_4), \\ I_t^{33} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int H(t, x, \eta_{123(-1)5}) d\eta_1 W(d\eta_{35}) \diamond \overline{W}(d\eta_2). \end{aligned}$$

We use Lemma 3.22 to have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}|\Delta_q I_t^{31}|^2 &\lesssim \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_5} \frac{\theta(2^{-q}k_{[125]})}{(|k_1|^2 + 1)(|k_2|^2 + 1)(|k_5|^2 + 1)} \left( \sum_{k_3} \frac{1}{(|k_3|^2 + 1)(|k_{[123]}|^2 + |k_3|^2 + 1)} \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k_{[12]}, k_5} \frac{\theta(2^{-q}k_{[125]})}{(|k_{[12]}|^{3-\frac{\kappa}{2}} + 1)(|k_5|^2 + 1)} dk_{[12]5} \lesssim 2^{q(1+\frac{\kappa}{2})}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $I_t^{32}$ , we simply replace  $k_5$  with  $k_4$  and change the roles of  $k_2$  and  $k_3$  in the above estimate and obtain the same bounds for  $\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q I_t^{32}|^2$ . Similarly, for  $I_t^{33}$ , we exchange the roles of  $k_1$  and  $k_3$  in the estimate and derive the same bounds for  $\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q I_t^{33}|^2$ .

**Terms in the first chaos:**

We have the following decomposition:

$$I_t^1 = \sum_{j=1}^2 I_t^{1j},$$

with

$$I_t^{11} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int H(t, x, \eta_{123(-1)(-2)}) d\eta_{12} W(d\eta_3), \quad I_t^{12} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int H(t, x, \eta_{123(-3)(-2)}) d\eta_{23} W(d\eta_1).$$

The convergence of the terms  $I_t^{1i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , require renormalization. More precisely we prove the probabilistic bounds for the following terms:

$$I_t^{11} - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon Z, \quad I_t^{12} - \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon Z.$$

We first have

$$\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q(I_t^{11} - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon Z)|^2 \lesssim \sum_{k_3} \frac{\theta(2^{-q}k_3)}{|k_3|^2 + 1} \left( \sum_{k_1, k_2} \frac{\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[12]})h_1(k_1, k_2, k_3)}{(|k_1|^2 + 1)(|k_2|^2 + 1)} \right)^2,$$



where

$$h_1(k_1, k_2, k_3) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[23]})L(k_{[123]})\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[12]}) - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)L(k_{[12]})\psi_\circ(k_{[12]}, k_{[12]}),$$

and

$$L(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1 - e^{-t(|k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + 3)}}{|k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + 3}.$$

The terms  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)L(k_{[12]})\psi_\circ(k_{[12]}, k_{[12]})$  correspond to the renormalization counterterm  $\tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon Z$ . We rewrite  $h_1(k_1, k_2, k_3)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[23]}) - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2))L(k_{[123]})\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[12]}) + \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)(L(k_{[123]}) - L(k_{[12]}))\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[12]}) \\ & + (\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[12]}) - \psi_\circ(k_{[12]}, k_{[12]}))L(k_{[12]})\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2), \end{aligned}$$

which by interpolation is bounded

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} |k_3|^{\frac{\kappa}{4}} \left( \frac{1}{(\varepsilon |k_{[23]}|)^{\frac{\kappa}{4}}} + \frac{1}{(\varepsilon |k_2|)^{\frac{\kappa}{4}}} \right) \frac{1}{|k_{[123]}|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + 1} \\ & + |k_3|^{\frac{\kappa}{4}} \frac{1}{(|k_1| + |k_2|)^{2 + \frac{\kappa}{4}} + 1} + \left( \frac{|k_3|}{|k_{[12]}|} \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{4}} L(k_{[12]}). \end{aligned}$$

We then use Lemma 3.22 to have that  $\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q(I_t^{11} - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon Z)|^2$  is bounded by

$$\sum_{k_3} \theta(2^{-q}k_3) \frac{1}{|k_3|^{2 - \frac{\kappa}{2}} + 1} \lesssim 2^{q(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2})}.$$

For  $I_t^{12} - \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon Z$  we have

$$\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q(I_t^{12} - \tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon Z)|^2 \lesssim \sum_{k_1} \frac{\theta(2^{-q}k_1)}{|k_1|^2 + 1} \left( \sum_{k_2, k_3} \frac{h_2(k_1, k_2, k_3)}{(|k_2|^2 + 1)(|k_3|^2 + 1)} \right)^2,$$

where

$$h_2(k_1, k_2, k_3) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[12]})^2 L_1(k_{[123]})\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[23]}) - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)^2 L_1(k_{[23]})\psi_\circ(k_{[23]}, k_{[23]}),$$

and

$$L_1(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1 - e^{-t(|k|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + 3)}}{|k|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + 3}.$$

Here  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)^2 L_1(k_{[23]})$  correspond to  $\tilde{b}_3^\varepsilon Z$  for the renormalization counterterms. We write  $h_2$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_{[12]})^2 - \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)^2)L_1(k_{[123]})\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[23]}) + \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)^2(L_1(k_{[123]}) - L_1(k_{[23]}))\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[23]}) \\ & + (\psi_\circ(k_{[123]}, k_{[23]}) - \psi_\circ(k_{[23]}, k_{[23]}))L_1(k_{[23]})\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k_2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We then use similar calculation for  $\mathbf{E}|\Delta_q(I_t^{11} - \tilde{b}_2^\varepsilon Z)|^2$  to derive the same bound.

Combining the above probabilistic bounds and using Gaussian hypercontractivity and Kolomogorov continuity criterion and Besov embedding Lemma A.1, we obtain the result in Proposition 3.12.

## 6. A-PRIORI AND CORRELATION ESTIMATES FOR THE QUANTUM GIBBS STATE

Now we start to consider the quantum Gibbs state.

**6.1. Second quantization formalism.** For every  $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ , we define the annihilation operator  $a(f)$  and the creation operator  $a^*(f)$  on Fock space  $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}(L^2(\mathbb{T}^3))$  by

$$\begin{aligned} (a(f)\psi)(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) &= \sqrt{n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \overline{f(x)} \psi(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x) dx, \\ (a^*(f)\psi)(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) \psi(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n), \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

and extend to  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$  by linearity. These operators are related to the operators  $a_x, a_x^*$  in (1.2) by

$$a(f) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \overline{f(x)} a_x dx, \quad a^*(f) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(x) a_x^* dx, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3).$$

In particular, for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ , we denote  $a_k = a(e_k)$  with function  $e_k(x) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} e^{ik \cdot x}$ . They satisfy

$$[a_k, a_j] = 0 = [a_k^*, a_j^*], \quad [a_k, a_j^*] = \delta_{k,j}, \quad \forall k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^3. \quad (6.2)$$

which are similar to (1.3).

If  $A$  is a self-adjoint operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$ , then its second quantization on Fock space can be written as

$$d\Gamma(A) = 0 \oplus \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{j=1}^n A_j \right) = \sum_{j,k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \langle e_j, A e_k \rangle a_j^* a_k = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a_x^* A a_x dx.$$

For example, the number operator is  $\mathcal{N} = d\Gamma(1)$ . More generally, if  $A_n$  is a self-adjoint operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^n$ , we can write its second quantization  $\mathbb{A}_n$  defined in (2.4) as

$$\mathbb{A}_n = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_n, j_1, \dots, j_n \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \langle e_{k_1} \otimes_s \dots \otimes_s e_{k_n}, A_n e_{j_1} \otimes_s \dots \otimes_s e_{j_n} \rangle a_{j_1}^* \dots a_{j_n}^* a_{k_n} \dots a_{k_1}.$$

We will always denote by  $h = -\Delta + 1$  the one-body operator on  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ . Thus the Gaussian quantum state in (2.5) is  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{Z}_0^{-1} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(h)}$ . Moreover, with our choice of the chemical potential  $\vartheta$  in (2.13), the interacting Hamiltonian  $\mathbb{H}_\lambda$  in (2.3) can be written as  $\lambda d\Gamma(h) + \mathbb{W} - E_\lambda$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W} &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2(2\pi)^3} (\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 + \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) |d\Gamma(e_k)|^2 - \lambda \vartheta^\varepsilon (\mathcal{N} - N_0), \\ \vartheta^\varepsilon &= a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - m + 1 - \varepsilon_\lambda, \quad m = m_0 - 2C_1 - 2C_2, \\ \varepsilon_\lambda &= \lambda \varrho_0 - \frac{\zeta\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)}{(4\pi)^{3/2}} \lambda^{-1/2} - C_0 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} = O(\lambda^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

and

$$N_0 = (2\pi)^3 \varrho_0, \quad E_\lambda = \frac{\lambda^2}{2} (2\pi)^3 \varrho_0^2 + (2\pi)^3 \lambda \varrho_0 \vartheta^\varepsilon, \quad (6.4)$$

where  $\varrho_0, C_0$  and  $a^\varepsilon, b^\varepsilon, C_1, C_2$  are introduced in (2.7), (2.8) and (2.12), respectively. Moreover, we used the notation  $|A|^2 = A^* A$  with  $A = d\Gamma(e_k)$  the second quantization of the multiplication operator  $e_k(x) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} e^{ik \cdot x}$ . Since the constant  $E_\lambda$  plays no role in the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$  (although it changes the partition function), from now on we will take

$$\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}, \quad \mathcal{Z}_\lambda = \text{Tr} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}, \quad \mathbb{H}_\lambda = \lambda d\Gamma(h) + \mathbb{W}. \quad (6.5)$$

as definition, where the renormalized interaction  $\mathbb{W}$  is given in (6.3). We can also write  $\mathbb{H}_\lambda$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_\lambda &= \lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a_x^* (-\Delta_x + m) a_x dx + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{T}^3} v^\varepsilon(x-y) (a_x^* a_x - \varrho_0) (a_y^* a_y - \varrho_0) dx dy \\ &\quad - (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - \varepsilon_\lambda) \lambda \int (a_x^* a_x - \varrho_0) dx, \end{aligned}$$

which is a quantum analogue of the energy functional in (2.15).

**6.2. Variational principle and a-priori estimates.** Now we collect a-priori estimates for the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ . Our starting point is the Gibbs variational principle, which asserts that the interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}_\lambda}$  in (6.5) is the *unique minimizer* for the variational problem

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} = \min_{\substack{\Gamma \geq 0 \\ \text{Tr } \Gamma = 1}} \left\{ \mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0) + \text{Tr} [\mathbb{W}\Gamma] \right\}. \quad (6.6)$$

with the relative entropy  $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0) = \text{Tr}[\Gamma(\log \Gamma - \log \Gamma_0)] \geq 0$ . This leads to the following a-priori estimate.

**Lemma 6.1** (A-priori estimates). *The relative partition function satisfies*

$$\left| \log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}. \quad (6.7)$$

Consequently, we have the following a-priori estimates on the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ :

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) + \lambda^2 \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (6.8)$$

Moreover, we have the Hilbert–Schmidt estimate on the one-body density matrix:

$$\lambda \left\| \sqrt{\hbar}(\Gamma_\lambda^{(1)} - \Gamma_0^{(1)})\sqrt{\hbar} \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}. \quad (6.9)$$

*Proof.* From (6.6), by using  $\Gamma_0$  as a trial state, we have the upper bound

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\Gamma_0] = \frac{\lambda^2}{2(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_0] + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Tr} \left[ |\text{d}\Gamma(e_k)|^2 \Gamma_0 \right]. \quad (6.10)$$

Here the expectation of  $\vartheta^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N} - N_0)$  in  $\mathbb{W}$  against  $\Gamma_0$  is 0. From [LNR21, Eq. (5.43)] we have

$$\lambda^2 \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_0] \lesssim \text{Tr}[h^{-2}] \lesssim 1. \quad (6.11)$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (6.10) is called the exchange energy, which can be computed explicitly. Note that if  $k \neq 0$ , then  $\text{Tr}[\text{d}\Gamma(e_k)\Gamma_0] = 0$  since  $\Gamma_0$  preserves the total momentum while  $\text{d}\Gamma(e_k) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^3} a_{p+k}^* a_k$  does not. Therefore, from the variance computation in [LNR21, Lemma 5.11], we have

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Tr} \left[ |\text{d}\Gamma(e_k)|^2 \Gamma_0 \right] = \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Tr} [e_k^* \Gamma_0^{(1)} e_k \Gamma_0^{(1)}].$$

By the operator inequality

$$\lambda \Gamma_0^{(1)} = \frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda h} - 1} \leq h^{-1}$$

and the cyclicity of the trace we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 \text{Tr} [e_k^* \Gamma_0^{(1)} e_k \Gamma_0^{(1)}] &= \lambda^2 \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\Gamma_0^{(1)}} e_k^* \Gamma_0^{(1)} e_k \sqrt{\Gamma_0^{(1)}} \right] \leq \lambda \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\Gamma_0^{(1)}} e_k^* h^{-1} e_k \sqrt{\Gamma_0^{(1)}} \right] \\ &= \lambda \text{Tr} \left[ h^{-1/2} e_k \Gamma_0^{(1)} e_k^* h^{-1/2} \right] \leq \text{Tr} \left[ h^{-1/2} e_k h^{-1} e_k^* h^{-1/2} \right] \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[ e_k^* h^{-1} e_k h^{-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Tr} \left[ |\text{d}\Gamma(e_k)|^2 \Gamma_0 \right] &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Tr} \left[ e_k^* h^{-1} e_k h^{-1} \right] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \widehat{G}^2(k) \lesssim \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \frac{1}{1 + |k|} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Here in the last estimate we used Lemma 3.22.

From (6.10), (6.11) and (6.12), we obtain the upper bound

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\Gamma_0] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}. \quad (6.13)$$

On the other hand, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality implies

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{2(2\pi)^3} (\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 - \lambda \vartheta^\varepsilon (\mathcal{N} - N_0) \geq \frac{\lambda^2}{4(2\pi)^3} (\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 - C(\vartheta^\varepsilon)^2. \quad (6.14)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} &= \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) + \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\Gamma_\lambda] \\ &\geq \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) + \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Tr}[|\text{d}\Gamma(e_k)|^2 \Gamma_\lambda] + \frac{\lambda^2}{4(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_\lambda] - C(\vartheta^\varepsilon)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

Since  $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) \geq 0$  and  $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon \geq 0$ , the right-hand side of (6.15) is bounded from below by  $-C(\vartheta^\varepsilon)^2 = O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ . Thus we get the lower bound

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} \gtrsim -\varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (6.16)$$

thus concluding the proof of (6.7).

