

NONLINEAR MULTIDOMAIN MODEL FOR NERVE BUNDLES WITH RANDOM STRUCTURE*

IRINA PETTERSSON[†], ANTONINA RYBALKO[‡], AND VOLODYMYR RYBALKO[§]

Abstract. We present a derivation of a multidomain model for the electric potential in bundles of randomly distributed axons with different radii. The FitzHugh–Nagumo dynamics is assumed on the axons’ membrane, and the conductivity depends nonlinearly on the electric field. Under ergodicity conditions, we study the asymptotic behavior of the potential in the bundle when the number of the axons in the bundle is sufficiently large and derive a macroscopic multidomain model describing the electrical activity of the bundle. Due to the randomness of geometry, the effective intracellular potential is not deterministic but is shown to be a stationary function with realizations that are constant on axons’ cross sections. The technique combines the stochastic two-scale convergence and the method of monotone operators.

Key words. Signals propagation in nerves, nonlinear conductivity, random media, stochastic homogenization, bidomain model.

MSC codes. Primary: 35B27, 78A48, 35K61, 35K57; Secondary: 35K65, 92C30.

1. Introduction. The axons in the nervous system are grouped into fascicles, and the number of axons and their diameters vary from one fascicle to another, as well as inside one fascicle [40]. The signal propagation along individual axons is traditionally modeled by nonlinear cable equations assuming the Hodgkin–Huxley dynamics [18] or its simplifications, such as FitzHugh–Nagumo model [13, 31]. In [22] a nonlinear cable equation for signal propagation in a single myelinated axon has been derived from a three-dimensional model.

To catch nontrivial interactions between the axons in the bundle (ephaptic interactions [7, 5]), one needs to consider a full three-dimensional model of the bundle with several (and quite often a large number) axons in it. Complicated geometry and nonlinear dynamics on the membrane make it, however, computationally expensive, and so macroscopic models are used to describe the electric potential in the axon bundles. It was suggested in [2] that one can model both peripheral nerves, cortical neurons, and syncytial tissues with the help of bidomain models. In [26] it was hypothesized that the homogenization procedure for a bundle of axons leads to a bidomain model. In [21] the authors have confirmed this hypothesis and derived an effective bidomain model for the nonlinear case, assuming FitzHugh dynamics on the membrane. In the latter work, the myelinated axons of the same radius are placed periodically inside the fascicle.

In the above-described models, the periodicity of the axon distributions inside a fascicle or of the geometry of syncytial tissues is a crucial assumption allowing to apply the classical homogenization techniques. In reality, however, the placement of the axons is not periodic, and the diameters of individual fibers in one fascicle may vary. Since the diameters of axons affect the conduction velocity, it is important to

* **Funding:** This work was supported by Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher education (STINT) project CS2018-7908, Olle Engkvist Foundation Grant 227-0235, and SSF grants for Ukrainian scientists Dnr UKR22-0004, UKR24-0023.

[†]Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, Sweden (irinap@chalmers.se).

[‡]Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, Sweden; Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics, Ukraine (rybalkoa@chalmers.se).

[§]Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, Sweden; Institute for Low Temperature Physics and Engineering, Ukraine (rybalko@chalmers.se).

allow for such variation.

There have been several attempts to remove the periodicity assumption. For example, in [36], a bidomain model for a beating heart with a non-periodic microstructure is proposed. Namely, the authors apply formal multi-scale expansions to problems stated in deformed periodic structures. The model accounts for the non-uniform orientation of the cells and the deformation of the tissue as a result of the heartbeat. In [34], the asymptotics of the electric potential in bundles with randomly distributed identical axons have been studied. It has been shown that the macroscopic behavior of the potential is given by an effective deterministic bidomain model.

The present paper generalizes the homogenization results [21] and [34] to the case of nonlinear conductivity and random geometry of the nerve cross section. Namely, we place the axons randomly in the cross section of the bundle, keeping the cross section of the axons the same along the bundle. Typically, the randomness in the cross section is generated by a stationary and ergodic point process. The evolution of the membrane potential, that is, the jump of the electric potential through the membrane, is modeled with the help of the FitzHugh–Nagumo dynamics. For a large number of axons in a bundle, we derive an effective model (5.13) of the multidomain type. The key contribution of the present work is the derivation of a non-deterministic effective problem. The randomness of the geometry is encoded in the function $r(\omega)$ (see (2.4)) and the Palm measure (3.2) corresponding to the surface measure of the axons' membrane. Considering stochastic geometry opens an opportunity to analyze, for example, how the concentration of axons of different radii influences the signal propagation in a bundle, which is not possible in a periodic setting.

To tackle the random geometry, one can make use of the ergodicity theorem directly [42] or apply stochastic two-scale convergence introduced in [9]. In [6], the authors suggest a different approach, defining the stochastic coefficients as stochastic deformations of the periodic setting using random diffeomorphisms. In the present work we use the stochastic two-scale convergence technique combined with the monotonicity method [29]. Another technical aspect of the homogenization procedure in our problem comes from the presence of the jump of the electric potential through the membrane. To pass to the limit in the surface terms, we use the Palm measure theory. A similar approach has been employed in [35] for the proof of convergence of the boundary integrals involving the flow velocity and elastic deformations and also in [16] to tackle the Robin boundary conditions.

It is known that if the conductivity of the medium decreases, it is necessary to deliver a pulse of a larger field amplitude to achieve the same effect [19]. The choice of a specific nonlinear conductivity is still phenomenological since the experimental data currently does not allow us to characterize the dependence of the conductivity on the electric field. In the present work, we impose hypothesis (H4) ensuring the monotonicity of the problem, which is clearly satisfied by, for example, the sigmoid-type functions.

Bidomain models are traditionally used to describe the macroscopic behavior of the electric potential in cardiac electrophysiology [14, 33, 1, 11, 15, 3]. In these works, the geometry of the tissue is periodic, and the conductivity is independent of the electric field. Moreover, both the intra- and extracellular components of the cardiac tissue are connected, which stands in contrast to the case when axons are disconnected in the transversal direction. As a consequence, the effective multidomain model (5.13) contains only derivatives of the intracellular potential in the longitudinal direction.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the random geometry of the nerve bundle. In Section 3, we introduce the necessary definitions

of the stochastic two-scale convergence in the mean, as well as the Palm measure. In Section 4, we formulate the microscopic problem, and Section 5 introduces the effective multidomain model. The proof of the main convergence result (Theorem 5.3) is given in Section 6. In the appendix, we provide some examples of stationary random media and perform the nondimensionalization of the problem to motivate the choice of the scaling in the microscopic model (the factor ε in (4.2)).

2. Geometry of nerve fascicles. A nerve fascicle is modeled as a cylindrical domain $G = (0, L) \times S$ in \mathbb{R}^3 , with length $L > 0$ and cross section $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We assume that S has a Lipschitz boundary ∂S . The lateral boundary of the cylinder is denoted by $\Sigma = (0, L) \times \partial S$, and its bases by $S_0 = \{0\} \times S$ and $S_L = \{L\} \times S$. In what follows, the points in \mathbb{R}^3 are denoted by $x = (x_1, x')$, $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

We assume that the bulk of the fascicle consists of two disjoint separated by semipermeable membrane parts: an intracellular part formed by thin cylinders (axons) and an extracellular part. Let us describe the random geometry of the bundle that will originate from the random distribution of the axons in the cross section of the fascicle.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ be a probability space with measure \mathcal{P} and the sigma-algebra \mathcal{F} . We will also assume that the Lebesgue space $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{P}) = L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, is separable. It is true if \mathcal{F} is countably generated (see e.g. Proposition 3.4.5, [10]).

Consider a two-dimensional dynamical system (of translations) $T_{x'} : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$, $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$, that is a family of invertible measurable maps with measurable inverses such that

- (i) $T_0 = \text{Id}$ and $T_{x'+y'} = T_{x'}T_{y'}$, for all $x', y' \in \mathbb{R}^2$.
- (ii) $T_{x'}$ is a measure-preserving transformation, that is $\mathcal{P}(T_{x'}^{-1}F) = \mathcal{P}(F)$ for all $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $F \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (iii) $T_{x'}\omega$ is a measurable map from $(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Omega, \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{F}, dx' \times \mathcal{P})$ to (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , where dx' is the standard Lebesgue measure and \mathcal{B} is the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{R}^2 .

We assume that $T_{x'}$ is ergodic, that is if $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is translation invariant, then F has either full or zero measure: $T_{x'}F = F$, $\forall x' \in \mathbb{R}^2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(F) = 0$ or 1 .

Given $\omega \in \Omega$, consider the random set $A(\omega)$ defined as a collection of an infinite number of disjoint open discs with radii $r_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$A(\omega) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(\omega),$$

$$A_j(\omega) = A(x'_j(\omega), r_j(\omega)) = \left\{ x' \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x' - x'_j(\omega)| < r_j(\omega) \right\}.$$

We assume that

- (H1) The distance between the discs is bounded from below:

$$\text{dist}(A_i(\omega), A_j(\omega)) \geq d_0 > 0, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

- (H2) There exists $R_0 > 0$ such that a.s. any disc of radius R_0 in \mathbb{R}^2 has a nontrivial intersection with $A(\omega)$.
- (H3) The radii $r_j(\omega)$ of the discs, $\forall j$, are bounded from below and above by deterministic positive constants: $0 < \underline{r} < r_j(\omega) < \bar{r}$.
- (H4) The dynamical system $T_{x'}$ is consistent with the random set $A(\omega)$, that is

$$A(T_{x'}\omega) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} A(x'_j(\omega) - x', r_j(\omega)) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{P} - \text{a.s. in } \Omega.$$

We introduce prototypes of the random set $A(\omega)$, its closure $\bar{A}(\omega)$, and the boundary $\partial A(\omega)$:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \{\omega \in \Omega : 0 \in A(\omega)\}, \\ \bar{\mathcal{A}} &= \{\omega \in \Omega : 0 \in \bar{A}(\omega)\}, \\ \mathcal{M} &= \bar{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A} = \{\omega \in \Omega : 0 \in \partial A(\omega)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hypothesis (H4) implies that

$$(2.2) \quad A(\omega) = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^2 : T_{x'}\omega \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Indeed, if $T_{x'}\omega \in \mathcal{A}$ then $0 \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} A(x'_j(\omega) - x', r_j(\omega))$, and consequently $x' \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} A(x'_j(\omega), r_j(\omega)) = A(\omega)$. Similarly, $\partial A(\omega) = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^2 : T_{x'}\omega \in \mathcal{M}\}$.