From (6.15) and (6.13), we also obtain (6.8). From the relative entropy estimate  $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}$  and the inequality from [LNR21, Theorem 6.1]:

$$\lambda^2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left| \sqrt{h}(\Gamma^{(1)} - \Gamma_0^{(1)}) \sqrt{h} \right|^2 \right] \leq 4 \mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0) \left( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma_0)} \right)^2, \quad (6.17)$$

we obtain (6.9). Note that there is no  $\lambda$  in the statement of [LNR21, Theorem 6.1], but applying this abstract with  $h \mapsto \lambda h$ , which is due to our choice  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{Z}_0^{-1} e^{-\lambda \text{d}\Gamma(h)}$ , then we have the factor  $\lambda^2$  in (6.17).  $\square$

**6.3. Correlation estimates for high momenta.** In principle, the estimates in (6.8) hold for any “good approximate minimizer” of the free energy. But to control the contribution from high momenta, we will need to use specific properties of the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ , which do not hold for any approximate minimizer of the free energy. The main result of this subsection is the following:

**Theorem 6.2** (Correlation estimates). *Let  $\lambda^{-1/4} \geq \Lambda \geq \varepsilon^{-9}$ . Let  $P = \mathbf{1}(h \leq \Lambda) = \sum_{|k|^2+1 \leq \Lambda} |e_k\rangle\langle e_k|$ . For all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ , we denote  $e_k = e_k^+ + e_k^-$  with  $e_k^- = P e_k P$ , where  $e_k$  is the multiplication operator with  $(2\pi)^{-3/2} e^{ik \cdot x}$ . Then*

$$\lambda^2 \left\langle \left| \text{d}\Gamma(e_k^+) - \langle \text{d}\Gamma(e_k^+) \rangle_0 \right|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda^{-1/4+} + \varepsilon^{-1} (\lambda^{3/2} |k|^2 + \lambda^{3/2} |k| \Lambda^{1/2}) + \varepsilon^{-5} \lambda, \quad (6.18)$$

and

$$\lambda^2 \left\langle \left| \text{d}\Gamma(e_k^-) - \langle \text{d}\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0 \right|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda \lesssim \varepsilon^{-4} + \varepsilon^{-5} \lambda^{3/2} \Lambda + \varepsilon^{-9} \lambda. \quad (6.19)$$

This result is an extension of [LNR21, Theorem 8.1] which concerned the case  $\varepsilon \simeq 1$ . The bound (6.19) was not included in [LNR21] and we add it here to improve the condition on  $v$  later. Proving the corresponding bound is the most challenging part in [LNR21]. In the proof below, we will simplify the analysis significantly by using the following abstract result from [DNN25, Theorem 2], which is an improvement of [LNR21, Theorem 7.1].

**Theorem 6.3** (Second order correlation inequality). *Let  $A$  be a self-adjoint operator on a separable Hilbert space such that  $\text{Tr}[e^{-sA}] < +\infty$  holds for all  $s > 0$ . Let  $B$  be a symmetric operator such*

that  $B$  is  $A$ -relatively bounded with a relative bound strictly smaller than 1. We also assume that the perturbed Gibbs states

$$G_t = \frac{\exp(-A + tB)}{\text{Tr}[\exp(-A + tB)]}, \quad t \in [-1, 1] \quad (6.20)$$

satisfies

$$\sup_{t \in [-1, 1]} |\text{Tr}(BG_t)| \leq a. \quad (6.21)$$

Then we have

$$\text{Tr}[B^2 G_0] \leq ae^a + \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}[[B, [A, B]]G_0]. \quad (6.22)$$

*Proof of Theorem 6.2.* Since  $e_k = (2\pi)^{-3/2} e^{ik \cdot x} = (2\pi)^{-3/2} (\cos(k \cdot x) + i \sin(k \cdot x))$ , it suffices to prove (6.18) with  $e_k^+$  replaced by  $f_k^+ = f_k - P f_k P$  where  $f_k(x) \in \{\cos(k \cdot x), \sin(k \cdot x)\}$  is real-valued. To apply Theorem 6.3, we consider the perturbed Gibbs states

$$\Gamma_{\lambda, t} = \mathcal{Z}_{\lambda, t}^{-1} e^{-\mathbb{H}\lambda + t\mathbb{B}}, \quad \Gamma_{0, t} = \mathcal{Z}_{0, t}^{-1} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(h) + t\mathbb{B}}, \quad t \in [-1, 1] \quad (6.23)$$

with

$$\mathbb{B} = \frac{1}{4} \lambda (d\Gamma(f_k^+) - \langle d\Gamma(f_k^+) \rangle_0) = \frac{1}{4} \begin{cases} \lambda (d\Gamma(Q) - \langle d\Gamma(Q) \rangle_0) & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \lambda d\Gamma(f_k^+) & \text{if } k \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

For  $k \neq 0$ ,  $\langle d\Gamma(f_k) \rangle_0 = \langle d\Gamma(P f_k P) \rangle_0 = 0$  due to the fact that  $\Gamma_0$  preserves the total momentum (we have the same identity for  $e_k$  and the function  $f_k$  is a linear combination of  $e_k$  and  $e_{-k}$ ).

Note that the constant  $\langle d\Gamma(f_k^+) \rangle_0$  in  $\mathbb{B}$  does not change the Gibbs states  $\Gamma_{\lambda, t}$  and  $\Gamma_{0, t}$ , but it affects the partition functions  $\mathcal{Z}_{\lambda, t}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_{0, t}$ . Hence, equivalently we can write

$$\Gamma_{\lambda, t} = e^{-\frac{1}{4} \lambda \langle d\Gamma(f_k^+) \rangle_0} \mathcal{Z}_{\lambda, t}^{-1} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(h_t) - \mathbb{W}}, \quad \Gamma_{0, t} = e^{-\frac{1}{4} \lambda \langle d\Gamma(f_k^+) \rangle_0} \mathcal{Z}_{0, t}^{-1} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(h_t)}, \quad t \in [-1, 1],$$

with

$$h_t = h - \frac{t}{4} f_k^+ = -\Delta + 1 - \frac{t}{4} f_k^+, \quad t \in [-1, 1].$$

For all  $t \in [-1, 1]$ , since  $\|f_k^+\| \leq 2$ , we have  $\|h_t - h\| \leq 1/2$ , and consequently  $h \gtrsim h_t \gtrsim h$ .

**Step 1.** Let us mimic the proof of Lemma 6.1 to show that

$$\lambda \left\| \sqrt{h} (\Gamma_{\lambda, t}^{(1)} - \Gamma_{0, t}^{(1)}) \sqrt{h} \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}. \quad (6.24)$$

Note that  $\Gamma_{\lambda, t}$  is the unique minimizer for the following variational problem, which is similar to (6.6),

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\lambda, t}}{\mathcal{Z}_{0, t}} = \min_{\substack{\Gamma \geq 0 \\ \text{Tr} \Gamma = 1}} \left\{ \mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma_{0, t}) + \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\Gamma] \right\}. \quad (6.24)$$

Using  $\Gamma_{0, t}$  as a trial state for the variational principle of  $\Gamma_{\lambda, t}$  similar to (6.6), we have the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\lambda, t}}{\mathcal{Z}_{0, t}} &\leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2(\pi)^2} \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_{0, t}] + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Tr} \left[ |d\Gamma(e_k)|^2 \Gamma_{0, t} \right] \\ &\quad - \lambda \vartheta^\varepsilon \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0) \Gamma_{0, t}]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

The term  $\vartheta^\varepsilon \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0) \Gamma_{0, t}]$  can be estimated by [DNN25, Lemma 5.1] as

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda |\text{Tr}[\mathcal{N} \Gamma_{0, t}] - \text{Tr}[\mathcal{N} \Gamma_0]| &= \left| \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda h_t} - 1} - \frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda h} - 1} \right] \right| \\ &\lesssim \|h_t - h\| (\text{Tr}[h^{-2}] + \text{Tr}[h_t^{-2}]) \lesssim 1. \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

(In [DNN25, Lemma 5.1], the trace is taken over the subspace  $\{e_0\}^\perp$  of  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$  since their lemma only assumes that  $h, h_t \gtrsim -\Delta$ . However, in our case here, we have  $h, h_t \geq -\Delta + 1/2$ , and hence the trace

can be taken over the whole  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ , by the same proof. ) Thus  $-\lambda\vartheta^\varepsilon \operatorname{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)\Gamma_{0,t}] \lesssim |\vartheta^\varepsilon| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}$ . We also have

$$\lambda^2 \operatorname{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_{0,t}])^2 \Gamma_{0,t}] \lesssim \operatorname{Tr}[h_t^{-2}] \lesssim 1$$

similarly to (6.11). Combining this with (6.26) and using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we can bound

$$\lambda^2 \operatorname{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_{0,t}] \leq 2\lambda^2 \operatorname{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_{0,t}])^2 \Gamma_{0,t}] + 2\lambda^2 (\operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_{0,t}] - \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_0])^2 \lesssim 1.$$

Moreover, by using the operator inequality

$$\lambda\Gamma_{0,t}^{(1)} = \frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda h_t} - 1} \leq h_t^{-1} \leq 2h^{-1},$$

we can proceed as in (6.12) and obtain

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) \operatorname{Tr} [|\mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k)|^2 \Gamma_{0,t}] \lesssim \sum_{k \neq 0} \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(k) \operatorname{Tr} [e_k^* h^{-1} e_k h^{-1}] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}. \quad (6.27)$$

Thus (6.25) gives the upper bound

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\lambda,t}}{\mathcal{Z}_{0,t}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}. \quad (6.28)$$

The lower bound  $-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\lambda,t}}{\mathcal{Z}_{0,t}} \gtrsim -\varepsilon^{-2}$  can be obtained exactly as in the proof of Lemma 6.1. In this way, we also obtain the relative entropy estimate  $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_{\lambda,t}, \Gamma_{0,t}) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}$ , which implies

$$\lambda \left\| \sqrt{h_t} (\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(1)} - \Gamma_{0,t}^{(1)}) \sqrt{h_t} \right\|_{\mathrm{HS}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \quad (6.29)$$

by [LNR21, Theorem 6.1]. Since  $h_t \geq \frac{1}{2}h$ , the operator  $h^{1/2}h_t^{-1/2}$  is bounded, and hence we can replace  $\sqrt{h_t}$  in (6.29) by  $\sqrt{h}$  and obtain (6.24).

**Step 2.** Using (6.24) and [LNR21, Lemma 6.3], we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{Tr}[\mathbb{B}\Gamma_{\lambda,t}]| &= \frac{1}{4}\lambda |\operatorname{Tr}[f_k^+ \Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(1)}] - \operatorname{Tr}[f_k^+ \Gamma_0^{(1)}]| \leq \frac{1}{4}\lambda |\operatorname{Tr}[f_k^+ (\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(1)} - \Gamma_0^{(1)})]| + \frac{1}{4}\lambda |\operatorname{Tr}[f_k^+ (\Gamma_0^{(1)} - \Gamma_0^{(1)})]| \\ &\lesssim \lambda \left\| \sqrt{h} (\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(1)} - \Gamma_0^{(1)}) \sqrt{h} \right\|_{\mathrm{HS}} \left\| h^{-1/2} f_k^+ h^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathrm{HS}} + \operatorname{Tr}[f_k^+ h^{-1} f_k^+ h^{-1}] \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \|Qh^{-1}\|_{\mathrm{HS}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda^{-1/4+}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.30)$$

for all  $t \in [-1, 1]$ . Here we decomposed  $f_k^+ = f_k - Pf_kP = Pf_kQ + Qf_kP + Qf_kQ$  and used that  $Q = \mathbf{1} - P$  satisfies

$$\|Qh^{-1}\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{|k|^2 \geq \Lambda/2} \frac{1}{(k^2 + 1)^2} \lesssim \Lambda^{-1/2+}.$$

**Step 3:** From the first moment estimate in Step 2, Theorem 6.3 gives us

$$\operatorname{Tr}[\mathbb{B}^2\Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda^{-1/4+} + \operatorname{Tr} \left[ [\mathbb{B}, [\mathbb{H}_\lambda, \mathbb{B}]] \Gamma_\lambda \right]. \quad (6.31)$$

In our choice of  $\Lambda$  and  $\varepsilon$ , we have  $0 < a = C\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda^{-1/4+} \lesssim 1$ , and hence  $ae^a \simeq a$ .

Next, let us estimate the double commutator

$$[\mathbb{B}, [\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]] = \lambda^3 [[\mathrm{d}\Gamma(f_k^+), [\mathrm{d}\Gamma(f_k^+), \mathrm{d}\Gamma(h)]] + \lambda^2 [[\mathrm{d}\Gamma(f_k^+), [\mathrm{d}\Gamma(f_k^+), \mathbb{W}]]].$$

For the kinetic term, note that  $[\mathrm{d}\Gamma(X), \mathrm{d}\Gamma(Y)] = \mathrm{d}\Gamma([X, Y])$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \pm [f_k^+, [f_k^+, h]] &= \pm [f_k - Pf_kP, [f_k, h] - P[f_k, h]P] \\ &\leq \|[f_k, [f_k, h]]\| + 2\|[f_k, h]Pf_kP\| + 2\|f_kP[f_k, h]P\| + 2\|Pf_kP[f_k, h]P\| \\ &\lesssim |k|^2 + |k|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

Here we used  $\|f_k\| \lesssim 1$ ,  $\|[f_k, [f_k, h]]\| \lesssim \|\nabla f_k\|_{L^\infty}^2 \lesssim |k|^2$ , and  $[f_k, h] = \Delta f_k + 2\nabla f_k \cdot \nabla$  which gives

$$\|[f_k, h]P\| \leq \|\Delta f_k\|_{L^\infty} + 2\|\nabla f_k\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla P\| \lesssim |k|^2 + |k|\Lambda^{1/2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \pm \lambda^3 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ [[d\Gamma(f_k^+), [d\Gamma(f_k^+), d\Gamma(h)]] \Gamma_\lambda \right] &\lesssim \lambda^3 (|k|^2 + |k|\Lambda^{1/2}) \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_\lambda] \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \lambda^{3/2} (|k|^2 + |k|\Lambda^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.33)$$

Here we used  $\operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \lambda^{-3/2}$ , which comes from the fact that

$$\operatorname{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)\Gamma_\lambda] \leq \operatorname{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_\lambda]^{1/2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \lambda^{-1}$$

due to (6.8) and  $N_0 \leq \lambda^{-3/2}$ .

For the interaction term, using (6.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pm \lambda^2 [[d\Gamma(f_k^+), [d\Gamma(f_k^+), \mathbb{W}]]] &= \pm \frac{\lambda^4}{2} \sum_{\ell \neq 0} \widehat{v^\varepsilon}(\ell) [[d\Gamma(f_k^+), [d\Gamma(f_k^+), |d\Gamma(e_\ell)|^2]] \\ &\lesssim \lambda^4 \sum_{\ell \neq 0} |\widehat{v^\varepsilon}(\ell)| \mathcal{N}^2 \lesssim \lambda^4 \varepsilon^{-3} \mathcal{N}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here for the first inequality we used again  $[d\Gamma(X), d\Gamma(Y)] = d\Gamma([X, Y])$  and the simple bound  $\pm d\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) \leq \|O\| \mathcal{N}$ .