For a small $\varepsilon > 0$ representing the microscale, we rescale the set $A(\omega)$:

$$(2.3) \quad A_\varepsilon(\omega) = \bigcup_{j \in J_\varepsilon} A_{\varepsilon j}(\omega), \quad A_{\varepsilon j}(\omega) = \varepsilon A(x'_j(\omega), r_j(\omega)),$$

where the union is taken over the indices $j \in J_\varepsilon$ such that the discs $A_{\varepsilon j}(\omega)$ are separated from the boundary of S , namely $\text{dist}(A_{\varepsilon j}(\omega), \partial S) > d_0\varepsilon$, $d_0 > 0$.

The random radii of the discs in the cross section is given by the following function:

$$r_\varepsilon(x, \omega) = \begin{cases} r_j(\omega), & x \in \bar{A}_{\varepsilon j}(\omega), \\ 0, & x \notin \bar{A}_{\varepsilon j}(\omega). \end{cases}$$

Then $r_\varepsilon(x, \omega) = r(T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega)$, where

$$(2.4) \quad r(\omega) = \begin{cases} r_{j_0}(\omega), & \omega \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}, \\ 0, & \omega \notin \bar{\mathcal{A}}, \end{cases}$$

and $r_{j_0}(\omega) > 0$ is the radius of the disc $A(x'_{j_0}(\omega), r_{j_0}(\omega))$ containing 0 (if exists).

The intracellular domain of j th axon is denoted by $F_{\varepsilon j}(\omega) = (0, L) \times A_{\varepsilon j}(\omega)$. The intracellular domain is then defined as a random set of axons, and the extracellular is the complement to the intracellular one:

$$(2.5) \quad F_\varepsilon(\omega) = (0, L) \times A_\varepsilon(\omega), \quad G_\varepsilon(\omega) = G \setminus F_\varepsilon(\omega).$$

The membrane (lateral boundary) of axons is denoted by

$$(2.6) \quad M_\varepsilon(\omega) = \partial F_\varepsilon(\omega) \setminus (S_0 \cup S_1).$$

The geometry of the cross section and the three-dimensional bundle is illustrated in Figure 1.




Fig. 1: Fascicle G with the lateral boundary Σ .

In what follows, we will use the Birkhoff ergodic theorem [12, 38].

THEOREM 2.1 (Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem). *Let $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p \geq 1$. Then for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, the realization $f(T_x\omega)$ possesses a mean value, that is*

$$f(T_{x/\varepsilon}\omega) \rightharpoonup \langle f(T_x\omega) \rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K f(T_{x/\varepsilon}\omega) dx.$$

Moreover, the mean value $\langle f(T_x\omega) \rangle$ considered as a function of $\omega \in \Omega$, is invariant, and

$$\int_{\Omega} \langle f(T_x\omega) \rangle d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

If the system T_x is ergodic, then

$$\langle f(T_x\omega) \rangle = \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

Applying the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, we conclude that \mathcal{P} -a.s. there exists a limit density of axons as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$(2.7) \quad \chi_{A_\varepsilon} \rightharpoonup \Lambda = \mathcal{P}(A) \text{ weakly in } L^p(G), \quad p \geq 1.$$

3. Stochastic two-scale convergence in the mean. In this section we recall the necessary definition of the two-scale convergence in the mean [9] and introduce the notion of the two-scale convergence on the random surfaces. We also formulate the hypotheses (H6)–(H8) on the initial data $V_\varepsilon, G_\varepsilon$ and the external excitation J_ε^e .

Consider the group $\{U(x') : x' \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$ of operators on $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ given for $f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ by

$$(U(x')f)(\omega) = f(T_{x'}\omega), \quad x' \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

$U(x')$ preserves inner product $(U(x')f, U(x')g)_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})} = (f, g)_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})}$ since (ii) is equivalent to

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\omega) d\mathcal{P} = \int_{\Omega} f(T_{x'}\omega) d\mathcal{P}, \quad \text{for all } f \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{P}).$$

As T_x is invertible, $U(x')$ is a unitary operator [41].

Under the assumption that $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ is separable, the group $\{U(x') : x' \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$ is strongly continuous, that is $U(x')f \rightarrow f$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$, as $x' \rightarrow 0$ (see Theorems 3.5.3 and 10.10.1 in [17]).

Denote by $(\nabla_\omega \cdot)_j$, $j = 2, 3$, the generators of the strongly continuous group of unitary operators in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ associated with translations $T_{x'}$ along e_j , the j th basis vector in \mathbb{R}^3 . The domains \mathcal{D}_j of these generators, $j = 2, 3$, are dense in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ and

$$(\nabla_\omega u)_j(\omega) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(T_{\delta e_j}\omega) - u(\omega)}{\delta}.$$

For each multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, we set $D^\alpha = (\nabla_\omega u)_1^{\alpha_1} (\nabla_\omega u)_2^{\alpha_2}$ and define

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\Omega) &= \mathcal{D}_2 \cap \mathcal{D}_3, \\ D^\infty(\Omega) &= \{f \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{P}) : D^\alpha f \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{P}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\Omega), \forall \alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $D^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ (see Lemma 2.1 in [9]). To formulate the assumptions and the main result we need the notion of stochastic two-scale convergence in the mean [9] both in $G_T = [0, T] \times G$ and on $[0, T] \times M_\varepsilon(\omega)$.

DEFINITION 3.1. A bounded sequence $\{u_\varepsilon\}$ of functions in $L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}))$ converges stochastically two-scale in the mean to $u \in L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}))$, and we write $u_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2s} u$, if for any $\varphi \in C(\bar{G}_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}))$, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} u_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x, T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega) dt dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} u(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x, \omega) dt dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

To define the convergence on the random surfaces $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$, we use the Palm measure corresponding to the surface measure of M_ε [27, 30].

LEMMA 3.2 (Palm measure μ and Campbell's formula). *There exists a unique measure μ , called the Palm measure, on Ω such that*

$$(3.2) \quad \mu(B) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\partial A(\omega)} \chi_{[0,1]^2}(x') \chi_B(T_{x'}\omega) ds(x') d\mathcal{P}(\omega),$$

where $ds(x')$ is the arc length measure of $\partial A(\omega)$, and χ is the characteristic function. Moreover, μ is σ -finite and

$$(3.3) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\partial A(\omega)} f(x', T_{x'}\omega) ds(x') d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} f(x', \omega) dx' d\mu(\omega),$$

for any $f(x', \omega) \in L^1(\mathbf{R}^2 \times \Omega, dx' \times d\mu)$.

The ergodicity implies that μ is independent of the choice of f .

Remark 3.3. Taking $f(x', \omega)$ such that $f = 0$ for $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$, and using the definition of the prototypal set \mathcal{M} , we see that for all such functions

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} f(x', \omega) dx' d\mu(\omega) = 0.$$

Thus, the integral over Ω in the right-hand side of (3.3) can be replaced by the integral over \mathcal{M} . The same applies also to the two-scale convergence definitions below.

DEFINITION 3.4 (Stochastic two-scale convergence on random surfaces). A sequence $\{u_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega)\}$ of functions on the random surface M_ε , such that for some $1 < p < \infty$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |u_\varepsilon|^p dS(x_1, x') dt d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \leq C,$$

converges stochastically two-scale in the mean to $u = u(t, x, \omega) \in L^p(G_T; L^p(\Omega, \mu))$ if

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} u_\varepsilon \varphi(t, x, T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega) dS(x) dt d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} u \varphi(t, x, \omega) dx dt d\mu(\omega),$$

for any $\varphi \in C(\bar{G}_T; L^q(\Omega, \mu))$, $q = p/(p-1)$. Here we write $dS(x_1, x') = dx_1 ds(x')$ for the surface measure on $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$.

We will also use stochastic two-scale convergence in the mean pointwise in time $t \in [0, T]$.

DEFINITION 3.5. *We say that a sequence $\{u_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega)\}$ of functions on the random surface $[0, T] \times M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ such that for $1 < p < \infty$,*

$$\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |u_\varepsilon|^p dS(x) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \leq C,$$

converges stochastically two-scale in the mean to $u = u(t, x, \omega) \in L^p(\bar{G}_T; L^p(\Omega, \mu))$, pointwise in time, if for any $t \in [0, T]$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} u_\varepsilon \varphi(t, x, T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega) dS(x) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \int_G u \varphi(t, x, \omega) dx d\mu(\omega),$$

for any $\varphi \in C(\bar{G}_T; L^q(\Omega, \mu))$, $q = p/(p-1)$.

Test functions in Definitions 3.4, 3.5 have the following property.

LEMMA 3.6. *For any $\varphi \in C(\bar{G}_T; L^q(\Omega, \mu))$, $1 < q < \infty$, and any $t \in [0, T]$, it holds*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\varphi(t, x, T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega)|^q dS(x) dt d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \int_G |\varphi(t, x, \omega)|^q dt dx d\mu(\omega).$$

Proof. By (2.3) we remove the discs that are too close to the boundary ∂S . Namely, there exists δ such that the random set $A_\varepsilon(\omega)$ is contained in a compact subset $S_{\delta(\varepsilon)} \Subset S$ with $\text{dist}(S_{\delta(\varepsilon)}, \partial S) = \delta(\varepsilon)$, and $\delta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, e.g. $\delta = (d_0 + 2\bar{r})\varepsilon$. Changing variables $y' = x'/\varepsilon$, using the Campbell formula, and rescaling back, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \int_0^L \int_{\partial A_\varepsilon(\omega)} \chi_{S_{\delta(\varepsilon)}}(x') |\varphi(t, x, T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega)|^q ds(x') dx_1 dt d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \int_0^L \int_{\partial A(\omega)} \chi_{S_{\delta(\varepsilon)}}(\varepsilon y') |\varphi(t, x_1, \varepsilon y', T_{y'}\omega)|^q ds(y') dx_1 dt d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \int_0^L \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} \chi_{S_{\delta(\varepsilon)}}(\varepsilon y') |\varphi(t, x_1, \varepsilon y', \omega)|^q dy' dx_1 dt d\mu(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \int_0^L \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} \chi_{S_{\delta(\varepsilon)}}(x') |\varphi(t, x, \omega)|^q dx' dx_1 dt d\mu(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, in order to apply the Campbell formula, the compact subset $S_{\delta(\varepsilon)}$ should be chosen independent of ω . Passing to the limit, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Together with the weak stochastic two-scale convergence in the mean introduced above, we will need a strong version of it.

DEFINITION 3.7. We say that u_ε defined on $[0, T] \times M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ converges **strongly** stochastically two-scale in the mean to $u \in L^p(G_T; L^p(\Omega, \mu))$ if u_ε converges stochastically two-scale in the mean to u and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |u_\varepsilon|^p dS(x) dt d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} |u|^p dt dx d\mu(\omega).$$

4. Problem setup. Let $u_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega)$ denote the electric potential in the bundle $G = G_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup F_\varepsilon(\omega)$, where $F_\varepsilon(\omega), G_\varepsilon(\omega)$, and $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ are defined by (2.5)–(2.6), respectively. We assume that the conductivity is a nonlinear function of the electric field strength:

$$u_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} u_\varepsilon^e & \text{in } G_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ u_\varepsilon^i & \text{in } F_\varepsilon(\omega), \end{cases} \quad \sigma_\varepsilon(x, \omega, |\nabla u_\varepsilon|) = \begin{cases} \sigma^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|) & \text{in } G_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \sigma^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^i|) & \text{in } F_\varepsilon(\omega). \end{cases}$$

(H4) The functions $\sigma^{e,i}(\eta)$ are continuously differentiable and satisfy the conditions

$$0 < \underline{\sigma} \leq \sigma^{e,i}(\eta) \leq \bar{\sigma}, \quad \underline{\sigma} < \eta \frac{d}{d\eta} \sigma^{e,i}(\eta) + \sigma^{e,i}(\eta), \quad \forall \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

In Lemma A.4 we prove that (H4) implies monotonicity of $\sigma^e(|\xi|)\xi$, $\sigma^i(|\xi|)\xi$.

Remark 4.1. The choice of nonlinear conductivity depending on $|\nabla u|$ is motivated by the use of such models in oncology [4]. Examples of conductivity functions satisfying assumption (H4) include sigmoid functions. A typical choice for tissue conductivity in electroporation models is a four-parameter sigmoid function [20]

$$(4.1) \quad \sigma(\eta) = \sigma_0 + \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_0}{2} (1 + \operatorname{erf}(k_{\text{ep}}(\eta - E_{\text{th}}))), \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Here, σ_0 is the conductivity of the non-electroporated tissue, $\sigma_1 > \sigma_0$ is the conductivity of the fully electroporated tissue, k_{ep} is the slope of the nonlinearity, and erf is the Gauss error function.

The jump $v_\varepsilon = [u_\varepsilon] = u_\varepsilon^i - u_\varepsilon^e$ through the lateral boundaries of axons $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ is called the transmembrane potential (or just membrane potential). On the membrane $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ we assume the current continuity $\sigma^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|)\nabla u_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu = \sigma^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^i|)\nabla u_\varepsilon^i \cdot \nu$ (ν is the unit normal on $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ external to the axons), and adopt the FitzHugh-Nagumo [13, 31] model for the ionic current on $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$:

$$I_{\text{ion}}(v_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon) = \frac{v_\varepsilon^3}{3} - v_\varepsilon - g_\varepsilon, \\ \partial_t g_\varepsilon = \theta v_\varepsilon + a - b g_\varepsilon, \quad \theta, a, b > 0,$$

where $I_{\text{ion}}(v_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$ is the ionic current, g_ε stands for the recovery variable and θ, a, b are constants.

The evolution of the electric potential $u_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega)$ in $G_T = [0, T] \times G$ is described by the following coupled system for $t \in [0, T]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\sigma^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)\nabla u_\varepsilon) &= 0 && \text{in } F_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \operatorname{div}(\sigma^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)\nabla u_\varepsilon) &= 0 && \text{in } G_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \sigma^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|)\nabla u_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu &= \sigma^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^i|)\nabla u_\varepsilon^i \cdot \nu && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.2) \quad & v_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon^i - u_\varepsilon^e && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\
 & \varepsilon(c_m \partial_t v_\varepsilon + I_{\text{ion}}(v_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)) = -\sigma^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|) \nabla u_\varepsilon^i \cdot \nu && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\
 & \partial_t g_\varepsilon = \theta v_\varepsilon + a - b g_\varepsilon && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\
 & \sigma^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla u_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu = J_\varepsilon^e(t, x) && \text{on } \Sigma, \\
 & u_\varepsilon = 0 && \text{on } S_0 \cup S_L, \\
 & v_\varepsilon(0, x, \omega) = V_\varepsilon(x, \omega), \quad g_\varepsilon(0, x, \omega) = G_\varepsilon(x, \omega) && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega),
 \end{aligned}$$

where ν denotes the external unit normal on $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ (exterior to $F_\varepsilon(\omega)$), the bases S_0, S_L , and Σ . The function $J_\varepsilon^e(t, x)$ represents an external boundary excitation of the nerve fascicle, and the constant c_m is the membrane capacity. Note that the only source of randomness is the distribution of axons in the cross section.

We study the asymptotic behavior of v_ε , as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and derive a macroscopic model under the following conditions on the initial and boundary data:

- (H6) The initial data V_ε admits an extension in G still denoted V_ε , such that $\|V_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(G)} \leq C$ and $V_\varepsilon = 0$ on $S_0 \cup S_L$. We assume that $V_\varepsilon(x, \omega)$ converges stochastically two-scale in the mean to $V_0 \in L^2(G; L^2(\Omega, \mu))$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
- (H7) The initial function $G_\varepsilon(x, \omega)$ converges strongly stochastically two-scale in the mean to $G_0 \in L^2(G; L^2(\Omega, \mu))$.
- (H8) The external excitation $J_\varepsilon^e \in L^2((0, T) \times \Sigma)$ converges weakly to $J_0^e(t, x)$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\int_0^T \int_\Sigma |\partial_t J_\varepsilon^e|^2 dS(x) dt \leq C.$$

Remark 4.2. Assumption (H6) together with Theorem 3.7 in [9] guarantees strong stochastic two-scale convergence and that the limit function $V_0(x)$ does not depend on ω . Moreover, due to Lemma 6.2, the initial data satisfies

$$\varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} V_\varepsilon^4 dS(x) \leq C.$$

Problem (4.2) can be written as an evolution equation with a non-local operator on the membranes $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ of axons:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.3) \quad & \varepsilon c_m \partial_t v_\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(t, v_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon I_{\text{ion}}(v_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon) = 0 && \text{on } (0, T) \times M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\
 & \partial_t g_\varepsilon = \theta v_\varepsilon + a - b g_\varepsilon && \text{on } (0, T) \times M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\
 & v_\varepsilon(0, x, \omega) = V_\varepsilon(x, \omega), \quad g_\varepsilon(0, x, \omega) = G_\varepsilon(x, \omega) && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega).
 \end{aligned}$$

The non-local integro-differential operator

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(t, \cdot) : D(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon) \subset H^{1/2}(M_\varepsilon(\omega)) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(M_\varepsilon(\omega))$$

is defined, for $t \in [0, T]$, as follows: For any $\phi \in H^1(F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega))$, $\phi|_{S_0 \cup S_L} = 0$, we set

$$(4.5) \quad (\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(t, v_\varepsilon), [\phi])_{L^2(M_\varepsilon(\omega))} = \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \sigma_\varepsilon(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|) \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \phi dx - \int_\Sigma J_\varepsilon^e \phi^e dS(x),$$

where $\phi^e = \phi|_{G_\varepsilon(\omega)}$, $\phi|_{S_0 \cup S_L} = 0$, and the function $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega))$ in (4.5), for a given jump $[u_\varepsilon] = v_\varepsilon$, solves the following problem:

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\sigma_\varepsilon(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)\nabla u_\varepsilon) &= 0 && \text{in } F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \sigma^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|)\nabla u_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu &= \sigma^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^i|)\nabla u_\varepsilon^i \cdot \nu && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ v_\varepsilon &= u_\varepsilon^i - u_\varepsilon^e && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \sigma^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|)\nabla u_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu &= J_\varepsilon^e(t, x) && \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_\varepsilon &= 0 && \text{on } S_0 \cup S_L. \end{aligned}$$