Combining with the bound  $\operatorname{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)^2 \Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \lambda^{-2}$  from (6.8) we get

$$\pm \lambda^2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ [[d\Gamma(f_k^+), [d\Gamma(f_k^+), \mathbb{W}]] \Gamma_\lambda \right] \lesssim \lambda \varepsilon^{-5}. \quad (6.34)$$

In summary, from (6.31), (6.33) and (6.34) we have

$$\operatorname{Tr}[\mathbb{B}^2 \Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda^{-1/4+} + \varepsilon^{-1} \lambda^{3/2} (|k|^2 + |k|\Lambda^{1/2}) + \varepsilon^{-5} \lambda, \quad (6.35)$$

which implies the desired inequality (6.18).

For the rough bound (6.19), we will use Theorem 6.3 with

$$A = \mathbb{H}_\lambda, \quad \widetilde{B} = \varepsilon^2 \lambda (d\Gamma(f_k^-) - \langle d\Gamma(f_k^-) \rangle_0) = \varepsilon^2 \begin{cases} \lambda (d\Gamma(P) - \langle d\Gamma(P) \rangle_0) & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \lambda d\Gamma(f_k^-) & \text{if } k \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Here  $f_k^- = P f_k P$ . Note that we have an extra factor  $\varepsilon^2$  in the definition of  $\widetilde{B}$  to make sure that it is of order 1. Then proceeding exactly as in (6.24) we also have

$$\lambda \left\| \sqrt{h} (\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\lambda,t}^{(1)} - \widetilde{\Gamma}_{0,t}^{(1)}) \sqrt{h} \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \quad (6.36)$$

with

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_{0,t} = \frac{\exp(-\lambda d\Gamma(h - \varepsilon^2 t f_k^-))}{\operatorname{Tr}[\exp(-\lambda d\Gamma(h - \varepsilon^2 t f_k^-))]}, \quad \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\lambda,t} = \frac{\exp(-A + t \widetilde{B})}{\operatorname{Tr}[\exp(-A + t \widetilde{B})]}, \quad t \in [-1, 1]. \quad (6.37)$$

Now instead of (6.30) and (6.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{Tr}[\widetilde{B} \Gamma_{\lambda,t}]| &\lesssim \varepsilon^2 \lambda \left\| \sqrt{h} (\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\lambda,t}^{(1)} - \widetilde{\Gamma}_{0,t}^{(1)}) \sqrt{h} \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| h^{-1/2} f_k^- h^{-1/2} \right\|_{\text{HS}} + \varepsilon^2 \operatorname{Tr}[f_k^- h^{-1} f_k^- h^{-1}] \\ &\lesssim \|P h^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim 1, \end{aligned} \quad (6.38)$$

and

$$\pm \lambda^3 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ [[d\Gamma(f_k^-), [d\Gamma(f_k^-), d\Gamma(h)]] \Gamma_\lambda \right] \lesssim \lambda^3 \Lambda \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \Lambda \lambda^{3/2}, \quad (6.39)$$

since we can replace (6.32) by

$$\pm [f_k^-, [f_k^-, h]] \lesssim \|f_k\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|P h\| \leq \Lambda. \quad (6.40)$$

The bound (6.34) still holds true with  $f_k^+$  replaced by  $f_k^-$ . Therefore, we have the following replacement for (6.35):

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\tilde{B}^2\Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim 1 + \varepsilon^{-1}\lambda^{3/2}\Lambda + \varepsilon^{-5}\lambda, \quad (6.41)$$

which implies (6.19).  $\square$

## 7. CONVERGENCE OF FREE ENERGY AND GIBBS STATE

Thanks to the estimates in the previous section, we can restrict the variational problem (6.6) to low momenta and then apply semiclassical approximation. This leads to a good estimate for the free energy and eventually implies the convergence of the Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ . The analysis of this part is close to [LNR21] but we need to carefully track the  $\varepsilon$ -dependence.

First, we recall the localization method on Fock space and introduce the quantum de Finetti measure on the localized space in Section 7.1, which provides a natural link to classical field theory. Then, we discuss the free energy in Section 7.2 and deduce a norm estimate for the Gibbs state in Section 7.3. Finally in Section 7.4 we conclude the convergence of density matrices in Theorem 2.6.

**7.1. Fock-space localization and de Finetti measure.** Let us recall the standard *localization method* in Fock space. Let  $P$  be an orthogonal projection on  $\mathfrak{H}$  and let  $Q = \mathbf{1} - P$ . We have the unitary equivalence

$$\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{H}) = \mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H} \oplus Q\mathfrak{H}) \approx \mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H}) \otimes \mathfrak{F}(Q\mathfrak{H}), \quad (7.1)$$

namely there is a unitary

$$\mathcal{U} : \mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H} \oplus Q\mathfrak{H}) \mapsto \mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H}) \otimes \mathfrak{F}(Q\mathfrak{H}) \quad (7.2)$$

satisfying

$$\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}^* = \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathcal{U}a^*(f)\mathcal{U}^* = a^*(Pf) \otimes \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1} \otimes a^*(Qf) \quad (7.3)$$

and a similar formula for annihilation operators. Consequently, for any state  $\Gamma$  on  $\mathfrak{F}$  and any orthogonal projector  $P$ , we define its *localization*  $\Gamma_P$  as a state on  $\mathfrak{F}$  obtained by taking the partial trace over  $\mathfrak{F}(Q\mathfrak{H})$ :

$$\Gamma_P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathfrak{F}(Q\mathfrak{H})}[\mathcal{U}\Gamma\mathcal{U}^*].$$

The density matrices of  $\Gamma_P$  can be shown to be equal to

$$(\Gamma_P)^{(k)} = P^{\otimes k}\Gamma^{(k)}P^{\otimes k}, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (7.4)$$

Now we consider the finite dimensional space  $P\mathfrak{H}$  and the associated Fock space  $\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})$ . Note that we have the resolution of identity

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})} = \pi^{-\mathrm{Tr}(P)} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |W(u)\rangle\langle W(u)| du, \quad (7.5)$$

where  $du$  is the usual Lebesgue measure on  $P\mathfrak{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{Tr}(P)}$  and

$$W(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exp(a^*(u) - a(u))|0\rangle = e^{-\|u\|^2/2} \exp(a^*(u))|0\rangle \quad (7.6)$$

is the coherent state on  $\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})$ , with  $|0\rangle$  the vacuum in  $\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})$ .

We have the following quantitative version of the *quantum de Finetti theorem* [LNR15, Lemma 6.2 and Remark 6.4].

**Theorem 7.1** (Quantitative quantum de Finetti). *For any state  $\Gamma$  on  $\mathfrak{F}$ , using the coherent states in (7.6) we define the lower symbol of  $\Gamma$  on  $P\mathfrak{H}$  at scale  $\lambda$  by*

$$d\mu_{P,\Gamma}^\lambda(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\lambda\pi)^{-\mathrm{Tr}(P)} \left\langle W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}), \Gamma_P W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})} du. \quad (7.7)$$



Then for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\mu_{P,\Gamma}^\lambda(u) = k! \lambda^k \Gamma_P^{(k)} + k! \lambda^k \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{\ell} \Gamma^{(\ell)} \otimes_s \mathbf{1}_{\otimes_s^{k-\ell} P\mathfrak{H}}. \quad (7.8)$$

Thus, with  $d = \text{Tr}[P]$ ,

$$\text{Tr} \left| k! \lambda^k \Gamma_P^{(k)} - \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\mu_{P,\Gamma}^\lambda(u) \right| \leq \lambda^k \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{\ell}^2 \frac{(k-\ell+d-1)!}{(d-1)!} \text{Tr}[\mathcal{N}^\ell \Gamma_P]. \quad (7.9)$$

The following Berezin-Lieb type inequality links the relative entropy of two quantum states to the classical entropy of their de Finetti measures [LNR15, Theorem 7.1].

**Theorem 7.2** (Relative entropy: quantum to classical). *Let  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$  be two states on  $\mathfrak{F}$ . Let  $\mu_{P,\Gamma}^\lambda$  and  $\mu_{P,\Gamma'}^\lambda$  be the lower symbols defined in (7.7). Then we have*

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma, \Gamma') \geq \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_P, \Gamma'_P) \geq \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\mu_{P,\Gamma}^\lambda, \mu_{P,\Gamma'}^\lambda). \quad (7.10)$$

Finally, we recall [LNR21, Lemma 9.3] for a comparison between the de Finetti measure  $d\mu_{P,0}^\lambda = d\mu_{P,\Gamma_0}^\lambda$  of the non-interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_0$  and the cylindrical projection  $\mu_{0,P}$  of the Gaussian free field  $\mu_0$  on  $P\mathfrak{H}$ .

**Lemma 7.3** (From de Finetti to classical field: non-interacting case). *For  $P = \mathbf{1}(h \leq \Lambda)$ , we have*

$$\|\mu_{P,0}^\lambda - \mu_{0,P}\|_{L^1(P\mathfrak{H})} \leq 2\text{Tr}[h^{-2}] \lambda \Lambda^3. \quad (7.11)$$

**7.2. Free energy estimate.** Now we are ready to relate the quantum free energy to the classical analogue in low momenta. From now on, we will always choose

$$P = \mathbf{1}(h \leq \Lambda), \quad Q = \mathbf{1} - P, \quad \text{with} \quad \Lambda = \lambda^{-1/8}.$$

Note that under the condition  $\varepsilon \gtrsim |\log \lambda|^{-\eta}$  for some  $\eta < 1/2$ , we have  $e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \lesssim_\kappa \lambda^{-\kappa}$  for any  $\kappa > 0$ .

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{Z}_0^{-1} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(h)}$  and  $\Gamma_\lambda$  in (6.5). Recall that  $\mu_{0,P}$  of the Gaussian free field  $\mu_0$  on  $P\mathfrak{H}$ . When  $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $\varepsilon \geq |\log \lambda|^{-\eta}$  for a constant  $0 < \eta < 1/2$ , then there exist  $\delta > 0$  depending on  $v$  such that*

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} = -\log \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} d\mu_{0,P}(u) \right) + O(\lambda^\delta). \quad (7.12)$$

*Proof.* We will prove the lower and upper bounds separately, both using the variational principle (6.6).

**Proof of the free energy lower bound.** By decomposing  $e_k = e_k^+ + e_k^-$  with  $e_k^- = P e_k P$ , then by Theorem 6.2 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \lambda^2 \left\langle |d\Gamma(e_k) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k) \rangle_0|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda - \lambda^2 \left\langle |d\Gamma(e_k^-) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda \right| \\ & \lesssim \lambda^2 \left\langle |d\Gamma(e_k^+) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k^+) \rangle_0|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda + \lambda^2 \left\langle |d\Gamma(e_k^+) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k^+) \rangle_0|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\langle |d\Gamma(e_k) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k) \rangle_0|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^{-5} (\Lambda^{-1/4+} + \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} |k|^2 + \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} |k| \Lambda^{1/2} + \lambda) + \varepsilon^{-5} (\Lambda^{-1/4+} + \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} |k|^2 + \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} |k| \Lambda^{1/2} + \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

and

$$\lambda^2 \left\langle |d\Gamma(e_k^-) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda \lesssim \varepsilon^{-4} + \varepsilon^{-5} \lambda^{3/2} \Lambda + \varepsilon^{-9} \lambda \lesssim \varepsilon^{-5}. \quad (7.14)$$

We will use (7.13) for  $|k| \leq \lambda^{-1/2}$  and (7.14) for  $|k| > \lambda^{-1/2}$ . Summing over  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \left\langle \left| \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k) - \langle \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k) \rangle_0 \right|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \left\langle \left| \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k^-) - \langle \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0 \right|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda \\ & \geq -\varepsilon^{-5} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \min \left\{ 1, (\Lambda^{-1/4+} + \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}|k|^2 + \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}|k|\Lambda^{1/2} + \lambda)^{1/2} \right\} \gtrsim -\lambda^\delta \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

with some small constant  $\delta > 0$  depending only on  $\delta_0 > 0$  in (2.10).

The following calculation is the same as [LNR21, (9.7)-(9.11)]. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \langle \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0 &= \lambda \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_k^- \Gamma_0^{(1)} \right) = \lambda \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_k^- \frac{1}{e^{\lambda h} - 1} \right) = \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_k^- h^{-1} \right) + \lambda \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_k^- \left( \frac{1}{e^{\lambda h} - 1} - \frac{1}{\lambda h} \right) \right) \\ &= \int \langle u, e_k^- u \rangle \mathrm{d}\mu_0(u) + O(\lambda \Lambda^{3/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.16)$$

Here we used  $\|(e^{\lambda h} - 1)^{-1} - (\lambda h)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$  and  $K = \mathrm{Tr} P \lesssim \Lambda^{3/2}$ . The bound (7.16) also shows that  $\lambda \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_k^- \Gamma_0^{(1)} \right) = O(\Lambda)$ , which then implies that  $\lambda \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_k^- \Gamma_\lambda^{(1)} \right) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda$  by using (6.9) as in (6.30). Combining with  $(e_k^-)^* = P(e_k)^* P = P e_{-k} P = e_{-k}^-$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \left\langle \left| \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k^-) - \langle \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0 \right|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda &\geq \lambda^2 \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_{-k}^- \otimes e_k^- \Gamma_\lambda^{(2)} \right) - \lambda \mathrm{Re} \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_{-k}^- \Gamma_\lambda^{(1)} \right) \int \langle u, e_k^- u \rangle \mathrm{d}\mu_0(u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left| \int \langle u, e_k^- u \rangle \mathrm{d}\mu_0(u) \right|^2 - C \lambda \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda^{5/2} \\ &= \lambda^2 \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_{-k} \otimes e_k (\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(2)} \right) - \lambda \mathrm{Re} \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_{-k} (\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(1)} \right) \int \langle u, e_k u \rangle \mathrm{d}\mu_0(u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \langle u, e_k u \rangle \mathrm{d}\mu_0(u) \right|^2 - C \lambda \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda^{5/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

Inserting (7.17) in (7.15) and using  $\sum_k \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3}$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \left\langle \left| \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k) - \langle \mathrm{d}\Gamma(e_k) \rangle_0 \right|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda \\ & \geq \lambda^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_{-k} \otimes e_k (\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(2)} \right) - \lambda \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \mathrm{Re} \mathrm{Tr} \left( e_{-k} (\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(1)} \right) \int \langle u, e_k u \rangle \mathrm{d}\mu_0(u) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \left| \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \langle u, e_k u \rangle \mathrm{d}\mu_0(u) \right|^2 - C \lambda \varepsilon^{-5} \Lambda^{5/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we represent  $(\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(1)}$  and  $(\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(2)}$  by de Finetti measure  $\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda = \mu_{P,\Gamma_\lambda}^\lambda$ . Here recall that  $\mathrm{Tr}[(\Gamma_\lambda)_P] = 1$  and

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{N}(\Gamma_\lambda)_P] \leq \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{N}\Gamma_\lambda] = N_0 + \mathrm{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)\Gamma_\lambda] \lesssim \lambda^{-3/2} + \varepsilon^{-1} \lambda^{-1} \lesssim \lambda^{-3/2}.$$