5. Effective problem and main result. To introduce the effective conductivity of the extracellular medium, we will use the notion of potential and solenoidal vector fields [23]. Recall that a vector $v \in (L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}))^2$ defined on Ω is called potential if almost all its realizations $v(T_{x'}\omega)$ are potential in \mathbb{R}^2 , that is for almost all ω , $v(T_{x'}\omega)$ admits the representation $v(T_{x'}\omega) = \nabla_{x'}\phi(x', \omega)$, $\phi(\cdot, \omega) \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and $\int_\Omega v(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = 0$. An equivalent definition of the potential vectors can be found in Lemma 2.3, [9]. The vector $v \in (L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}))^2$ is called solenoidal if almost all its realizations $v(T_{x'}\omega)$ are solenoidal in \mathbb{R}^2 , i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v(T_{x'}\omega) \cdot \nabla \phi dx' = 0, \quad \phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

We denote by $V_{\text{pot}}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ the set of potential vectors with zero mean value, and by $L_{\text{sol}}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ the set of all solenoidal vectors. Then the orthogonal Weyl decomposition holds (Lemma 7.3, [42]):

$$(L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}))^2 = V_{\text{pot}}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}) \oplus L_{\text{sol}}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P}).$$

We define the effective extracellular conductivity σ_{hom}^e as follows

$$(5.1) \quad \sigma_{\text{hom}}^e(\xi) = \nabla \Phi(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where

$$(5.2) \quad \Phi(\xi) = \inf_{w \in V_{\text{pot}}^2(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{A}} Q^e(|\xi + (0, w)|) d\mathcal{P}(\omega), \quad Q^e(\eta) = \int_0^\eta \sigma^e(\zeta) \zeta d\zeta.$$

The definition (5.1) can be equivalently written as

$$(5.3) \quad \sigma_{\text{hom}}^e(\xi) = \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{A}} \sigma^e(|\xi + (0, w)|)(\xi + (0, w)) d\mathcal{P}(\omega)$$

with w minimizing (5.2).

We will approximate the intracellular potential u_ε^i by a function $u^i(t, x, \omega)$ such that almost all its realizations are constants on the axons (see problem (5.13)). To this end, we will need the following class of functions:

$$(5.4) \quad \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A}) = \{w \in L^2(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}) : \exists \tilde{w} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{P}) \text{ s.t. } \tilde{w}|_{\mathcal{A}} = w, \nabla_\omega \tilde{w} = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{A}\}.$$

For any $w \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$ it holds that $w \in L^2(\Omega, \mu)$ (see Lemma 6.2 in [35]), and we can introduce the orthogonal projector $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})}$ on $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mu)$. We denote by $\mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})$ the Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega, \mu) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A}) =: \mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})$.

Remark 5.1. For any function $w \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$, $\nabla_\omega \tilde{w}(T_{y'}\omega) = \nabla_{y'} \tilde{w}(T_{y'}\omega) = 0$ for $y' \in A(\omega)$ and a.e. ω . That is almost all realizations $w(T_{y'}\omega)$ are constants in y' on the axons $A_j(\omega)$.

The lemma below shows that on functions $w \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$ the $L^2(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$ -norm is equivalent to the $L^2(\Omega, \mu)$ -norm.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $f(T_{x'}\omega) = f_j(\omega)$ is constant in x' in $\bar{A}_j(\omega)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, for a.a. $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ (with respect to both measures $d\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and $d\mu(\omega)$). Then*

$$(5.5) \quad \int_{\mathcal{A}} f(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} r(\omega) f(\omega) d\mu(\omega).$$

Proof. It suffices to prove this lemma for $f \geq 0$ such that $f = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \bar{\mathcal{A}}$. For large enough $N > 0$ consider the squares $q = [-N, N]^2$ and $q_{\bar{r}} = [-N - 2\bar{r}, N + 2\bar{r}]^2$ (see the assumption (H3)). Since $T_{x'}$ is measure preserving, the Campbell formula (3.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi_{q_{\bar{r}}}(x') f(\omega) dx' d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(T_{x'}\omega) \chi_{q_{\bar{r}}}(x') f(T_{x'}\omega) dx' d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{A(\omega) \cap q_{\bar{r}}} f(T_{x'}\omega) dx' d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_j f_j(\omega) |A_j(\omega) \cap q_{\bar{r}}| d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j: A_j(\omega) \cap q_{\bar{r}} \neq \emptyset} f_j(\omega) \pi r_j^2(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\partial A(\omega)} \chi_q(x') f(T_{x'}\omega) r(T_{x'}\omega) ds(x') d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \\ (5.6) \quad &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\Omega} \chi_q(x') f(\omega) r(\omega) d\mu(\omega) dx'. \end{aligned}$$

Calculating the integrals in x' in both parts of the inequality (5.6), we get

$$(5.7) \quad (2N + 4\bar{r})^2 \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \geq \frac{(2N)^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) r(\omega) d\mu(\omega).$$

Analogously, starting with $\chi_q(x')$ instead of $\chi_{q_{\bar{r}}}(x')$ in (5.6), we obtain the estimate from above

$$(5.8) \quad (2N)^2 \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \leq \frac{(2N + 4\bar{r})^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) r(\omega) d\mu(\omega).$$

Then, passing to the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.7), (5.8) completes the proof. \square

To formulate the limit problem (5.13), we introduce the functional spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_e &= \{u^e \in H^1(G) : u^e|_{S_0 \cup S_L} = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{H}_i &= \{u^i \in L^2(G, \mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})) : \partial_{x_1} u^i \in L^2(G, \mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})), u^i|_{S_0 \cup S_L} = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{H}'_i &= \{v = \partial_{x_1 x_1}^2 u^i, u^i \in \mathcal{H}_i\}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{H}'_i is dual to \mathcal{H}_i .

Consider the non-local integro-differential operator

$$(5.9) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{hom}}(t, \cdot) : \mathcal{H}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_i$$

given for $t \in [0, T]$ by

$$(5.10) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{hom}}(t, v) = -\frac{r(\omega)}{2} \partial_{x_1} (\sigma^i (|\partial_{x_1}(v + u^e)|) \partial_{x_1}(v + u^e)),$$

where $u^e \in \mathcal{H}_e$ solves

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_G r(\omega) \sigma^i (|\partial_{x_1}(v + u^e)|) \partial_{x_1}(v + u^e) \partial_{x_1} \phi^e dx d\mu(\omega) \\ & + \int_G \sigma_{\text{hom}}^e(\nabla u^e) \cdot \nabla \phi^e dx - \int_{\Sigma} J_0^e \phi^e dS(x) = 0, \quad \forall \phi^e \in \mathcal{H}_e. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the definition of \mathcal{L}_{hom} that

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{L}_{\text{hom}}(t, v), [\phi])_{L^2(G; L^2(\mathcal{M}, \mu))} = \int_G \sigma_{\text{hom}}^e(\nabla u^e) \cdot \nabla \phi^e dx \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_G r(\omega) \sigma^i (|\partial_{x_1} u^i|) \partial_{x_1} u^i \partial_{x_1} \phi^i dx d\mu(\omega) - \int_{\Sigma} J_0^e \phi^e dS(x). \end{aligned}$$

holds for u^e solving (5.11), $u^i = v + u^e$ and for any $\phi^e \in \mathcal{H}_e, \phi^i \in \mathcal{H}_i, [\phi] = \phi^i - \phi^e$.

We will prove that the asymptotic behavior of solutions of the boundary value problem (4.2) is described by the following limit model:

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} c_m \partial_t v_0 + \mathcal{L}_{\text{hom}}(t, v_0) + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})} I_{\text{ion}}(v_0, g_0) &= 0 && \text{in } G_T \times \mathcal{M}, \\ \partial_t g_0 = \theta v_0 + a - b g_0 &&& \text{in } G_T \times \mathcal{M}, \\ v_0(0, x) = V_0(x), \quad g_0(0, x, \omega) = G_0(x, \omega) &&& \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M}, \end{aligned}$$

with $u_0^e = u_0^e(t, x)$, $u_0^i = u_0^i(t, x, \omega)$ such that $u_0^i(t, x, \cdot) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$. Here with a slight abuse of notation, we set $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})} I_{\text{ion}}(v_0, g_0) = \frac{v_0^3}{3} - v_0 - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})} g_0$. The well-posedness of the limit problem (5.13) will be shown in Section 6.3.

The main result of the paper describing the convergence of solutions of (4.2) to those of the macroscopic problem (5.13) is contained in the following theorem.

THEOREM 5.3. *Under assumptions (H1)–(H8), for $t \in [0, T]$, the solution $\{v_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon\}$ of the microscopic problem (4.2) converges strongly stochastically two-scale in the mean on the random surfaces $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ to the solution $\{v_0, g_0\}$ of the macroscopic problem (5.13), as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, the potential u_ε converges stochastically two-scale in the mean in G_T (see Definition 3.1) to*

$$u_0(t, x, \omega) = \chi_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega) u_0^e(t, x) + \chi_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega) u_0^i(t, x, \omega),$$

where u_0^e is a solution of the problem (5.11) with $v = v_0$, $u_0^i = v_0 + u_0^e$.