Therefore, using (7.9) with  $k = 1$  and  $k = 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Tr} \left| (\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(1)} - \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u\rangle\langle u| \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) \right| \lesssim \lambda \mathrm{Tr}[(\Gamma_\lambda)_P] = \lambda, \\ & \mathrm{Tr} \left| \lambda^2 (\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(2)} - \frac{1}{2} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle\langle u^{\otimes k}| \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) \right| \lesssim \lambda^2 \mathrm{Tr}[(1 + \mathcal{N})(\Gamma_\lambda)_P] \lesssim \lambda^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.18)$$

Using also  $\sum_k \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) e_{-k}(x) e_k(y) = v^\varepsilon(x-y)$ ,  $\sum_k \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3}$ ,  $\text{Tr}[P] \lesssim \Lambda^{3/2}$  and  $\text{Tr}[P \otimes P] \lesssim \Lambda^3$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \left\langle \left| \text{d}\Gamma(e_k) - \langle \text{d}\Gamma(e_k) \rangle_0 \right|^2 \right\rangle_\lambda \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \langle u, e_{-k} u \rangle \langle u, e_k u \rangle \text{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \text{Re} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \langle u, e_{-k} u \rangle \text{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) \int \langle u, e_k u \rangle \text{d}\mu_0(u) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \left| \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \langle u, e_k u \rangle \text{d}\mu_0(u) \right|^2 - C\lambda \varepsilon^{-5} \Lambda^{5/2} - C\lambda^{1/2} \varepsilon^{-3} \Lambda^3 \\ & \geq \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \int : |u(x)|^2 : v^\varepsilon(x-y) : |u(y)|^2 : \text{d}x \text{d}y \right) \text{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda - C\lambda^\delta. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us the first term in  $\mathcal{D}[u]$  in (2.26). Concerning the contribution of  $\lambda \vartheta^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N} - N_0)$ , we have

$$\lambda |\text{Tr}[Q(\Gamma_\lambda^{(1)} - \Gamma_0^{(1)})]| \leq \lambda \|\sqrt{h}(\Gamma_\lambda^{(1)} - \Gamma_0^{(1)})\|_{\text{HS}} \|\sqrt{h}\|_{\text{HS}} \|Qh^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda^{-1/4+}.$$

by (6.9). Similarly,  $\lambda \mathfrak{e}_\lambda \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{N} - N_0)\Gamma_\lambda] = O(\varepsilon^{-2} \lambda^{1/2})$  where  $\mathfrak{e}_\lambda$  is defined in (6.3). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta^\varepsilon \lambda \langle (\mathcal{N} - N_0) \rangle_\lambda & \leq (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon + 1 - m) \lambda \text{Tr}[(\Gamma_\lambda)_P^{(1)} - (\Gamma_0)_P^{(1)}] + C\varepsilon^{-3} \Lambda^{-1/4+} \\ & \leq (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - m + 1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} : |u(x)|^2 : \text{d}x + C\lambda^\delta, \end{aligned} \quad (7.19)$$

which gives the second term in  $\mathcal{D}[u]$  in (2.26). Here we used again (7.16) and (7.18). Thus in summary, for the interaction term we have

$$\text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\Gamma_\lambda] \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{D}[u] \text{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) - C\lambda^\delta, \quad (7.20)$$

with  $\mathcal{D}[u]$  in (2.26). Combining with the Berezin-Lieb inequality (7.10), and the classical variational principle (2.25) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} & = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) + \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\Gamma_\lambda] \geq \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda, \mu_{P,0}^\lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{D}[u] \text{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) - C\lambda^\delta \\ & \geq -\log \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \text{d}\mu_{P,0}^\lambda(u) \right) - C\lambda^\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (7.21)$$

Finally, on the right hand side of (7.21), let us replace the de Finetti measure  $\text{d}\mu_{P,0}^\lambda$  of the non-interacting Gibbs measure  $\Gamma_0$  by the cylindrical projection  $\mu_{0,P}$  of the Gaussian free field  $\text{d}\mu_0$ . Since  $\hat{v} \geq 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}[u] \gtrsim -(\vartheta^\varepsilon)^2 \gtrsim -\varepsilon^{-2}$ . Therefore,

$$0 \leq e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \leq e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}}. \quad (7.22)$$

Combining with the estimate  $\|\mu_{P,0}^\lambda - \mu_{0,P}\|_{L^1(P\mathfrak{H})} \leq 2\text{Tr}[h^{-2}] \lambda \Lambda^3 \lesssim$  from Lemma 7.3, we deduce from (7.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} & \geq -\log \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \text{d}\mu_{0,P}(u) + e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \lambda \Lambda^3 \right) - C\lambda^\delta \\ & \geq -\log \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \text{d}\mu_{0,P}(u) \right) - C\lambda^\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

In the last estimate we also used the lower bound

$$\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \text{d}\mu_{0,P}(u) \gtrsim e^{-C\varepsilon^{-2}}, \quad (7.24)$$

which follows from

$$\int \mathcal{D}(u) \text{d}\mu_{0,P}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int v^\varepsilon(x-y) G_P(x-y)^2 \text{d}x \text{d}y \simeq \varepsilon^{-2}.$$

and Jensen's inequality. Here  $G_P$  is the Green function projected on  $PL^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ .

**Proof of the free energy upper bound.** Using the unitary  $\mathcal{U}$  in (7.2), we define the trial state

$$\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathcal{U}^* \left( \Gamma_{\lambda,P} \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q \right) \mathcal{U}, \quad (7.25)$$

where  $(\Gamma_0)_Q$  is the  $Q$ -localization of the Gaussian state  $\Gamma_0$ , and  $\Gamma_{\lambda,P}$  is the interacting Gibbs state in  $\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})$ :

$$\Gamma_{\lambda,P} = \frac{e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P}} \quad (7.26)$$

with  $\mathbb{W}_P$  the localized interaction

$$\mathbb{W}_P = \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_k \widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k) \left| d\Gamma(e_k^-) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0 \right|^2 - \lambda \vartheta^\varepsilon (d\Gamma(P) - \langle d\Gamma(P) \rangle_0). \quad (7.27)$$

Note that the expectation  $\langle d\Gamma(P e^{ik \cdot x} P) \rangle_0$  in  $\Gamma_0$  is the same as that in  $(\Gamma_0)_P$ . In general,  $\Gamma_{\lambda,P}$  is different from the state  $(\Gamma_\lambda)_P$  obtained by  $P$ -localizing the full interacting Gibbs state  $\Gamma_\lambda$ .

Under the definition, we can compute explicitly

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(1)} = P \Gamma_{\lambda,P}^{(1)} P + Q \Gamma_0^{(1)} Q, \quad (7.28)$$

and

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} = P^{\otimes 2} \Gamma_{\lambda,P}^{(2)} P^{\otimes 2} + Q^{\otimes 2} \Gamma_0^{(2)} Q^{\otimes 2} + \left( \Gamma_{\lambda,P}^{(1)} \otimes Q \Gamma_0^{(1)} Q + Q \Gamma_0^{(1)} Q \otimes \Gamma_{\lambda,P}^{(1)} \right). \quad (7.29)$$

On the other hand, since the trial state is factorized and the Gaussian state  $\Gamma_0$  satisfies  $\Gamma_0 = (\Gamma_0)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q$ , we have

$$\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\Gamma}, \Gamma_0) = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_{\lambda,P} \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q, (\Gamma_0)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q) = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_{\lambda,P}, (\Gamma_0)_P)$$

with  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{U}^* \left( (\Gamma_0)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q \right) \mathcal{U}$ . Hence, by the variational principle (6.6)

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} \leq \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\Gamma}, \Gamma_0) + \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\tilde{\Gamma}] = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_{\lambda,P}, (\Gamma_0)_P) + \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\tilde{\Gamma}].$$

Next, we have

$$\text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\tilde{\Gamma}] \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}_P \Gamma_{\lambda,P}] + e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} (\Lambda^{-1/4+} + \lambda)^\delta, \quad (7.30)$$

which can be obtained by the same argument in the proof of Lemma 7.4 (see also the proof of [LNR21, Lemma 10.2]). Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} &\leq \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_{\lambda,P}, (\Gamma_0)_P) + \text{Tr}[\mathbb{W}_P \Gamma_{\lambda,P}] + e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} (\Lambda^{-1/4+} + \lambda)^\delta \\ &= -\log \frac{\text{Tr} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P}}{\text{Tr} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h)}} + e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} (\Lambda^{-1/4+} + \lambda)^\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (7.31)$$

Here in the last equality we used the variational principle due to the choice of  $\Gamma_{\lambda,P}$ .

To compute the relevant partition functions on the right hand side of (7.31), we use the coherent-state resolution of the identity (7.5):

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H})} = (\lambda\pi)^{-K} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \left| W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right\rangle \left\langle W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right| du,$$

Here we rescaled (7.5) with  $u \mapsto u\lambda^{-1/2}$ , and denote  $K = \dim P\mathfrak{H} = \text{Tr } P \lesssim \Lambda^{3/2}$ . By the Peierls-Bogoliubov inequality  $\langle x, e^A x \rangle \geq e^{\langle x, Ax \rangle}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr } e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P} &= \frac{1}{(\lambda\pi)^K} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P} \left| W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right\rangle \left\langle W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right| \right] du \\ &= \frac{1}{(\lambda\pi)^K} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \left\langle W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}), e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P} W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right\rangle du \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(\lambda\pi)^K} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \exp \left[ -\left\langle W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}), \lambda(d\Gamma(P_h) + \mathbb{W}_P) W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right\rangle \right] du. \end{aligned} \quad (7.32)$$

Then, for  $u \in P\mathfrak{H}$ , we have the identity

$$\lambda \left\langle W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}), d\Gamma(P_h) W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right\rangle = \langle u, hu \rangle$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda^2 \left\langle W(u/\lambda^{1/2}), |d\Gamma(e_k^-) - \langle d\Gamma(e_k^-) \rangle_0|^2 W(u/\lambda^{1/2}) \right\rangle \\ &= \left| \langle u, e_k^- u \rangle \right|^2 - 2\text{Re} \lambda \langle u, e_k^- u \rangle \text{Tr} \left[ e_k^- \Gamma_0^{(1)} \right] + \lambda^2 \left| \text{Tr} \left[ e_k^- \Gamma_0^{(1)} \right] \right|^2 + \lambda |e_k|^2 \|u\|^2 \text{Tr } P \\ &\leq \left| \langle u, e_k^- u \rangle - \langle \langle u, e_k^- u \rangle \rangle_{\mu_0} \right|^2 + C \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^{3/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.33)$$

The latter bound is an analogue of (7.17) and is based on (7.16). We also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda \vartheta^\varepsilon \left\langle W(u/\lambda^{1/2}), (d\Gamma(P) - \langle d\Gamma(P) \rangle_0) W(u/\lambda^{1/2}) \right\rangle \\ &= (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon - m + 1) (\langle u, Pu \rangle - \langle \langle u, Pu \rangle \rangle_{\mu_0}) + O(\lambda^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (7.34)$$

where the error term comes from the constant  $\varepsilon_\lambda = O(\lambda^{1/2})$  in  $\vartheta^\varepsilon$ .

Summing over  $k$  and using  $\sum_k |\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(k)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3}$ , we find that

$$\left\langle W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \mathbb{W}_P, W(u/\sqrt{\lambda}) \right\rangle \leq \mathcal{D}[u] + C \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^{3/2} \varepsilon^{-3}.$$

Inserting the latter bound in (7.32) we arrive at

$$\text{Tr } e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P} \geq (\lambda\pi)^{-K} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \exp \left[ -\langle u, hu \rangle - \mathcal{D}[u] - C \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^{3/2} \varepsilon^{-3} \right] du.$$

Combining with the explicit computation for  $\text{Tr } e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h)}$  in [LNR21, (10.12)], we find

$$\frac{\text{Tr } e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P}}{\text{Tr } e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(P_h)}} \geq \left[ \prod_{j=1}^K \frac{1}{\lambda \lambda_j} (1 - e^{-\lambda \lambda_j}) \right] \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \exp \left[ -\mathcal{D}[u] - C \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^{3/2} \varepsilon^{-3} \right] d\mu_{0,P}(u) \quad (7.35)$$

where  $d\mu_{0,P}$  is the cylindrical projection of  $d\mu_0$  on  $P\mathfrak{H}$  and  $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots$  are eigenvalues of  $h = -\Delta + 1$ . Since  $K = \text{Tr } P \leq \Lambda^{3/2}$  and  $\lambda_j \simeq j^{2/3}$  we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda \lambda_j} (1 - e^{-\lambda \lambda_j}) \right] \geq \prod_{j=1}^K \left[ 1 - \frac{\lambda \lambda_j}{2} \right] \geq 1 - C \lambda K \lambda_K \geq 1 - C \lambda \Lambda^{5/2}.$$

On the other hand, using again (7.22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \left[ -\mathcal{D}[u] - C \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^{5/2} \varepsilon^{-3} \right] &= \exp \left[ -\mathcal{D}[u] \right] \exp \left[ -C \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^{5/2} \varepsilon^{-3} \right] \\ &\geq \exp \left[ -\mathcal{D}[u] \right] - e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^3. \end{aligned}$$

Using also  $\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \|u\|^2 d\mu_{0,P}(u) = \text{Tr} [Ph^{-1}] \lesssim \Lambda^{1/2}$  we get

$$\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \exp \left[ -\mathcal{D}[u] - C \|u\|^2 \lambda \Lambda^{5/2} \varepsilon^{-3} \right] d\mu_{0,P}(u) \geq \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \exp \left[ -\mathcal{D}[u] \right] d\mu_{0,P}(u) - e^{-C\varepsilon^{-2}} \lambda \Lambda^3.$$

Then we conclude from (7.35) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{Tr} e^{-\lambda \mathrm{d}\Gamma(P_h) - \mathbb{W}_P}}{\mathrm{Tr} e^{-\lambda \mathrm{d}\Gamma(P_h)}} &\geq (1 - C\lambda\Lambda^{5/2}) \left[ \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{0,P}(u) - e^{-C\varepsilon^{-2}} \lambda\Lambda^3 \right] \\ &\geq \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{0,P}(u) - e^{-C\varepsilon^{-2}} \lambda\Lambda^3. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (7.22) in the last inequality. Thanks to (7.24), we can take the log and use the fact that  $\log(1+t) = O(t)$  for  $|t|$  small to conclude the proof of the upper bound in (7.12).  $\square$

**7.3. Norm estimate for the Gibbs state.** By refining the free energy estimate, we have

**Lemma 7.5** (Trace-class estimates for states). *Let  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{Z}_0^{-1} e^{-\lambda \mathrm{d}\Gamma(h)}$  and  $\Gamma_\lambda$  in (6.5). When  $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $\varepsilon \geq |\log \lambda|^{-\eta}$  for a constant  $0 < \eta < 1/2$ , then there exist  $C > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$  depending on  $v$  such that*

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left| \Gamma_\lambda - \mathcal{U}^* \left( (\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q \right) \mathcal{U} \right| \leq O(\lambda^{\delta/C}), \quad (7.36)$$

with  $\mathcal{U}$  the unitary in (7.2) and  $(\Gamma_\lambda)_P, (\Gamma_0)_Q$  are localized states in  $\mathfrak{F}(P\mathfrak{H}), \mathfrak{F}(Q\mathfrak{H})$ , respectively. Moreover, the de Finetti measure  $\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda$  associated with  $(\Gamma_\lambda)_P$  as in (7.7) satisfies

$$\left\| \mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda - \tilde{\mu} \right\|_{L^1(P\mathfrak{H})} \leq O(\lambda^{\delta/C}), \quad \mathrm{d}\tilde{\mu}(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{0,P}(u)}{\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{0,P}(v)}. \quad (7.37)$$

Note that (7.36) confirms the expectation that the interacting and non-interacting Gibbs states almost coincide on high kinetic energy modes, whereas (7.37) quantifies the precision of the mean-field/semi-classical approximation on low kinetic energy modes.