Note that the limit problem (5.13) can be formulated in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} c_m \partial_t v_0 + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})} I_{\text{ion}}(v_0, g_0) &= \frac{r(\omega)}{2} \partial_{x_1} (\sigma^i (|\partial_{x_1} u_0^i|)) && \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M}, \\ \int_{\Omega} (c_m \partial_t v_0 + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})} I_{\text{ion}}(v_0, g_0)) d\mu(\omega) &= -\text{div}(\sigma_{\text{hom}}^e(\nabla u_0^e)) && \text{in } G, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial_t g_0 &= \theta v_0 + a - b g_0 && \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M}, \\
 v_0 &= u_0^i - u_0^e && \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M}, \\
 u_0^e &= u_0^i = 0 && \text{on } S_0 \cup S_L, \\
 \sigma_{hom}^e(\nabla u_0^e) \cdot \nu &= J_0^e && \text{on } \Sigma, \\
 v_0(0, x) &= V_0(x), \quad g_0(0, x, \omega) = G_0(x, \omega) && \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.4. To discuss the essence of the effective bidomain operator and asymptotics of potentials consider a simplified problem. Disregard the recovery variable g_ε and consider a stationary counterpart of problem (4.2) obtained by replacing $\varepsilon(c_m \partial_t v_\varepsilon + I_{ion}(v_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon))$ by $\varepsilon f(x)$ with a known function $f(x)$ (independent of ε). Then, problems for the extracellular potential u_ε^e and intracellular potential u_ε^i decouple so that the asymptotic behavior of these potentials can be studied separately. Indeed, u_ε^e and u_ε^i can be found via the minimization problems.

$$(5.14) \quad \min_{u_\varepsilon^e} \int_{G_\varepsilon(\omega)} Q^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|) dx - \int_\Sigma J_\varepsilon^e u_\varepsilon^e dS - \varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} f u_\varepsilon^e dS,$$

$$(5.15) \quad \min_{u_\varepsilon^i} \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega)} Q^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^i|) dx + \varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} f u_\varepsilon^i dS,$$

where $Q^\alpha(\eta) = \int_0^\eta \sigma^\alpha(\zeta) \zeta d\zeta$, $\alpha = i, e$ (cf. (5.2)). Considering first u_ε^e , we postulate the ansatz

$$(5.16) \quad u_\varepsilon^e = u_0^e(x) + \varepsilon u_1^e(x, \omega, x'/\varepsilon) + o(\varepsilon),$$

assuming that $w(x, T_{y'}\omega) = \nabla_{y'} u_1^e(x, \omega, y')$ is a stationary random vector field. Then substituting the ansatz (5.16) in (5.14), one can formally derive the effective conductivity (5.1)–(5.2). Indeed, since $\nabla u_\varepsilon^e(x) \simeq \nabla u_0^e(x) + (0, w(x, T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega))$ we get,

$$(5.17) \quad \int_\Omega \int_{G_\varepsilon(\omega)} Q^e(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^e|) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \int_G \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{A}} Q^e(|\nabla u_0^e(x) + (0, w)|) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dx.$$

Passing to the limit in other terms, then minimizing in w we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \inf_{u_0^e} \int_G \left[\inf_{w \in V_{pot}} \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{A}} Q^e(|\xi + w|) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \Big|_{\xi = \nabla u_0^e} - \int_\Sigma J_0^e u_0^e dS - \int_\Omega f u_0^e d\mu \right] dx \\
 &= \inf_{u_0^e} \int_G \left[\Phi(\nabla u_0^e) - \int_\Sigma J_0^e u_0^e dS - \int_\Omega f u_0^e d\mu \right] dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, taking the variation in u_0^e we arrive at the homogenized equation for the limit function u_0^e : $-\text{div } \sigma_{hom}^e(\nabla u_0^e) = \int_\Omega f(x) d\mu(\omega)$.

Since axons form disconnected structure of thin cylinders, the intracellular potential is approximated (on the fine scale) by a random stationary function constant in cross sections of axons:

$$(5.18) \quad u_\varepsilon^i = u_0^i(x_1, \varepsilon x'_j(\omega), T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega) + o(\varepsilon),$$

where $x'_j(\omega)$ are the coordinates of the axons' center, and $u_0^i(x_1, x', \cdot) \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$. Then one can show, using the Campbell formula, that

$$(5.19) \quad \int_\Omega \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega)} Q^i(|\nabla u_\varepsilon^i|) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \int_\Omega \int_G \frac{r(\omega)}{2} Q^i(|(\partial_{x_1} u_0^i)|) dx d\mu(\omega).$$

Passing to the limit in the second term of (5.15) and then taking variations in u_0^i we formally arrive in the stochastic part of the bidomain operator, $\frac{r(\omega)}{2} \partial_{x_1}(\sigma^i(|\partial_{x_1} u_0^i|)) = f(x)$.

The formal computations above are used for the construction of test functions (6.35)–(6.38). While passing to the limit, we combine the method of monotone operators combined with the convergence of the test functions (see Lemma 6.6).

Remark 5.5. As mentioned in the introduction, in the numerical study [26], the authors modeled an axonal fascicle by means of a linear bidomain model. The aim of the study was to provide a computational model to estimate the regions in which electrical stimulation would lead to a membrane potential exceeding a certain threshold and, in this way, generate a propagating signal. Using the macroscopic multidomain type model (5.13) would allow us to account for axons of different radii without discretizing the original three-dimensional geometry of the bundle.

6. Proof of Theorem 5.3. The proof of Theorem 5.3 is organized as follows. In Section 6.1 we derive a priori estimates (Lemma 6.1), construct an extension operator from the extracellular domain $G_\varepsilon(\omega)$ to the whole bundle G (Lemma 6.3), as well as construct a quasi-extension of v_ε^i in G . In Section 6.2, we formulate the key compactness results to extract converging subsequences for the membrane potential, the intra- and extracellular potentials, and their derivatives. Lemma 6.5 is another important result of the section, stating the convergence of the traces on the lateral boundary of the axons. Finally, we pass to the limit using the Minty method for monotone operators. Note that a special choice of test functions in the extracellular domain (see problem (6.35)–(6.38) and Lemma 6.6) leads to the appearance of the effective conductivity. In Section A we present several random geometries satisfying assumptions (H1)–(H4).

6.1. Microscopic problem. We start with writing down a weak formulation of the microscopic problem. For brevity, we skip the argument ω in $v_\varepsilon(t, x), g_\varepsilon(t, x)$. In order to transform the problem to a one with a monotone operator, we introduce a parameter $\lambda > 0$, which will be chosen later, and make the following factorization

$$v_\varepsilon = e^{\lambda t} \hat{v}_\varepsilon, \quad g_\varepsilon = e^{\lambda t} \hat{g}_\varepsilon, \quad \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega, \eta) = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}^e(t, \eta) = \sigma^e(e^{\lambda t} \eta) & \text{in } G_\varepsilon(\omega) \\ \hat{\sigma}^i(t, \eta) = \sigma^i(e^{\lambda t} \eta) & \text{in } F_\varepsilon(\omega). \end{cases}$$

We define the operator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\hat{v}_\varepsilon) = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\varepsilon(t, \omega; \hat{v}_\varepsilon)$ as follows. For any $\phi \in H^1(F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega))$, $\phi|_{S_0 \cup S_L} = 0$, we set

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\varepsilon(\hat{v}_\varepsilon), [\phi])_{L^2(M_\varepsilon(\omega))} \\ &= \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega, |\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon|) \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx - \int_{\Sigma} e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e \phi^e \, dS(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi^e = \phi|_{G_\varepsilon(\omega)}$, $\phi|_{S_0 \cup S_L} = 0$, and the function $\hat{u}_\varepsilon \in H^1(F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega))$ in (6.1), for a given jump $[\hat{u}_\varepsilon] = \hat{v}_\varepsilon$, solves the following problem:

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega, |\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon|) \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon) &= 0 && \text{in } F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \hat{\sigma}^e(t, |\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu &= \hat{\sigma}^i(t, |\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i|) \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i \cdot \nu && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \hat{v}_\varepsilon &= \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e && \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \hat{\sigma}^e(t, |\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu &= e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e(t, x) && \text{on } \Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

$$\hat{u}_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on } S_0 \cup S_L.$$

The original system (4.3) transforms into

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon c_m \partial_t \hat{v}_\varepsilon + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\varepsilon(\hat{v}_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}(\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon) &= 0 && \text{on } (0, T) \times M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \partial_t \hat{g}_\varepsilon = \theta \hat{v}_\varepsilon + a e^{-\lambda t} - (b + \lambda) \hat{g}_\varepsilon &&& \text{on } (0, T) \times M_\varepsilon(\omega), \\ \hat{v}_\varepsilon(0, x, \omega) = V_\varepsilon(x, \omega), \hat{g}_\varepsilon(0, x, \omega) = G_\varepsilon(x, \omega) &&& \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(6.4) \quad \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}(\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon) = \frac{e^{2\lambda t}}{3} \hat{v}_\varepsilon^3 + (c_m \lambda - 1) \hat{v}_\varepsilon - \hat{g}_\varepsilon.$$

Choosing λ such that

$$(6.5) \quad \lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}(\theta + 3) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}(\theta + 1) - b$$

and using Lemma A.4, we ensure that the problem is monotone. The proof of the monotonicity and well-posedness of problem (6.3), for a fixed ω , follows the lines of the proof in the deterministic case (see [21]). We refer, namely, to Theorem 1.4 in [24] and Remark 1.8 in Chapter 2 (see also Theorem 4.1 in [39]).

LEMMA 6.1 (A priori estimates). *Assume hypotheses (H4)–(H8) hold. A solution $W_\varepsilon = (\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon)^T$ of problem (6.3), for any $t \in [0, T]$, satisfies the following estimates:*

$$(6.6) \quad \varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\hat{v}_\varepsilon|^4 dS(x) + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\partial_t \hat{v}_\varepsilon|^2 dS(x) dt \leq C,$$

$$(6.7) \quad \varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\hat{g}_\varepsilon|^2 dS(x) + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\partial_t \hat{g}_\varepsilon|^2 dS(x) dt \leq C,$$

with a constant C independent of ε and t , but depending on T , and the norms of initial functions $\|G_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(M_\varepsilon(\omega))}$, $\|V_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(G)}$.

Denoting $\hat{u}_\varepsilon = e^{-\lambda t} u_\varepsilon$ with $[\hat{u}_\varepsilon] = \hat{v}_\varepsilon$, one can obtain a priori estimates for the electric potential in the intra- and extracellular domains, as well as its traces on the membrane:

$$(6.8) \quad \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(|\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon|^2 + |\hat{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \right) dx \leq C,$$

$$(6.9) \quad \varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(|\hat{u}_\varepsilon^e|^4 + |\hat{u}_\varepsilon^i|^4 \right) dS(x) \leq C$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. The inequalities (6.6), (6.7), (6.8) one can obtain in the same way as in [21].