*Proof of Lemma 7.5.* Since  $\Gamma_0$  is factorized, namely  $\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{U}^* \left( (\Gamma_0)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q \right) \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) &= \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{U}\Gamma_\lambda\mathcal{U}^*, (\Gamma_0)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q) \\ &= \mathcal{H} \left( \Gamma_\lambda, \mathcal{U}^* \left( (\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q \right) \mathcal{U} \right) + \mathcal{H}((\Gamma_\lambda)_P, (\Gamma_0)_P) + \mathcal{H}((\Gamma_\lambda)_Q, (\Gamma_0)_Q). \end{aligned} \quad (7.38)$$

Combining (7.38) with the energy lower bound (7.20) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\mathcal{Z}_\lambda}{\mathcal{Z}_0} &= \mathcal{H}(\Gamma_\lambda, \Gamma_0) + \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbb{W}\Gamma_\lambda] \\ &\geq \mathcal{H} \left( \Gamma_\lambda, \mathcal{U}^* \left( (\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q \right) \mathcal{U} \right) + \mathcal{H}((\Gamma_\lambda)_P, (\Gamma_0)_P) + \mathcal{H}((\Gamma_\lambda)_Q, (\Gamma_0)_Q) \\ &\quad + \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{D}[u] \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) + O(\lambda^\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (7.39)$$

By the Berezin-Lieb inequality (7.10) and the classical variational principle (2.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}((\Gamma_\lambda)_P, (\Gamma_0)_P) + \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{D}[u] \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) &\geq \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{cl}}(\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda, \mu_{P,0}^\lambda) + \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{D}[u] \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) \\ &= \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{cl}}(\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda, \mu') - \log \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,0}^\lambda(u) \right) \\ &\geq \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{cl}}(\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda, \mu') - \log \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{0,P}(u) \right) + O(\lambda^\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (7.11), (see also [LNR21, (9.17), (11.11)]) and  $\mu_{P,0}^\lambda$  is the de Finetti measure of  $(\Gamma_0)_P$  and

$$\mathrm{d}\mu'(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,0}^\lambda(u)}{\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]} \mathrm{d}\mu_{P,0}^\lambda(v)}. \quad (7.38)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\log \frac{Z_\lambda}{Z_0} &\geq \mathcal{H}\left(\Gamma_\lambda, \mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q\right)\mathcal{U}\right) + \mathcal{H}((\Gamma_\lambda)_Q, (\Gamma_0)_Q) + \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda, \mu') \\
 &\quad - \log \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[u]} d\mu_{0,P}(u) \right) + O(\lambda^\delta).
 \end{aligned} \tag{7.38}$$

Comparing with the the upper bound in (7.12), we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}\left(\Gamma_\lambda, \mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q\right)\mathcal{U}\right) + \mathcal{H}((\Gamma_\lambda)_Q, (\Gamma_0)_Q) + \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda, \mu') \lesssim \lambda^\delta. \tag{7.39}$$

Let us conclude using the (quantum and classical) Pinsker inequalities (see e.g. [CL14]),

$$\mathcal{H}(A, B) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\text{Tr}|A - B|)^2, \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(|\nu_1 - \nu_2|(\mathfrak{H})\right)^2.$$

From (7.39) we find that

$$\text{Tr}|\Gamma_\lambda - \mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q\right)\mathcal{U}| \lesssim \lambda^{\delta/C}, \quad \text{Tr}|(\Gamma_\lambda)_Q - (\Gamma_0)_Q| \lesssim \lambda^{\delta/C}.$$

By the triangle inequality, we conclude (7.36) by

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{Tr}|\Gamma_\lambda - \mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q\right)\mathcal{U}| \\
 &\leq \text{Tr}|\Gamma_\lambda - \mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q\right)\mathcal{U}| + \text{Tr}|\mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q\right)\mathcal{U} - \mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q\right)\mathcal{U}| \\
 &= \text{Tr}|\Gamma_\lambda - \mathcal{U}^*\left((\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_\lambda)_Q\right)\mathcal{U}| + \text{Tr}|(\Gamma_\lambda)_Q - (\Gamma_0)_Q| \lesssim \lambda^{\delta/C}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using  $\|\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda - \mu'\|_{L^1(P\mathfrak{H})} \lesssim \lambda^{\delta/C}$  due to (7.39), and  $\|\tilde{\mu} - \mu'\|_{L^1(P\mathfrak{H})} \leq O(\lambda^{\delta/C})$  by Lemma 7.3, we also obtain (7.37) by the triangle inequality.  $\square$

**7.4. Convergence of density matrices.** Finally, we will use the norm approximation on  $\Gamma_\lambda$  established in the previous subsection to deduce the desired estimate on its density matrices. Let us recall two lemmas from [LNR21].

**Lemma 7.6** (Rough Hilbert-Schmidt estimate). *For every  $k \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\left\| \lambda^k \Gamma_\lambda^{(k)} \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim_k e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is the same with [LNR21, Lemma 11.3]. From the heat kernel positivity  $e^{-th}(x, y) \geq 0$  and the pointwise estimate  $\mathbb{W} \geq -C\varepsilon^{-2}$ , a standard argument using the Trotter product formula and the relative bound (6.7) on partition functions, we obtain the kernel estimate

$$0 \leq \Gamma_\lambda^{(k)}(X_k; Y_k) \lesssim_k e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \Gamma_0^{(k)}(X_k; Y_k)$$

for all  $X_k, Y_k \in (\mathbb{T}^3)^k$ . Thus the desired bound follows from  $\|\lambda^k \Gamma_0^{(k)}\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim \|h^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^k \lesssim_k 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.7** (From states to density matrices, Hilbert-Schmidt estimate). *Let  $\Gamma, \Gamma'$  be two states on Fock space that commute with the number operator  $\mathcal{N}$ . Then for all  $k \geq 1$ , we have the Hilbert-Schmidt norm estimate on the associated density matrices*

$$\|\Gamma^{(k)} - \Gamma'^{(k)}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq C_k \left( \text{Tr}|\Gamma - \Gamma'| \right) \left( \sum_{\ell=k}^{2k} \left( \|\Gamma^{(\ell)}\|_{\text{HS}} + \|\Gamma'^{(\ell)}\|_{\text{HS}} \right) \right). \tag{7.38}$$

This is [LNR21, Lemma 11.4]. Now we are ready to conclude

*Proof of Theorem 2.6.* By (7.3), the density matrices of  $\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda = \mathcal{U}^* \left( (\Gamma_\lambda)_P \otimes (\Gamma_0)_Q \right) \mathcal{U}$  satisfies

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda^{(k)} = P^{\otimes k} \Gamma_\lambda^{(k)} P^{\otimes k} + Q^{\otimes k} \Gamma_0^{(k)} Q^{\otimes k}. \quad (7.39)$$

Here there is no cross term since  $h^{\otimes k}$  commutes with  $\Gamma_0^{(k)}$ . From (7.39), it is clear that  $\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda^{(k)}$  satisfies the same Hilbert-Schmidt estimate as in Lemma 7.6. Note that  $e^{\varepsilon^{-2}} \lesssim \lambda^{-\kappa}$  for every  $\kappa > 0$ . Hence, combining with the norm estimate (7.36), we deduce from Lemma 7.7 that

$$\|\Gamma_\lambda^{(k)} - \tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda^{(k)}\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim_k O(\lambda^{\delta/C_k}), \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Thus it suffices to focus on  $\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda^{(k)}$ . The  $Q$ -localized term is small since

$$\lambda^k \left\| Q^{\otimes k} \Gamma_0^{(k)} Q^{\otimes k} \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim_k \|Qh^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^k \lesssim_k \Lambda^{-k/4} \lesssim_k \lambda^{\delta k/C}.$$

Here we used the explicit form of  $\Gamma_0^{(k)}$  in (2.6), which implies  $\lambda^k \Gamma_0^{(k)} \leq (h^{-1})^{\otimes k}$ . For the  $P$ -localized term, we use the quantitative quantum de Finetti theorem 7.1 exactly as in the proof of [LNR21, Lemma 11.2]. Recalling the lower symbol  $\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda$  of  $(\Gamma_\lambda)_P$ , we have from (7.8)

$$\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) = \lambda^k k! P^{\otimes k} \Gamma^{(k)} P^{\otimes k} + \lambda^k k! \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{\ell} P^{\otimes \ell} \Gamma^{(\ell)} P^{\otimes \ell} \otimes_s \mathbf{1}_{\otimes_s^{k-\ell} P\mathfrak{H}}. \quad (7.40)$$

From the lower symbol expression (7.40), taking the Hilbert-Schmidt norm on both sides, then using the uniform bound in Lemma 7.6 and the fact that  $\dim(P\mathfrak{H}) \leq C\Lambda^{3/2} \ll \lambda^{-1/2}$ , we find that for every  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\left\| \lambda^k k! P^{\otimes k} \Gamma_\lambda^{(k)} P^{\otimes k} - \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda(u) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim_k O(\lambda^{\delta/C_k}). \quad (7.41)$$

A similar estimate with  $\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda$  replaced by  $\tilde{\mu}$  in (7.37) holds thanks to the operator inequality

$$\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\tilde{\mu} \leq e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\mu_{0,P} = e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} k! (Ph^{-1})^{\otimes k}. \quad (7.42)$$

Next, for every Hilbert-Schmidt operator  $X \geq 0$  on  $\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes sk}$ , using (7.37) we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{Tr} \left[ X \left( \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| (d\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda - d\tilde{\mu})(u) \right) \right] \right|^2 \\ & \leq \|X \otimes X\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes 2k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes 2k}| (d\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda + d\tilde{\mu})(u) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \|\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda - \tilde{\mu}\|_{(P\mathfrak{H})} \\ & \lesssim_k \|X\|_{\text{HS}}^2 O(\lambda^{\delta/C_k}). \end{aligned}$$

By duality we deduce that

$$\left\| \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| (d\mu_{P,\lambda}^\lambda - d\tilde{\mu})(u) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim_k O(\lambda^{\delta/C_k}). \quad (7.43)$$

Thus, by the triangle inequality,

$$\left\| \lambda^k k! P^{\otimes k} \Gamma_\lambda^{(k)} P^{\otimes k} - \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\tilde{\mu}(u) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim_k O(\lambda^{\delta/C_k}). \quad (7.44)$$

To conclude, we need to replace  $d\tilde{\mu}$  in (7.44) by  $d\nu^\varepsilon$ . We compare

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_{\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\nu^\varepsilon - \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| d\tilde{\mu}(u) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]} d\mu_{0,P}(v)} \left\| \int_{\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| e^{-\mathcal{D}(u)} (d\mu_{0,P} - d\mu_0) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \left\| \frac{1}{\int_{P\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]} d\mu_{0,P}(v)} - \frac{1}{\int_{\mathfrak{H}} e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]} d\mu_0(v)} \right\| \left\| \int_{\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| e^{-\mathcal{D}(u)} d\mu_0 \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\
 & \leq e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \left\| \int_{Q\mathfrak{H}} |u^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle u^{\otimes k}| e^{-\mathcal{D}(u)} d\mu_0 \right\|_{\text{HS}} + e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \int_{P\mathfrak{H}} |e^{-\mathcal{D}[Pv]} - e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]}| d\mu_0(v) \\
 & \leq e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \left( \|Qh^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^{1/2} + \int |\mathcal{D}(v) - \mathcal{D}(Pv)| d\mu_0(v) \right) \\
 & \leq e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} (\|Qh^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^{1/2} + \Lambda^{-1/4+}) \leq e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \Lambda^{-1/4+} \lesssim_k O(\lambda^{\delta/C_k}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here in the third inequality we used

$$|e^{-\mathcal{D}[Pv]} - e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]}| \leq |\mathcal{D}[Pv] - \mathcal{D}[v]| (e^{-\mathcal{D}[Pv]} + e^{-\mathcal{D}[v]}) \lesssim e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} |\mathcal{D}[Pv] - \mathcal{D}[v]|$$

since  $\mathcal{D}[v] \geq -\tau_\varepsilon^2 \geq -C\varepsilon^{-2}$ , and then we used similar calculation as in the proof of [LNR21, Lemma 5.3] (see in particular, [LNR21, (5.15) and (5.8)]) to bound

$$\int |\mathcal{D}(v) - \mathcal{D}(Pv)| d\mu_0(v) \lesssim \|\widehat{v^\varepsilon}\|_{\ell^1} \|Qh^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3} \Lambda^{-1/4+} \lesssim e^{C\varepsilon^{-2}} \lambda^\delta.$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.6.  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. NOTATIONS AND BESOV SPACES

**A.1. Besov spaces.** In this section, we recall the definitions and some key properties of Besov spaces and paraproducts. For a more detailed introduction, we refer to [BCD11, GIP15]. Let  $\chi, \theta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be nonnegative radial functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , such that

- i. the support of  $\chi$  is contained in a ball, and the support of  $\theta$  is contained in an annulus;
- ii.  $\chi(z) + \sum_{j \geq 0} \theta(2^{-j}z) = 1$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .
- iii.  $\text{supp}(\chi) \cap \text{supp}(\theta(2^{-j}\cdot)) = \emptyset$  for  $j \geq 1$  and  $\text{supp}(\theta(2^{-i}\cdot)) \cap \text{supp}(\theta(2^{-j}\cdot)) = \emptyset$  for  $|i - j| > 1$ .

We call the pair  $(\chi, \theta)$  a dyadic partition of unity, and refer to [BCD11, Proposition 2.10] for its existence. The Littlewood-Paley blocks are then defined as follows:

$$\Delta_{-1}u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi \mathcal{F}u), \quad \Delta_j u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta(2^{-j}\cdot) \mathcal{F}u), j \geq 0.$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}'$  be the space of distributions on  $\mathbb{T}^3$ . For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, p, q \in [1, \infty]$ , the Hölder-Besov space is defined by

$$\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d) : \|u\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha} = \left( \sum_{j \geq -1} (2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p})^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} < \infty \right\},$$

with the usual interpretation as  $l^\infty$  norm in case  $q = \infty$ . For the shift operator  $\tau_y$  introduced in (3.14), it is easy to see that

$$\|\tau_y f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha} = \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The following embedding results will be frequently used.

**Lemma A.1.** (i) Let  $1 \leq p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \infty$  and  $1 \leq q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \infty$ , and let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\mathbf{B}_{p_1, q_1}^\alpha \subset \mathbf{B}_{p_2, q_2}^{\alpha - d(1/p_1 - 1/p_2)}$ . (cf. [GIP15, Lemma A.2])

(ii) Let  $s \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq p \leq \infty, \delta > 0$ . Then  $\mathbf{B}_{p,1}^s \subset \mathbf{B}_{p,\infty}^s \subset \mathbf{B}_{p,1}^{s-\delta}$ . Here  $\subset$  means continuous and dense embedding.

We also recall the following interpolation lemma.

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  and  $\alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfy  $\alpha = \theta\alpha_1 + (1-\theta)\alpha_2$ , and  $p, q, p_1, q_1, p_2, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$  satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\theta}{p_1} + \frac{1-\theta}{p_2}, \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\theta}{q_1} + \frac{1-\theta}{q_2}.$$

*It holds that*

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha} \leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_1,q_1}^{\alpha_1}}^\theta \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_2,q_2}^{\alpha_2}}^{1-\theta}.$$

(cf. [ZZZ22, Lemma 2.7])

**A.2. Smoothing effect of heat flow.** We recall the following smoothing effect of the heat flow  $P_t = e^{t(\Delta-1)}$  (e.g. [GIP15, Lemma A.7], [MW17, Proposition A.13], [ZZZ22, Lemma 2.8]).

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $u \in \mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, p, q \in [1, \infty]$ . Then for every  $\delta \geq 0$ ,*

$$\|P_t u\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^{\alpha+\delta}} \lesssim t^{-\delta/2} \|u\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha}.$$

*If  $0 < \beta < 2$ , then*

$$\|(I - P_t)u\|_{L^p} \lesssim t^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|u\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^\beta}.$$

**Lemma A.4.** ([GIP15, Lemma A.9], [ZZZ22, Lemma 2.8, Lemma 2.9]) *Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then the following bounds hold for  $\mathcal{S}f = \int_0^\cdot P_{\cdot-s} f ds$*

$$\|\mathcal{S}f\|_{L_T^\infty \mathbf{C}^{2+\alpha}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L_T^\infty \mathbf{C}^\alpha}.$$

*If  $0 \leq 2 + \alpha < 2$  then*

$$\|\mathcal{S}f\|_{C_T^{(2+\alpha)/2} L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L_T^\infty \mathbf{C}^\alpha}.$$

**A.3. Paraproducts and commutators.** Now, we recall the following paraproduct introduced by Bony (see [Bon81]). In general, the product  $fg$  of two distributions  $f \in \mathbf{C}^\alpha, g \in \mathbf{C}^\beta$  is well defined and only if  $\alpha + \beta > 0$ . In terms of Littlewood-Paley blocks, the product  $fg$  of two distributions  $f$  and  $g$  can be formally decomposed as

$$fg = \sum_{j \geq -1} \sum_{i \geq -1} \Delta_i f \Delta_j g = f \prec g + f \circ g + f \succ g,$$

with

$$f \prec g = g \succ f = \sum_{j \geq -1} \sum_{i < j-1} \Delta_i f \Delta_j g, \quad f \circ g = \sum_{|i-j| \leq 1} \Delta_i f \Delta_j g.$$

We also denote

$$\succ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \succ + \circ, \quad \prec \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prec + \circ.$$

For  $j \geq 0$  we also use the notations

$$S_j f = \sum_{i \leq j-1} \Delta_i f,$$

and  $\theta_i = \theta(2^{-i}\cdot)$  for  $i \geq 0$  and  $\theta_{-1} = \chi$ .

It is easy to see that the support of Fourier of  $S_j f \Delta_j g$  is contained in an annulus of the form  $2^j \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $\tilde{\theta} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with support in an annulus such that  $\tilde{\theta} = 1$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let  $K_j = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \theta_j, \tilde{K}_j = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_j$  with  $\tilde{\theta}_j = \tilde{\theta}(2^{-j}\cdot)$ .

The following results on paraproduct in Besov space is from [Bon81] (see also [GIP15, Lemma 2.1], [MW17, Proposition A.7]).

**Lemma A.5.** Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p, p_1, p_2, q \in [1, \infty]$  such that  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f \prec g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\beta} &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_2,q}^\beta}, \\ \|f \prec g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^{\alpha+\beta}} &\lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_1,q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_2,q}^\beta}, \quad (\text{for } \alpha < 0) \\ \|f \circ g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^{\alpha+\beta}} &\lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_1,q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_2,q}^\beta}, \quad (\text{for } \alpha + \beta > 0). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for  $\alpha + \beta > 0$

$$\|fg\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^{\alpha+\beta}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_1,q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_2,q}^\beta}.$$

Moreover, for  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $p_3, p_4 \in [1, \infty]$  satisfy  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}$ . Then it holds that

$$\|fg\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_1,q}^\alpha} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}} + \|f\|_{L^{p_3}} \|g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_4,q}^\alpha}.$$

**Lemma A.6.** (Duality.) Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $p'$  and  $q'$  be their conjugate exponents, respectively. Then the mapping  $\langle u, v \rangle \mapsto \int u \bar{v} dx$  extends to a continuous bilinear form on  $\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha \times \mathbf{B}_{p',q'}^{-\alpha}$ , and one has  $|\langle u, v \rangle| \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p,q}^\alpha} \|v\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p',q'}^{-\alpha}}$  (cf. [MW17a, Proposition 3.23]).

We also recall the following commutator estimate ([GIP15, Lemma 2.4], [MW17, Proposition A.9]).

**Lemma A.7.** Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma > 0$  and  $\beta + \gamma < 0$ ,  $p, p_1, p_2, p_3 \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}$ . Then there exist a trilinear bounded operator  $C(f, g, h) : \mathbf{B}_{p_1}^\alpha \times \mathbf{B}_{p_2}^\beta \times \mathbf{B}_{p_3}^\gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_p^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}$  satisfying

$$\|C(f, g, h)\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_1}^\alpha} \|g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_2}^\beta} \|h\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_3}^\gamma}$$

and for smooth functions  $f, g, h$

$$C(f, g, h) = (f \prec g) \circ h - f(g \circ h).$$

We also recall the following commutators from [CC18, Lemma A.1].

**Lemma A.8.** Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p, p_1, p_2 \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ . Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ , the space of Schwartz functions. Then for every  $\eta \leq 1$  it holds that

$$\|\varphi(\varepsilon \mathcal{D})(f \prec g) - f \prec \varphi(\varepsilon \mathcal{D})g\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{\alpha+\beta-\eta}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\eta \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_1}^\alpha} \|g\|_{\mathbf{B}_{p_2}^\beta}.$$

Here  $\varphi(\mathcal{D})f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi \mathcal{F}f) = (\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi) * f$  and the proportional constant is uniform in  $\varepsilon$ . Moreover, it holds that for  $T > 0$

$$\|[\mathcal{I}, f \prec]g\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^{\alpha+\beta+2}} \lesssim \left( \|f\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{C_T^{\alpha/2} L^\infty} \right) \|g\|_{C_T \mathbf{C}^\beta}.$$

*Proof.* The first result follows from [CC18, Lemma A.1]. The second result follows from the first result and we refer to [HZZZ24, Lemma 3.13] for a proof.  $\square$

**Lemma A.9.** It holds that for  $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$

$$\|\tau_y f - f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^\alpha} \lesssim |y|^\delta \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{\alpha+\delta}}.$$

Moreover, if  $(1 + |x|^\delta)v \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , then it holds that

$$\|v^\varepsilon * f - f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^\alpha} \lesssim \varepsilon^\delta \|f\|_{\mathbf{B}_p^{\alpha+\delta}}.$$

*Proof.* The first result follows from [HZZZ24, Corollary 2.9]. We have

$$v^\varepsilon * f - f = \int v(y)(f(x - \varepsilon y) - f(x)) dy.$$

Thus the result follows from the first result.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.8, THEOREM 3.17 AND LEMMA 4.17

*Proof of Theorem 3.8.* For fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , due to the smoothing effect of  $v^\varepsilon$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{V}} \in C_T \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$   $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.. It is standard to derive a local in time solution in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  by fixed point arguments in suitable space, following similar arguments as in [DD03, MW17a]. We then use invariant measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  to construct global in time solutions. More precisely, recall the following potential term from  $\nu^\varepsilon$

$$W^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \int : |\Phi(x)|^2 : v^\varepsilon(x-y) : |\Phi(y)|^2 : dx dy - (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} : |\Phi(x)|^2 : dx,$$

which can be approximated by the following Galerkin approximation:

$$\begin{aligned} W_N^\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \int (|\Phi_N(x)|^2 - \mathbf{E}|\Phi_N(x)|^2) v^\varepsilon(x-y) (|\Phi_N(y)|^2 - \mathbf{E}|\Phi_N(y)|^2) dx dy \\ &\quad - (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon) \int (|\Phi_N(x)|^2 - \mathbf{E}|\Phi_N(x)|^2) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \left( |\Phi_N(x)|^2 - \mathbf{E}|\Phi_N(x)|^2 - (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon) \right) v^\varepsilon(x-y) \\ &\quad \times \left( |\Phi_N(y)|^2 - \mathbf{E}|\Phi_N(y)|^2 - (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon) \right) dx dy - T^\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\Phi_N = P_N \Phi$  for  $P_N f = \mathcal{F}^{-1} 1_{|k| \leq N} \mathcal{F} f$  and  $T^\varepsilon = 4\pi^3 (a^\varepsilon - 6b^\varepsilon)^2$ . We can then apply the same arguments as in [LNR21, Lemma 5.3] to have  $W_N^\varepsilon \rightarrow W^\varepsilon$  in  $L^1(\mu_0)$  for Gaussian free field  $\mu_0 = \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2}(m - \Delta)^{-1})$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We further construct the probability measure

$$\nu^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon} e^{-W^\varepsilon} d\mu_0, \quad \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon = \int e^{-W^\varepsilon} d\mu_0,$$

with  $W^\varepsilon \geq -T^\varepsilon$ .

Using Galerkin approximation we establish that the measure  $\nu^\varepsilon$  is an invariant measure to equation (3.1). Another way to derive that  $\nu^\varepsilon$  is an invariant measure of the solutions to equation (3.1) is through the Dirichlet form approach. Since  $\nu^\varepsilon$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu_0$ , with its density in  $L^p(\mu_0)$  for every  $p \geq 1$ , we can readily apply the general Dirichlet form theory from [AR91] to construct a Markov process that leaves  $\nu^\varepsilon$  as an invariant measure for equation (3.1). Moreover, by following the same approach as in [RZZ17, Theorem 3.9], we conclude that this Markov process coincides with the local solutions to equation (3.1).

Let  $\zeta_{\Psi^\varepsilon(0)}$  denote the blow-up time of  $\Psi^\varepsilon$  in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  starting from  $\Psi^\varepsilon(0)$ . We then use  $\nu^\varepsilon$  to apply Bourgain's argument [Bou94] to extend the local-in-time solution to a global one for  $\nu^\varepsilon$ -a.s. initial data in  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ , meaning that  $\mathbf{P}(\zeta_{\Psi^\varepsilon(0)} = \infty) = 1$  for  $\nu^\varepsilon$ -a.s.  $\Psi^\varepsilon(0) \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$  (see also [DD03]). Moreover, by a general result from [HM18], we can show that the Markov semigroup formed by the solutions to equation (3.1) is strong Feller. This implies that for every  $t \geq 0$ , the map  $\Psi^\varepsilon(0) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(t < \zeta_{\Psi^\varepsilon(0)})$  is continuous. Consequently, we conclude that  $\mathbf{P}(\zeta_{\Psi^\varepsilon(0)} = \infty) = 1$  for every  $\Psi^\varepsilon(0) \in \mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ . Moreover, by applying [HM18, Corollary 3.9], the strong Feller property of the Markov semigroup, and the fact that  $\nu^\varepsilon$  is supported on  $\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ , we conclude that  $\nu^\varepsilon$  is the unique invariant measure of the solutions to equation (3.1). The result follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.17.* During the proof, we use  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon(t)\|$ ,  $\|(\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z})(t)\|$ , and  $\|\mathbb{Z}(t)\|$  to denote the quantities  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|$ ,  $\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon - \mathbb{Z}\|$ , and  $\|\mathbb{Z}\|$  introduced in Section 3.3, where these norms are now considered on the interval  $[0, t]$  for the random fields. We also introduce the following random time: Define for any  $L \geq 1$

$$\tau_L^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|\psi_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \geq L\} \wedge T, \quad \varrho_L^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon(t)\| \geq L\}.$$

We first have the following bound before  $\tau_L^\varepsilon \wedge \varrho_{L_1}^\varepsilon$ ,  $L, L_1 \geq 1$ : Set

$$Q^\varepsilon(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\psi_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} + t^{\frac{1+3\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} + t^{\frac{3+8\kappa}{4}} \|\psi_\varepsilon^\sharp(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1+3\kappa}} + 1.$$

It holds that for  $t \leq \tau_L^\varepsilon \wedge \varrho_{L_1}^\varepsilon$

$$Q^\varepsilon(t) \lesssim C(L, L_1), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

with the propotional constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ . In fact, by similar calculations as in [ZZ18, Section 4] there exists  $q > 1$  such that for  $0 \leq t \leq \varrho_{L_1}^\varepsilon \wedge \tau_L^\varepsilon$

$$Q^\varepsilon(t)^q \leq C(L_1)(\|\psi(0)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^q + 1) + C(L_1) \int_0^t Q^\varepsilon(r)^{3q} dr.$$

Then Bihari's inequality implies that there exists a short time  $t^* = \tilde{C}(L, L_1) > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t^* \wedge \tau_L^\varepsilon \wedge \varrho_{L_1}^\varepsilon]} Q^\varepsilon(t) \leq C(L_1, L).$$

Consider the solution at time  $t^* < t \leq \varrho_{L_1}^\varepsilon \wedge \tau_L^\varepsilon$ , then it can be viewed as a solution starting from  $t - \frac{t^*}{2}$ . A similar argument as above implies for  $t^* < t \leq \varrho_{L_1}^\varepsilon \wedge \tau_L^\varepsilon$

$$\left(\frac{t^*}{2}\right)^{\frac{1+3\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}} + \left(\frac{t^*}{2}\right)^{\frac{3+8\kappa}{4}} \|\psi_\varepsilon^\sharp(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{1+3\kappa}} \lesssim C(L, L_1),$$

which implies (B.1).