To prove (6.9) we use estimate (6.6) for the potential $\hat{v}_\varepsilon = \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e$ combined with the bound $\int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\hat{u}_\varepsilon^e|^4 dS(x) \leq C/\varepsilon$. The latter bound is derived from the H^1 -estimate

(6.8) with the help of Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3 below.

LEMMA 6.2. *For any function $u(x) \in H^1(G)$ the following estimate holds*

$$\varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |u|^4 dS(x) \leq C \left(\varepsilon \|u\|_{H^1(G)}^4 + \|u\|_{L^4(G)}^4 \right).$$

The proof is given in Lemma 4.1 [34] where we treat the case of identical randomly distributed axons. A similar argument is presented in [35], Lemma 8.1. The main idea is to derive an estimate for one fixed disc, rescale by ε , and sum up over all the discs to obtain the integral over $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$.

With the functions \hat{u}^e, \hat{u}^i defined in the extra- and intracellular domains, we associate the functions $\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e$ and \tilde{u}_ε^i in the whole G constructed in the following way. The function $\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e$ is a classical extension of \hat{u}_ε^e on G , while \tilde{u}_ε^i equals to the mean value of \hat{u}_ε^i on the cross sections of axons and is extended to G by a cut-off function.

LEMMA 6.3 (Extension from the extracellular part to G). *For any ω , there exists an extension operator $\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega : H^1(G_\varepsilon(\omega)) \rightarrow H^1(G)$ such that for any function $u(x) \in H^1(G_\varepsilon)$, $u(x) = 0$ on $S_0 \cup S_1$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\|\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega u\|_{H^1(G)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(G_\varepsilon(\omega))}.$$

The proof can be found in [34]. As a consequence of (6.6), Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.3 we obtain (6.9).

LEMMA 6.4 (Quasi-extension from the intracellular part to G). *For \hat{u}_ε^i satisfying (6.8), there exists \tilde{u}_ε^i defined in G and such that for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, \cdot, \omega) \in H^1(G)$, and*

- (i) $\int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} |\tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i|^2 dS(x) \leq C \varepsilon^2$.
- (ii) *For any $x_1 \in [0, L]$, \tilde{u}_ε^i is constant on cross sections of axons $\nabla_{x'} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i|_{A_\varepsilon(\omega)} = 0$, and*

$$\varepsilon^2 \int_G |\nabla_{x'} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i|^2 dx \leq C.$$

Proof. We set

$$(6.10) \quad \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) = \sum_{j \in J_\varepsilon} \chi(|x'/\varepsilon - x_j(\omega)| - r_j(\omega)) \frac{1}{|A_{\varepsilon j}(\omega)|} \int_{A_{\varepsilon j}(\omega)} \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x_1, x', \omega) dx',$$

where $\chi(r)$ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi(r) = 1$ if $r \leq 0$, and $\chi(r) = 0$ if $r > d_0/2$ (d_0 is the minimal distance between the axons, see (H1)). Then, using the Poincaré inequality on cross sections of axons, we obtain the bound (i), and (ii) follows directly from the construction of the function \tilde{u}_ε^i . \square

6.2. Compactness and passage to the limit. In view of a priori estimates (6.6), (6.7), up to a subsequence, we have the following stochastic two-scale convergence on random surfaces $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_\varepsilon &\xrightarrow{2s} \hat{v}_0 \in L^4(G_T; L^4(\Omega, \mu)), \\ \hat{g}_\varepsilon &\xrightarrow{2s} \hat{g}_0 \in L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mu)), \\ \partial_t \hat{v}_\varepsilon &\xrightarrow{2s} \partial_t \hat{v}_0 \in L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mu)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\partial_t \hat{g}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2s} \partial_t \hat{g}_0 \in L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mu)),$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, for any fixed $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(6.11) \quad \hat{v}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2s} \hat{v}_0 \text{ in } L^2(G; L^2(\Omega, \mu)),$$

$$(6.12) \quad \hat{g}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2s} \hat{g}_0 \text{ in } L^2(G; L^2(\Omega, \mu)).$$

By (6.8), Lemmas 6.3, 6.4, and Theorem 3.7 in [9], possibly passing to a further subsequence, we have the following convergence:

$$(6.13) \quad \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e(t, x, \omega) \xrightarrow{2s} \hat{u}_0^e(t, x) \quad \text{in } L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})),$$

$$(6.14) \quad \nabla_x (\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e(t, x, \omega)) \xrightarrow{2s} \nabla \hat{u}_0^e(t, x) + \hat{z}(t, x, \omega) \quad \text{in } (L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})))^3,$$

where $\text{curl}_\omega \hat{z} = 0$, $\int_\Omega \hat{z} d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = 0$,

$$(6.15) \quad \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \xrightarrow{2s} \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \quad \text{in } L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})),$$

$$(6.16) \quad \varepsilon \nabla_{x'} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \xrightarrow{2s} \nabla_\omega \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \quad \text{in } L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})).$$

Then

$$(6.17) \quad \chi_{F_\varepsilon}(x) \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \xrightarrow{2s} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \text{ in } L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})),$$

$$(6.18) \quad \chi_{F_\varepsilon}(x) \partial_{x_1} \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \xrightarrow{2s} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \partial_{x_1} \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \text{ in } L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})),$$

$$(6.19) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \nabla_\omega \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) = 0.$$

Note that (6.19) follows from (6.16) and the fact that $\nabla_{x'} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i = 0$ for $x' \in A_\varepsilon(\omega)$. In the next lemma we prove the convergence of traces of $\hat{u}_\varepsilon^e, \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i$ on $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$.

LEMMA 6.5. *For the traces of $\hat{u}_\varepsilon^e, \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i$ on the random surface $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ the following convergences holds:*

$$(6.20) \quad \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e(t, x, \omega) \xrightarrow{2s} \hat{u}_0^e(t, x) \text{ in } L^4(G_T; L^4(\Omega, \mu)),$$

$$(6.21) \quad \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \xrightarrow{2s} \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \text{ in } L^4(G_T; L^4(\Omega, \mu)),$$

where $\hat{u}_0^e(t, x)$ and $\hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega)$ are given by (6.13) and (6.15), respectively.

Proof. We prove the convergence for the intracellular component (6.21). The convergence of \hat{u}_ε^e (6.20) is proved similarly.

To this end, it is sufficient to show that, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$(6.22) \quad \mathcal{I}(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_\Omega \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) dS(x) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dt$$

$$- \int_{G_T} \int_\Omega \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(\omega) d\mu(\omega) dx dt \rightarrow 0,$$

for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(G_T), \phi \in D^\infty(\Omega)$, where $D^\infty(\Omega)$ is defined in (3.1), $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega)$ is the quasi-extension defined by (6.10), and $\hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega)$ is the limit function in (6.15).

We will follow the proof of Lemma 8.1 in [35]. The main trick is to approximate the surface measure on $M_\varepsilon(\omega)$ by the weighted Lebesgue measure $\rho_\delta(T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega) dx_1 dx'$ on \mathbb{R}^3 where

$$(6.23) \quad \rho_\delta(\omega) = \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_{\partial A(\omega)} k\left(\frac{y'}{\delta}\right) ds(y'),$$

$k(y) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ being a non-negative symmetric function such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} k(y) dy = 1$, $\delta > 0$.

We write $\mathcal{I}(\varepsilon)$ as a sum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\varepsilon) &= \mathcal{I}_1(\varepsilon, \delta) + \mathcal{I}_2(\varepsilon, \delta) + \mathcal{I}_3(\delta), \\ \mathcal{I}_1(\varepsilon, \delta) &= \int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega) \rho_\delta(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dx_1 dx' dt \\ &\quad - \int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(\omega) d\mu_\delta(\omega) dx dt; \\ \mathcal{I}_2(\varepsilon, \delta) &= \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega) dS(x) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dt \\ &\quad - \int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega) \rho_\delta(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dx_1 dx' dt; \\ \mathcal{I}_3(\delta) &= \int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(\omega) (d\mu_\delta(\omega) - d\mu(\omega)) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Here $d\mu_\delta(\omega) = \rho_\delta(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is the Palm measure of $\rho_\delta(T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega) dx_1 dx'$.

Thanks to (6.15)

$$(6.24) \quad \mathcal{I}_1(\varepsilon, \delta) \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Next, we estimate $\mathcal{I}_2(\varepsilon, \delta)$. We fix t, x_1, ω and consider functions

$$(6.25) \quad \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(x') = \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^i(t, x_1, x', \omega) \varphi(t, x_1, x') \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega)$$

extended by zero on \mathbb{R}^2 . Changing the variables we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(x') \rho_\delta(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega) dx' = \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y') \rho_\delta(T_{y'}\omega) dy' \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y') \int_{\partial A(T_{y'}\omega)} k\left(\frac{y''}{\delta}\right) ds(y'') dy' \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y') \int_{\partial A(\omega) - y'} k\left(\frac{y''}{\delta}\right) ds(y'') dy' \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y') \int_{\partial A(\omega)} k\left(\frac{z' - y'}{\delta}\right) ds(z') dy' \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2} \int_{\partial A(\omega)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} k\left(\frac{y' - z'}{\delta}\right) \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon z') dz' ds(y')$$

and then

$$(6.26) \quad \varepsilon \int_{\varepsilon \partial A(\omega)} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(x') ds(x') - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(x') \rho_\delta(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) dx = \varepsilon^2 \int_{\partial A(\omega)} w_{\varepsilon, \delta}(y') ds(y'),$$

with

$$(6.27) \quad w_{\varepsilon, \delta}(y') = \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y') - \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} k\left(\frac{y' - z'}{\delta}\right) \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon z') dz'.$$