For  $L \geq 0$  define

$$\tau_L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|\varphi(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \geq L\} \wedge T, \quad \bar{\varrho}_L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|\mathbb{Z}(t)\| \geq L\},$$

and

$$\tilde{\varrho}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|(\mathbb{Z} - \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon)(t)\| \geq \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{4}}\}.$$

Then using Lemma 3.18–Lemma 3.21 and (3.57), (3.58), (3.49) above, (B.1) and similar argument as [ZZ18, Section 4] we have for  $L, L_i \geq 1$  with  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_L \wedge \tau_{L_1}^\varepsilon \wedge \varrho_{L_2}^\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\varrho}_{L_3} \wedge \tilde{\varrho}^\varepsilon]} \|\psi^\varepsilon(t) - \varphi(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Moreover, we have the following estimates: for  $\eta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\psi^\varepsilon - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} > \eta\right) \\ & \leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_L \wedge \tau_{L_1}^\varepsilon \wedge \varrho_{L_2}^\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\varrho}_{L_3} \wedge \tilde{\varrho}^\varepsilon]} \|\psi^\varepsilon - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} > \eta\right) + \mathbf{P}(\tau_L \wedge \varrho_{L_2}^\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\varrho}_{L_3} \wedge \tilde{\varrho}^\varepsilon > \tau_{L_1}^\varepsilon) \\ & \quad + \mathbf{P}(T > \tau_L) + \mathbf{P}(T > \tilde{\varrho}^\varepsilon) + \mathbf{P}(T > \varrho_{L_2}^\varepsilon) + \mathbf{P}(T > \bar{\varrho}_{L_3}). \end{aligned}$$

The first term goes to zero as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  by (B.2). Also for  $L_1 > L + \eta$

$$\mathbf{P}(\tau_L \wedge \varrho_{L_2}^\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\varrho}_{L_3} \wedge \tilde{\varrho}^\varepsilon > \tau_{L_1}^\varepsilon) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_L \wedge \tau_{L_1}^\varepsilon \wedge \varrho_{L_2}^\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\varrho}_{L_3} \wedge \tilde{\varrho}^\varepsilon]} \|\psi^\varepsilon - \varphi\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} > \eta\right),$$

which goes to zero by (B.2). The third term tends to zero as  $L$  go to  $\infty$  by Theorem 3.6. The fourth term goes to zero as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  by (3.49). The last two terms go to zero uniformly over  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  as  $L_2, L_3$  go to  $\infty$  by Lemma 3.2 and (3.48). Thus the result follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.17.* Let  $\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon$  and  $\tilde{Z}$  be solutions to (3.1) and (3.7) with general initial conditions, respectively. By the general results of [HM18],  $(\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon, \tilde{Z})$  is a Markov process on  $(\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa})^2$ , and we denote by  $(P_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$  the associated Markov semigroup. To derive the desired structural properties about the limiting measure, we will follow the Krylov-Bogoliubov construction with a specific choice of initial condition that allows to exploit the uniform estimate from Theorem 4.3. Namely, we denote by  $\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon$  the solution to (3.1) starting from  $Z(0)$  where  $Z$  is the stationary solution to (3.7), so that the process  $\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon - \tilde{Z}$  starts from the origin. In this case  $\tilde{Z}$  is the same as the stationary solution  $Z$ . By Theorem 4.3 for every  $T \geq 1$  and  $\kappa > 0$

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{E}\left(\|(\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon - \tilde{Z})(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}}^2\right) dt \lesssim T,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of  $T$ . In fact, as the uniform bounds are independent of initial data, we can have the same estimates for the solution on  $[n, n+1]$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , i.e. by Proposition 4.10

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_n^{n+1} \mathbf{E} \left( \|(\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon - \tilde{Z})(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1+\kappa}{2}}}^2 \right) dt \\ & \lesssim \int_n^{n+1} \mathbf{E} \|\psi_l(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + \int_n^{n+1} \mathbf{E} \|\psi_h(t)\|_{\mathbf{B}_4^{1-2\kappa}}^2 dt \\ & \quad + \int_n^{n+1} \mathbf{E} \|\mathcal{Z}^{\check{V}}(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1+\kappa}{2}}}^2 dt + \int_n^{n+1} \mathbf{E} \|\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}(Z))(t)\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1+\kappa}{2}}}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \mathbf{E} \|\psi_l(n)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1 \lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we used the fact that the moment bounds for the stochastic terms are uniform with respect to time shifts (see e.g. [MW17]) and Theorem 4.3. In the second step we used (4.14) to have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \int_n^{n+1} \|\psi_h\|_{\mathbf{B}_4^{1-2\kappa}}^2 ds & \lesssim 1 + \mathbf{E} \left( K(\|\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon\|) \int_n^{n+1} \int_n^s (s-r)^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi_l(r)\|_{L^4}^2 dr ds \right) \\ & \lesssim 1 + \mathbf{E} \int_n^{n+1} \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 ds + \mathbf{E} \int_n^{n+1} \mathcal{V}^\varepsilon(\psi_l) ds \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here the proportional constant independent of  $n$ . Taking sum for  $n$  we derive the estimate.

We then apply Krylov-Bogoliubov existence theorem (see [DZ96, Corollary 3.1.2]) as in the proof of [SZZ22, Lemma 4.2] to construct an invariant measure  $\pi^\varepsilon$  on  $(\mathbf{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa})^2$  for  $(P_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$  and the desired stationary process  $(\Psi^\varepsilon, Z)$ , defined to be the unique solution to (3.3) and (3.7) obtained by sampling the initial datum from  $\pi^\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

### APPENDIX C. THE IDEAL BOSE GAS

In the grand canonical ensemble, the non-interacting (ideal) Bose gas in  $\mathbb{T}^3$  at temperature  $\lambda^{-1} > 0$  and with chemical potential  $-\vartheta_0 < 0$  is described by the Gibbs state on Fock space

$$\Gamma_0 = \mathcal{Z}_0^{-1} e^{-\lambda d\Gamma(-\Delta + \vartheta_0)}, \quad \mathcal{Z}_0 = \mathrm{Tr} e^{-\lambda(-\Delta + \vartheta_0)}.$$

This model is exactly solvable. In particular, the total number of particles in  $\Gamma_0$  is

$$N = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \frac{1}{e^{\lambda(|k|^2 + \vartheta_0)} - 1}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

which is proportional to  $\lambda^{-3/2}$  when  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$  if  $\lambda^{1/2} \lesssim \vartheta_0 \lesssim \lambda^{-1}$ .

The *Bose-Einstein condensation* is the phenomenon when the number of particles in the zero-momentum mode  $N_0 = \mathrm{Tr}[a_0^* a_0 \Gamma_0] = (e^{\lambda \vartheta_0} - 1)^{-1}$  is comparable to  $N$ . As Bose [Bos24] and Einstein [Ein24] realized in 1924, in the limit  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , i.e.  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\frac{N_0}{N} \simeq \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda} \right)^{3/2} \right]_+, \quad \lambda_c = \pi \left( \frac{N}{\zeta(3/2)} \right)^{-2/3},$$

which implies a phase transition when  $\lambda_c/\lambda$  crosses the critical value 1. The parameter  $\lambda_c^{-1}$  is called the critical temperature (here we are in a fixed volume setting, hence  $\lambda_c^{-1} \simeq N^{2/3}$ ). A more detailed analysis using (C.1) shows that if we fix  $\lambda/\lambda_c = \alpha \in (0, \infty)$ , then

$$\begin{cases} N_0 \simeq N, & \vartheta_0 \simeq \lambda^{1/2} & \text{if } \alpha < 1 \quad (\text{condensed phase}), \\ N_0 \simeq 1, & \vartheta_0 \simeq \lambda^{-1} & \text{if } \alpha > 1 \quad (\text{non-condensed phase}). \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

To understand further details of the phase transition, we need to zoom in at the critical point with a specific rate of convergence. The choice  $\vartheta_0 \simeq 1$ , as used in [LNR21, FKSS22] and in the present paper,

is special since it ensures that the contributions from all momentum modes (both zero and nonzero) are comparable, thus naturally leading to the emergence of the  $\Phi_3^4$  theory. This choice places us in the non-condensed phase, but just slightly above the critical point. The condensed phase requires  $\vartheta_0 \simeq \lambda^{1/2}$ , which we do not consider here; see [DNN25] for recent results in this case (with a weaker interaction potential).

Concerning the total number of particles, we have the following expansion in terms of  $\lambda$ .

**Lemma C.1** (Particle number of the ideal Bose gas). *For  $\lambda > 0$  small we have*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda(|k|^2+1)} - 1} = \frac{\pi^{3/2} \zeta(\frac{3}{2})}{\sqrt{\lambda}} - 2\pi^2 + \pi^{3/2} \sum_{\ell \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{e^{-|\ell|}}{|\ell|} + O(\sqrt{\lambda}). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

This formula is the same as [LNR21, Eq. (B.5)], except for a rescaling by the volume  $(2\pi)^3$  and a quantitative error estimate.

*Proof.* Using  $\lambda(e^{\lambda(|k|^2+1)} - 1)^{-1} = \lambda \sum_{n \geq 1} e^{-n\lambda(|k|^2+1)}$  and the Poisson summation formula

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \widehat{f}(k) = (2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{\ell \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3} f(\ell)$$

for  $f(x) = e^{-n\lambda|x|^2} - \mathbf{1}_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^3} * e^{-n\lambda|x|^2}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \frac{1}{e^{\lambda(|k|^2+1)} - 1} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{dp}{e^{\lambda(|p|^2+1)} - 1} \right) \\ &= \lambda \sum_{n \geq 1} e^{-n\lambda} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \left( e^{-n\lambda|k|^2} - \int_{(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})^3} e^{-n\lambda|k-p|^2} dp \right) \\ &= 2^{-3} \lambda \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e^{-n\lambda}}{(n\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \sum_{\ell \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}} e^{-\frac{|\ell|^2}{4n\lambda}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

For every  $\ell \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ , we have the convergence of the Riemann sum

$$\pi^{3/2} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi n\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-n\lambda - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4n\lambda}} \rightarrow \pi^{3/2} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-t - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4t}} dt = \pi^{3/2} \frac{e^{-|\ell|}}{|\ell|} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

when  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ . Here in the last equality we used the Fourier transform of Yukawa potential, see [LL01, Theorem 6.23]. In fact, the convergence rate in (C.5) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\lambda}{(n\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-n\lambda - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4n\lambda}} - \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-t - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4t}} dt \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \frac{\lambda}{(n\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-n\lambda - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4n\lambda}} - \int_{n-1}^n \frac{\lambda}{(t\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-\lambda t - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4\lambda t}} dt \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \left| \frac{\lambda}{(n\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-n\lambda - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4n\lambda}} - \int_{n-1}^n \frac{\lambda}{(t\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-\lambda t - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4\lambda t}} dt \right| \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{n-1}^n \left| \partial_t \left( \frac{\lambda}{(t\lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-\lambda t - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4\lambda t}} \right) \right| dt \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda} t^{5/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{t^{3/2}} + \frac{|\ell|^2}{4\lambda^{3/2} t^{7/2}} \right) e^{-\lambda t - \frac{|\ell|^2}{4\lambda t}} dt \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda} t^{5/2}} \left( \frac{\lambda t}{|\ell|^2} \right)^3 + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{t^{3/2}} \left( \frac{\lambda t}{|\ell|^2} \right)^2 + \frac{|\ell|^2}{\lambda^{3/2} t^{7/2}} \left( \frac{\lambda t}{|\ell|^2} \right)^4 \right) e^{-\lambda t} dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \frac{\lambda^{5/2}}{|\ell|^4} \int_0^\infty t^{1/2} e^{-\lambda t} dt \lesssim \frac{\lambda}{|\ell|^4}.$$

Here we used  $e^{-|\ell|^2/(4t\lambda)} \lesssim_s (t\lambda/|\ell|^2)^s$  for all  $s \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ . Since  $|\ell|^{-4}$  is summable in  $2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ , we deduce from (C.4) and (C.5)

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda(|k|^2+1)} - 1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\lambda dk}{e^{\lambda(|k|^2+1)} - 1} + \sum_{\ell \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}} \pi^{3/2} \frac{e^{-|\ell|}}{|\ell|} + O(\sqrt{\lambda}). \quad (\text{C.6})$$

The conclusion follows from the well-known formula

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\lambda^{3/2} dk}{e^{\lambda(|k|^2+1)} - 1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{dk}{e^{|k|^2+\lambda} - 1} = \pi^{3/2} \zeta\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) - 2\pi^2 \sqrt{\lambda} + O(\lambda)_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+}. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

□

## REFERENCES

- [AM01] P. Arnold and G. Moore, BEC transition temperature of a dilute homogeneous imperfect Bose gas, *Physical Review Letters*, 87, p. 120401, 2001.
- [AK20] S. Albeverio and S. Kusuoka. The invariant measure and the flow associated to the  $\varphi_3^4$ -quantum field model. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (5) 20 no. 4, 1359–1427, 2020.
- [AR91] S. Albeverio and M. Röckner. Stochastic differential equations in infinite dimensions: solutions via Dirichlet forms. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 89(3), 347–386, 1991.
- [BCCH21] Y. Bruned, A. Chandra, I. Chevyrev, and M. Hairer. Renormalising SPDEs in regularity structures, *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, Vol:23, 869-947, 2021.
- [BCD11] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, R. Danchin, Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations, vol. 343 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [Bos24] S. N. Bose, Plancks Gesetz und Lichtquantenhypothese, *Zeitschrift für Physik* 26, pp. 178–181, 1924.
- [BHZ19] Y. Bruned, M. Hairer, and L. Zambotti. Algebraic renormalisation of regularity structures. *Invent. Math.* 215, no. 3, 1039–1156, 2019.
- [Bon81] J.-M. Bony, Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* (4) 14, no. 2, 209–246, 1981.
- [Bou94] J. Bourgain, Periodic nonlinear Schrödinger equation and invariant measures, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 166, no. 1, 1–26, 1994.
- [Bou96] ———, Invariant measures for the 2d-defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 176, pp. 421–445, 1996.
- [Bou97] ———, Invariant measures for the Gross-Pitaevskii equation, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 76, pp. 649–02, 1997.
- [BB14a] J. Bourgain and A. Bulut, Almost sure global well posedness for the radial nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the unit ball I: the 2D case, *Annales I. H. Poincaré (C)*, 31, pp. 1267–1288, 2014.
- [BB14b] ———, Almost sure global well posedness for the radial nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the unit ball II: the 3D case, *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 16, pp. 1289–1325, 2014.
- [BBS19] R. Bauerschmidt, D. Brydges, and G. Slade, Introduction to a Renormalisation Group Method, vol. 2242 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer Singapore, 2019.
- [BBHLV99] G. Baym, J.-P. Blaizot, M. Holzmann, F. Laloë, and D. Vautherin, The transition temperature of the dilute interacting Bose gas, *Physical Review Letters*, 83, pp. 1703–1706, 1999.
- [BBHLV01] ———, Bose-Einstein transition in a dilute interacting gas, *European Physical Journal B*, 24, p. 107, 2001.
- [Bri22] B. Bringmann. Invariant Gibbs measures for the three-dimensional wave equation with a Hartree nonlinearity I: Measures. *Stoch. PDE: Anal Comp*, 10, 1-89, 2022.
- [BC23] B. Bringmann and S. Cao. A para-controlled approach to the stochastic Yang-Mills equation in two dimensions. arXiv:2305.07197, May 2023.
- [BC24] B. Bringmann and S. Cao. Global well-posedness of the stochastic Abelian-Higgs equations in two dimensions. arXiv:2403.16878, 2024.
- [BC24a] B. Bringmann and S. Cao. Global well-posedness of the dynamical sine-Gordon model up to  $6\pi$ . arXiv:2410.15493, 2024.
- [BG20] N. Barashkov, M. Gubinelli, A variational method for  $\Phi_3^4$ , *Duke Math. J.* 169 no. 17, 3339–3415, 2020.
- [BTT13] N. Burq, L. Thomann, and N. Tzvetkov, Long time dynamics for the one dimensional non linear Schrödinger equation, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 63, pp. 2137–2198, 2013.



- [C96] J. Cardy, Scaling and renormalization in statistical physics, vol. 5 of Cambridge Lecture Notes in Physics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [CC18] R. Catellier and K. Chouk, Paracontrolled distributions and the 3-dimensional stochastic quantization equation. *Ann. Probab.*, 46(5):2621–2679, 2018.
- [CDS15] F. Cacciafesta and A.-S. de Suzzoni, Invariant measure for the Schrödinger equation on the real line, *J. Func. Anal.*, 269, pp. 271–324, 2015.
- [CCHS22] A. Chandra, I. Chevyrev, M. Hairer, and H. Shen. Langevin dynamic for the 2D Yang- Mills measure. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 136:1–147, 2022.
- [CCHS24] A. Chandra, I. Chevyrev, M. Hairer, and H. Shen. Stochastic quantisation of Yang-Mills-Higgs in 3D. *Invent. math.*, 237, 541–696, 2024.
- [CFW24] A. Chandra, G. de Lima Feltes, H. Weber, A priori bounds for 2-d generalised Parabolic Anderson Model, arXiv:2402.05544, 2024.
- [CGW22] A. Chandra, T. S. Gunaratnam, and H. Weber. Phase transitions for  $\varphi_3^4$ , *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 392, 691–782, 2022.
- [CH16] A. Chandra and M. Hairer. An analytic BPHZ theorem for regularity structures. *arxiv:1612.08138*.
- [CHS18] A. Chandra, M. Hairer, and H. Shen. The dynamical sine-Gordon model in the full subcritical regime, August 2018.
- [CL14] E. A. Carlen and E. H. Lieb, Remainder terms for some quantum entropy inequalities, *J. Math. Phys.*, 55, p. 042201, 2014.
- [DD03] G. Da Prato, A. Debussche, Strong solutions to the stochastic quantization equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 31(4):1900–1916, 2003.
- [DNN25] A. Deuchert, P. T. Nam, and M. Napiórkowski. The Gibbs State of the Mean-Field Bose Gas. Preprint 2025.
- [DNY19] Y. Deng, A. R. Nahmod, and H. Yue. Invariant Gibbs measures and global strong solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations in dimension two. arXiv:1910.08492, October 2019.
- [DNY22] Y. Deng, A. R. Nahmod, and H. Yue. Random tensors, propagation of randomness, and nonlinear dispersive equations. *Invent. Math.*, 228(2):539–686, 2022
- [Duc21] P. Duch. Flow equation approach to singular stochastic PDEs. arXiv:2109.11380, September 2021.
- [DZ96] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems, volume 229 of London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [DGR24] P. Duch, M. Gubinelli, P. Rinaldi, Parabolic stochastic quantisation of the fractional  $\Phi_3^4$  model in the full subcritical regime. 2024.
- [DNN25] A. Deuchert, P. T. Nam, and M. Napiórkowski. The Gibbs State of the Mean-Field Bose Gas. Preprint 2025.
- [Ein24] A. Einstein. Quantentheorie des einatomigen idealen Gases. *Königliche Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte* (1924), 261–267.
- [FKSS17] J. Fröhlich, A. Knowles, B. Schlein, and V. Sohinger, Gibbs measures of nonlinear Schrödinger equations as limits of many-body quantum states in dimensions  $d \leq 3$ , *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 356, pp. 883–980, 2017.
- [FKSS19] J. Fröhlich, A. Knowles, B. Schlein, and V. Sohinger, A microscopic derivation of time-dependent correlation functions of the 1  $D$  cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Adv. Math.*, 353, pp. 67–115, 2019.
- [FKSS22] J. Fröhlich, A. Knowles, B. Schlein, and V. Sohinger, The mean-field limit of quantum Bose gases at positive temperature, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 35, no. 4, 955–1030, 2022.
- [FKSS23] J. Fröhlich, A. Knowles, B. Schlein, and V. Sohinger, The Euclidean  $\Phi_2^4$  theory as a limit of an interacting Bose gas, To appear in *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, arXiv:2201.07632., 2023.
- [GIP15] M. Gubinelli, P. Imkeller, N. Perkowski, Paracontrolled distributions and singular PDEs, *Forum Math. Pi* 3 no. 6, 2015.
- [GH19] M. Gubinelli, M. Hofmanová, Global solutions to elliptic and parabolic  $\psi^4$  models in Euclidean space. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 368(3):1201–1266, 2019.
- [GH21] M. Gubinelli, M. Hofmanová, A PDE construction of the Euclidean  $\Phi^4$  quantum field theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 384(1):1–75, 2021.
- [GJ87] J. Glimm and A. Jaffe, Quantum Physics: A Functional Integral Point of View, Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [GJS74] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, and T. Spencer, The Wightman axioms and particle structure in the  $\mathcal{P}(\varphi)_2$  quantum field model, *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 100 (1974), pp. 585–632.
- [GM24] M. Gubinelli and S.-J. Meyer. The FBSDE approach to sine-Gordon up to  $6\pi$ . arXiv:2401.13648, January 2024.
- [GP17] M. Gubinelli, N. Perkowski, KPZ reloaded, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 349(1):165–269, 2017.
- [GRS75] F. Guerra, L. Rosen, and B. Simon, The  $\mathbf{P}(\varphi)_2$  Euclidean quantum field theory as classical statistical mechanics. I, II, *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 101, pp. 111–189, 1975; *ibid.* (2) 101 191–259, 1975.
- [Hai14] M. Hairer, A theory of regularity structures. *Invent. Math.* 198(2), 269–504, 2014.

- [HB03] M. Holzmam and G. Baym, Condensate density and superfluid mass density of a dilute Bose-Einstein condensate near the condensation transition, *Physical Review Letters*, 90, p. 040402, 2003.
- [HIN17] M. Hoshino, Y. Inahama, N. Naganuma, Stochastic complex Ginzburg-Landau equation with space-time white noise, *Electron. J. Probab.* 22 no. 104, 1–68, 2017.
- [Hos18] M. Hoshino, Global well-posedness of complex Ginzburg–Landau equation with a space-time white noise, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 54, no. 4, 1969–2001, 2018.
- [HLS09] C. Hainzl, M. Lewin, and J. P. Solovej, The thermodynamic limit of quantum Coulomb systems. Part II. Applications, *Advances in Math.*, 221, pp. 488–546, 2009.
- [HM18a] M. Hairer and K. Matetski. Discretisations of rough stochastic PDEs. *Ann. Probab.*, 46(3):1651–1709, 2018.
- [HM18] M. Hairer and J. Mattingly. The strong Feller property for singular stochastic PDEs. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 54(3):1314–1340, 2018.
- [HS16] M. Hairer and H. Shen. The dynamical sine-Gordon model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 341(3):933–989, 2016.
- [HS22] M. Hairer and P. Schönbauer. The support of singular stochastic PDEs. *Forum Math. Pi*, 10:No. e1, 127, 2022.
- [HZZZ24] Z. Hao, X. Zhang, R. Zhu, X. Zhu. Singular kinetic equations and applications. *Ann. Probab.*, Vol. 52, No. 2, 576–657, 2024.
- [JLM85] G. Jona-Lasinio and P. K. Mitter. On the stochastic quantization of field theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 101(3):409–436, 1985.
- [JP23] A. Jagannath and N. Perkowski. A simple construction of the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 376, no. 3, 1507–1522, 2023.
- [Kup16] A. Kupiainen. Renormalization group and stochastic PDEs. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 17(3):497–535, 2016.
- [KPS01] V. A. Kashurnikov, N. V. Prokof'ev, and B. V. Svistunov, Critical temperature shift in weakly interacting Bose gas, *Physical Review Letters*, 87, p. 120402, 2001.
- [L11] M. Lewin, Geometric methods for nonlinear many-body quantum systems, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 260, pp. 3535–3595, 2011.
- [LL01] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss, Analysis, vol. 14 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2nd ed., 2001.
- [LNR15] M. Lewin, P. T. Nam, and N. Rougerie. Derivation of nonlinear Gibbs measures from many-body quantum mechanics, *J. Éc. polytech. Math.*, 2, pp. 65–115, 2015.
- [LNR18] M. Lewin, P. T. Nam, and N. Rougerie. Gibbs measures based on 1D (an)harmonic oscillators as mean-field limits, *J. Math. Phys.*, 59, p. 041901, 2018.
- [LNR21] M. Lewin, P. T. Nam, and N. Rougerie. Classical field theory limit of many-body quantum Gibbs states in 2D and 3D. *Invent. Math.* 224, 315–444, 2021
- [LOT23] P. Linares, F. Otto, and M. Tempelmayr. The structure group for quasi-linear equations via universal enveloping algebras. *Commun. Am. Math. Soc.* 3, 1–64, 2023.
- [LOTT24] P. Linares, F. Otto, M. Tempelmayr, and P. Tsatsoulis. A diagram-free approach to the stochastic estimates in regularity structures. *Invent. Math.* 237, no. 3, 1469–1565, 2024.
- [LRS88] J. L. Lebowitz, H. A. Rose, and E. R. Speer, Statistical mechanics of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *J. Statist. Phys.*, 50, pp. 657–687, 1988.
- [LSSY05] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, J. P. Solovej, and J. Yngvason, The mathematics of the Bose gas and its condensation, Oberwolfach Seminars, Birkhäuser, 2005.
- [MW17] J.-C. Mourrat and H. Weber. The dynamic  $\Phi_3^4$  model comes down from infinity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 356(3):673–753, 2017.
- [MW17a] J.-C. Mourrat and H. Weber. Global well-posedness of the dynamic  $\Phi^4$  model in the plane. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(4):2398–2476, 2017.
- [MW20] A. Moinat and H. Weber. Space-time localisation for the dynamic  $\Phi_3^4$  model. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 73(12):2519–2555, 2020.
- [N73] E. Nelson, Construction of quantum fields from Markoff fields, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 12, pp. 97–112, 1973.
- [OSSW18] F. Otto, J. Sauer, S. Smith, and H. Weber. Parabolic equations with rough coefficients and singular forcing, March 2018.
- [OOT24] T. Oh, M. Okamoto, L. Tolomeo, Focusing  $\Phi_3^4$ -model with a Hartree-type nonlinearity, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* Volume 304, Number 1529, 2024.
- [OT18] T. Oh and L. Thomann, A pedestrian approach to the invariant gibbs measures for the 2-d defocusing nonlinear schrödinger equations, *Stoch PDE: Anal Comp.*, 6, pp. 397–445, 2018.
- [OW19] F. Otto and H. Weber. Quasilinear SPDEs via rough paths. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 232(2):873–950, 2019.
- [PW81] G. Parisi, Y. S. Wu. Perturbation theory without gauge fixing. *Sci. Sinica* 24, no. 4, 483–496, 1981.
- [RS72] M. Reed and B. Simon, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. I. Functional analysis, Academic Press, 1972.

- [RS16] N. Rougerie and S. Serfaty, Higher dimensional coulomb gases and renormalized energy functionals, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 69 (2016), pp. 519–605, 2016.
- [RZZ17] M. Röckner, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Restricted Markov uniqueness for the stochastic quantization of  $P(\Phi)_2$  and its applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 272(10), 4263–4303, 2017.
- [RZZ17a] M. Röckner, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, Ergodicity for the stochastic quantization problems on the 2D-torus, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 352, pp. 1061–1090, 2017.
- [R15] N. Rougerie, De Finetti theorems, mean-field limits and Bose-Einstein condensation, ArXiv e-prints, (2015).
- [She21] H. Shen. Stochastic quantization of an Abelian gauge theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 384(3):1445–1512, 2021.
- [S74] B. Simon, The  $P(\varphi)_2$  Euclidean (quantum) field theory, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1974. Princeton Series in Physics.
- [S05] ———, Functional integration and quantum physics, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, second ed., 2005.
- [S66] K. Symanzik, Euclidean quantum field theory. I. Equations for a scalar model, *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 7, (1966), pp. 510–525, 1966.
- [SSZZ22] H. Shen, S. Smith, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Large  $N$  limit of the  $O(N)$  linear sigma model via stochastic quantization. *Ann. Probab.* 50(1), 131–202, 2022.
- [SZZ22] H. Shen, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Large  $N$  limit of the  $O(N)$  linear sigma model in 3D. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 394 no.3, 953–1009. 2022.
- [SZZ23] H. Shen, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu. Large  $N$  limit and  $1/N$  expansion of invariant observables in  $O(N)$  linear  $\sigma$ -model via SPDE. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05166, 2023.
- [Sta13] H. R. Stahl. Proof of the BMV conjecture. *Acta Math.* 211 (2), 255–290, 2013.
- [Tri78] H. Triebel. Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators, volume 18 of North-Holland Mathematical Library. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
- [TT10] L. THOMANN AND N. TZVETKOV, Gibbs measure for the periodic derivative nonlinear schrödinger equation, *Nonlinearity*, 23, p. 2771, 2010.
- [TW18] P. Tsatsoulis and H. Weber, Spectral gap for the stochastic quantization equation on the 2-dimensional torus, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 54, pp. 1204–1249, 2018.
- [T08] N. Tzvetkov, Invariant measures for the defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 58, pp. 2543–2604, 2008.
- [ZJ89] J. Zinn-Justin, Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- [ZJ13] ———, Phase transitions and renormalization group, Oxford Graduate Texts, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013. Paperback edition of the 2007 original [MR2345069].
- [ZZ15] Rongchan Zhu, Xiangchan Zhu, Three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations driven by space-time white noise, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 259, 9, 5, 2015, 4443–4508
- [ZZ18] R. Zhu and X. Zhu. Lattice approximation to the dynamical  $\Phi_3^4$  model. *Ann. Probab.*, 46(1):397–455, 2018.
- [ZZZ22] X. Zhang, R. Zhu, X. Zhu, Singular HJB equations with applications to KPZ on the real line, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 183 no. 3-4, 789–869, 2022

(P. T. Nam) LMU MUNICH, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THERESIENSTRASSE 39, 80333 MUNICH, GERMANY  
*Email address:* nam@math.lmu.de

(R. Zhu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING 100081, CHINA  
*Email address:* zhurongchan@126.com

(X. Zhu) ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA  
*Email address:* zhuxiangchan@126.com