Due to the properties of mollifiers (see, e.g., Lemma 3.5 in [25]), we have

$$(6.28) \quad \|w_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C \|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon \cdot)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad \|w_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C \delta \|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon \cdot)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, trace inequality, and (6.28) we get

$$(6.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\partial A(\omega)} |w_{\varepsilon, \delta}(y')| ds(y') &\leq C \varepsilon \left(\sum_j \int_{\partial A_j(\omega)} |w_{\varepsilon, \delta}(y')|^2 ds(y') \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon \left(\sum_j \|w_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{H^1(A_j(\omega))} \|w_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^2(A_j(\omega))} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon \left(\delta \|w_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \delta^{-1} \|w_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon \sqrt{\delta} \|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon \cdot)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} = C \sqrt{\delta} (\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \varepsilon \|\nabla \tilde{w}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (6.26) in t, x_1, ω , using (6.29) and Lemmas 6.1, 6.4 we obtain

$$(6.30) \quad |\mathcal{I}_2(\varepsilon, \delta)| \leq C \sqrt{\delta}.$$

To estimate $\mathcal{I}_3(\delta)$, we assume for simplicity that the function $\hat{u}_0^i(t, x_1, x', \omega)$ is continuously differentiable in x' (otherwise, it will be approximated by continuously differentiable in x' functions). Applying Campbell's formula (3.3) to the function $\hat{u}_0^i(t, x_1, x', T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) \varphi(t, x_1, x') \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega)$ we obtain

$$(6.31) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(\omega) d\mu(\omega) dx dt \\ &= \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_0^L \int_{\Omega} \int_{\varepsilon \partial A(\omega)} \hat{u}_0^i(t, x_1, x', T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) ds(x') d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dx_1 dt \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(6.32) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(\omega) d\mu_\delta(\omega) dx dt \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} \hat{u}_0^i(t, x, T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) \varphi(t, x) \phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) \rho_\delta(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}} \omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dx dt \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Now we fix t, x_1, ω and consider the function

$$\tilde{z}_\varepsilon(x') = \tilde{u}_0^i(t, x_1, x', T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega)\varphi(t, x_1, x')\phi(T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega)$$

extended by zero on \mathbb{R}^2 in place of (6.25). Then we proceed as before for $\mathcal{I}_2(\varepsilon, \delta)$ and get the following estimate for $\mathcal{I}_3(\delta)$:

$$(6.33) \quad |\mathcal{I}_3(\delta)| \leq C\sqrt{\delta} \left(\int_{G_T} \int_{\Omega} (|\hat{u}_0^i|^2 + |\nabla_\omega \hat{u}_0^i|^2 + \varepsilon^2 |\nabla_{x'} \hat{u}_0^i|^2) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dx dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Taking into account the convergence (6.24) and estimates (6.30), (6.33) we pass to the limit as $\varepsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$ and obtain (6.22).

In the case when the function $\hat{u}_0^i(t, x_1, x', \omega)$ does not have C^1 -regularity in x' , one can approximate it by

$$(6.34) \quad \hat{u}_{0,\delta}(t, x_1, x', \omega) = \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_S k \left(\frac{x' - y'}{\delta} \right) \hat{u}_0^i(t, x_1, y', \omega) dy',$$

and use (6.33) for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Lemma 6.5 is proved. \square

To pass to the limit in (6.3), we use the Minty method [29]. For an arbitrary function $\psi(t, x, \omega) \in C^2(G_T, L^2(\Omega, \mu))$, we set $\psi_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega) = \psi(t, x, T_{x'/\varepsilon}\omega)$ which will be

used as a test function for g_ε . We define also $\phi_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega) = \begin{cases} \phi_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) & \text{if } x \in F_\varepsilon(\omega) \\ \phi_\varepsilon^e(t, x, \omega) & \text{if } x \in G_\varepsilon(\omega) \end{cases}$

which we will be chosen later as a test function for v_ε .

Let $\phi_0^e \in C^2(G_T)$ be an arbitrary function that equals zero on $S_0 \cup S_L$. Take ϕ_ε^e as a solution of the problem

$$(6.35) \quad \operatorname{div}(\hat{\sigma}^e(t, |\nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e) = \frac{1}{1-\Lambda} \operatorname{div}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}^e(\nabla \phi_0^e)) \quad \text{in } G_\varepsilon(\omega),$$

$$(6.36) \quad \hat{\sigma}^e(t, |\nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu = 0 \quad \text{on } M_\varepsilon(\omega),$$

$$(6.37) \quad \hat{\sigma}^e(t, |\nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nu = \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}^e(\nabla \phi_0^e) \cdot \nu \quad \text{on } \Sigma,$$

$$(6.38) \quad \phi_\varepsilon^e = 0 \quad \text{on } S_0 \cup S_L.$$

Recall that $\Lambda = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ (see (2.7)), the transformed effective extracellular conductivity $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}^e$ is define by (5.2), and

$$(6.39) \quad \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}^e(t, \xi) = e^{-\lambda t} \nabla \Phi(e^{\lambda t} \xi), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

LEMMA 6.6. *For the unique solution ϕ_ε^e of (6.35)–(6.38), the following uniform in $t \in [0, T]$ convergence holds for a.a. $\omega \in \Omega$:*

$$(6.40) \quad \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e \rightarrow \phi_0^e, \text{ strongly in } L^4(G),$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover,

$$(6.41) \quad \nabla(\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e) \stackrel{2s}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla \phi_0^e + z(t, x, \omega) \text{ in } (L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{P})))^3,$$

where $\operatorname{curl}_\omega z = 0$, $\int_\Omega z d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = 0$.

Proof. The proof of (6.41) can be done in the standard way (for example, as Lemma 4 in [34]) using additionally the monotonicity of the vector field $\hat{\sigma}^\varepsilon(t, |\xi|)\xi$ (see also Lemma A.4). \square

COROLLARY 6.7. *For the solution ϕ_ε^e of (6.35)–(6.38) the following strong stochastic two-scale convergence on M_ε holds (see (3.5)), as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:*

$$(6.42) \quad \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e \xrightarrow{2s} \phi_0^e \text{ strongly in } L^4(G_T; L^4(\Omega, \mu)).$$

Proof. We get this result applying Lemma 6.2 with $u = \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e - \phi_0^e$ and using the compactness of the embedding $H^1(G) \subset L^4(G)$. \square

Next, let us proceed with the definition of the test function ϕ_ε^i . Taking an arbitrary bounded function $\phi_0^i(t, x, \omega) \in C^2(G_T, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A}))$ that equals zero on $S_0 \cup S_L$, we define test functions ϕ_ε^i on each axon by setting

$$(6.43) \quad \phi_\varepsilon^i(t, x, \omega) = \phi_0^i(t, x_1, \varepsilon x'_j(\omega), T_{\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}}\omega), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in F_{\varepsilon j}(\omega).$$

By construction (6.43) of ϕ_ε^i , we have the strong stochastic two-scale convergence (see (3.5)), as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$(6.44) \quad \phi_\varepsilon^i \xrightarrow{2s} \phi_0^i \text{ strongly in } L^4(G_T; L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{P})).$$

For brevity, in what follows, we omit arguments in the conductivity function and write $\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(|\xi|)$ for $\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(t, x, \omega, |\xi|)$. Thanks to the assumption (H4), it holds that

$$(6.45) \quad (\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(|\xi|)\xi - \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(|\eta|)\eta) \cdot (\xi - \eta) \geq \underline{\sigma}|\xi - \eta|^2, \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in \mathbf{R}^3,$$

with the positive constant $\underline{\sigma}$ (see A.4). Using (6.45) for $\nabla \phi_\varepsilon, \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon$ we get

$$(6.46) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} (\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon|)\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(|\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon|)\nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon) \cdot (\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon) dx \\ &= \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon|)\nabla \phi_\varepsilon \cdot (\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon) dx \\ & \quad - (\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\varepsilon(\hat{v}_\varepsilon), [\phi_\varepsilon - \hat{u}_\varepsilon])_{L^2(M_\varepsilon(\omega))} - \int_{\Sigma} e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e(\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dS(x) \\ & \geq \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \underline{\sigma} |\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then (6.46) implies that for a.a. $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(6.47) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(c_m \partial_t \hat{v}_\varepsilon + \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}(\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon) \right) ([\phi_\varepsilon] - \hat{v}_\varepsilon) dS(x) dt \\ & \leq \int_0^T \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon(|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon|)\nabla \phi_\varepsilon \cdot (\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon) dx dt \\ & \quad - \int_{\Sigma} e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e(\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dS(x) - \int_0^T \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \underline{\sigma} |\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

We write $\hat{I}_{\text{ion}}(\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon) = \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}(\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon) + \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}([\phi_\varepsilon], \psi_\varepsilon) - \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}([\phi_\varepsilon], \psi_\varepsilon)$ and thanks to (6.5) obtain

$$(6.48) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(\hat{I}_{\text{ion}}(\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon) - \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}([\phi_\varepsilon], \psi_\varepsilon) \right) (\hat{v}_\varepsilon - [\phi_\varepsilon]) dS(x) dt \\ & + \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left((b + \lambda)\hat{g}_\varepsilon - \theta\hat{v}_\varepsilon - (b + \lambda)\psi_\varepsilon + \theta[\phi_\varepsilon] \right) (\hat{g}_\varepsilon - \psi_\varepsilon) dS(x) dt \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the equation for \hat{g}_ε in (6.3) by $\varepsilon(\hat{g}_\varepsilon - \psi_\varepsilon)$, replacing $\hat{v}_\varepsilon = \hat{v}_\varepsilon + [\phi_\varepsilon] - [\phi_\varepsilon]$, $\hat{g}_\varepsilon = \hat{g}_\varepsilon + \psi_\varepsilon - \psi_\varepsilon$ in the right-hand side and integrating, we obtain

$$(6.49) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{g}_\varepsilon^2(T) dS(x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} g_\varepsilon^2(0) dS(x) - \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \partial_t \hat{g}_\varepsilon \psi_\varepsilon dS(x) dt \\ & + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(\theta[\phi_\varepsilon] + ae^{-\lambda t} - (\lambda + b)\psi_\varepsilon \right) (\psi_\varepsilon - \hat{g}_\varepsilon) dS(x) dt \\ & + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(\theta(\hat{v}_\varepsilon - [\phi_\varepsilon]) - (\lambda + b)(\hat{g}_\varepsilon - \psi_\varepsilon) \right) (\psi_\varepsilon - \hat{g}_\varepsilon) dS(x) dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then (6.47), (6.48) yield

$$(6.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\varepsilon c_m}{2} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{v}_\varepsilon^2(T) dS(x) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{g}_\varepsilon^2(T) dS(x) \\ & - \frac{\varepsilon c_m}{2} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} v_\varepsilon^2(0) dS(x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} g_\varepsilon^2(0) dS(x) \\ & - \varepsilon c_m \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon} \partial_t \hat{v}_\varepsilon [\phi_\varepsilon] dS(x) dt - \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \partial_t \hat{g}_\varepsilon \psi_\varepsilon dS(x) dt \\ & + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(\hat{I}_{\text{ion}}([\phi_\varepsilon], \psi_\varepsilon) \right) (\hat{v}_\varepsilon - [\phi_\varepsilon]) dS(x) dt \\ & + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \left(\theta[\phi_\varepsilon] + ae^{-\lambda t} - (\lambda + b)\psi_\varepsilon \right) (\psi_\varepsilon - \hat{g}_\varepsilon) dS(x) dt \\ & \leq \int_0^T \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon (|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon|) \nabla \phi_\varepsilon \cdot (\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon) dx dt \\ & - \int_0^T \int_{\Sigma} e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e(\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dS(x) dt - \int_0^T \int_{F_\varepsilon(\omega) \cup G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \underline{\sigma} |\nabla \phi_\varepsilon - \nabla \hat{u}_\varepsilon|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we integrate (6.50) over Ω and pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Due to the lower semi-continuity of L^2 -norms of functions $\hat{v}_\varepsilon, \hat{g}_\varepsilon$ and taking into account (6.11), (6.12), we get:

$$(6.51) \quad \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{v}_\varepsilon^2(T) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \geq \int_{\Omega} \int_G \hat{v}_0^2(T) dx d\mu(\omega),$$

$$(6.52) \quad \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \int_{M_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{g}_\varepsilon^2(T) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \geq \int_{\Omega} \int_G \hat{g}_0^2(T) dx d\mu(\omega).$$

Further, we have the following convergence

$$(6.53) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{\sigma}^\varepsilon(|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nabla(\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dt \\ & \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_G \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e) \cdot (\nabla \phi_0^e - \nabla \hat{u}_0^e) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, multiplying (6.35) by $(\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e)$, integrating by parts, and using boundary conditions (6.36)-(6.38) we obtain

$$(6.54) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{G_\varepsilon(\omega)} \hat{\sigma}^\varepsilon(|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e|) \nabla \phi_\varepsilon^e \cdot \nabla(\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx = \int_G \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e) \cdot (\nabla \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e - \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx \\ & + \int_G \text{div}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e)) \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\Lambda} \chi_{G_\varepsilon}(x)\right) (\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e - \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (6.14), (6.41)

$$(6.55) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \int_G \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e) \cdot (\nabla \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e - \nabla \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dt \\ & \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_G \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e) \cdot (\nabla \phi_0^e - \nabla \hat{u}_0^e) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\chi_{G_\varepsilon}(x)$ converges strongly stochastically two-scale to $\chi_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)$ and in view of (6.40), (6.13) we also have

$$(6.56) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \int_G \text{div}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e)) \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\Lambda} \chi_{G_\varepsilon}(x)\right) (\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e - \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dt \\ & \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_G \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e) \cdot (\phi_0^e - \hat{u}_0^e) dx dt \int_{\Omega} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\Lambda} \chi_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)\right) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

thus (6.54) is established.

By the construction of the test function ϕ_ε^i , using (6.18) and Lemma 5.2 we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T \int_\Omega \int_{F_\varepsilon} \hat{\sigma}^i(|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon^i|) \nabla \phi_\varepsilon^i \cdot \nabla (\phi_\varepsilon^i - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^i) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dt \\
& \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{A}} \int_G \hat{\sigma}^i(|\nabla \phi_0^i|) \partial_{x_1} \phi_0^i \partial_{x_1} (\phi_0^i - \hat{u}_0^i) dx d\mathcal{P}(\omega) dt \\
(6.57) \quad & = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\Omega \int_G r(\omega) \hat{\sigma}^i(|\nabla \phi_0^i|) \partial_{x_1} \phi_0^i \partial_{x_1} (\phi_0^i - \hat{u}_0^i) dx d\mu(\omega) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, pass to the limit in the first term of the last line of (6.50). To this end, consider a harmonic function $\Psi_\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \in H^1(G)$ being a solution of the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.58) \quad & \Delta \Psi_\varepsilon(t, x) = 0 && \text{in } G, \\
& \nabla \Psi_\varepsilon(t, x) \cdot \nu = e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e && \text{on } \Sigma, \\
& \Psi_\varepsilon(t, x) = 0 && \text{on } S_0 \cup S_L.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (H8) one can show that

$$(6.59) \quad \nabla \Psi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \nabla \Psi \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(G_T),$$

where Ψ solves (6.58) with $e^{-\lambda t} J_0^e$ in place of $e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e$. Then we represent

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.60) \quad & \int_0^T \int_\Sigma e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e (\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dS(x) dt \\
& = \int_0^T \int_G \Delta \Psi (\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e - \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx dt + \int_0^T \int_G \nabla \Psi \cdot \nabla (\Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \phi_\varepsilon^e - \Pi_\varepsilon^\omega \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dx dt,
\end{aligned}$$

and pass to the limit using (6.58), (6.59), (6.14), (6.41):

$$(6.61) \quad \int_0^T \int_\Sigma e^{-\lambda t} J_\varepsilon^e (\phi_\varepsilon^e - \hat{u}_\varepsilon^e) dS(x) dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_\Sigma e^{-\lambda t} J_0^e (\phi_0^e - \hat{u}_0^e) dS(x) dt.$$

Summarizing, from (6.51), (6.52), (6.55), (6.57) we pass to the limit in (6.50) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_m \int_\Omega \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{v}_0 (\hat{v}_0 - [\phi_0]) dx d\mu(\omega) dt + \int_\Omega \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{g}_0 (\hat{g}_0 - \psi) dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
& + \int_\Omega \int_{G_T} \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}([\phi_0], \psi) (\hat{v}_0 - [\phi_0]) dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
& + \int_\Omega \int_{G_T} \left(\theta[\phi_0] + a e^{-\lambda t} - (\lambda + b)\psi \right) (\psi - \hat{g}_0) dx d\mu(\omega) dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.62) \quad &\leq \int_{G_T} \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \phi_0^e) \cdot (\nabla \phi_0^e - \nabla \hat{u}_0^e) dx dt - \int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} \int_{\Sigma} J_0^e(\phi_0^e - \hat{u}_0^e) dS(x) dt \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} r(\omega) \hat{\sigma}^i(|\partial_{x_1} \phi_0^i|) \partial_{x_1} \phi_0^i \partial_{x_1} (\phi_0^i - \hat{u}_0^i) dx d\mu(\omega) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

By density, (6.62) holds for test functions

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi_0^i \in L^4(G_T; L^4(\Omega, \mu) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})) : \partial_{x_1} \phi_0^i \in L^2(G_T; \mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})), \phi_0^i = 0 \text{ on } S_0 \cup S_L, \\
&\phi_0^e \in L^4(G_T) : \nabla \phi_0^e \in (L^2(G_T))^3, \phi_0^e = 0 \text{ on } S_0 \cup S_L, \\
&\psi \in L^2(G_T; L^2(\Omega, \mu)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us take in (6.62) test functions in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_0^e &= \hat{u}_0^e + \delta \tilde{\phi}_0^e, & \phi_0^i &= \hat{u}_0^i + \delta \tilde{\phi}_0^i, \\
\psi &= \hat{g}_0 + \delta \tilde{\psi}, & [\phi_0] &= \hat{v}_0 + \delta [\tilde{\phi}_0],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta \neq 0$ is a small parameter, and $\tilde{\phi}_0^i, \tilde{\phi}_0^e, \tilde{\psi}$ are of the same classes as the functions ϕ_0^i, ϕ_0^e, ψ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \delta c_m \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{v}_0 [\tilde{\phi}_0] dx d\mu(\omega) dt - \delta \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{g}_0 \tilde{\psi} dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
&- \delta \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \left((c_m \lambda - 1)(\hat{v}_0 + \delta [\tilde{\phi}_0]) + \frac{e^{2\lambda t}}{3} (\hat{v}_0 + \delta [\tilde{\phi}_0])^3 - \hat{g}_0 - \delta \tilde{\psi} \right) [\tilde{\phi}_0] dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
&+ \delta \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \left(\theta (\hat{v}_0 + \delta [\tilde{\phi}_0]) + a e^{-\lambda t} - (\lambda + b)(\hat{g}_0 + \delta \tilde{\psi}) \right) \tilde{\psi} dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
&\leq \delta \int_{G_T} \hat{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla(\hat{u}_0^e + \delta \tilde{\phi}_0^e)) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi}_0^e dx dt \\
&+ \frac{\delta}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} r(\omega) \hat{\sigma}^i(|\partial_{x_1}(\hat{u}_0^i + \delta \tilde{\phi}_0^i)|) \partial_{x_1}(\hat{u}_0^i + \delta \tilde{\phi}_0^i) \partial_{x_1} \tilde{\phi}_0^i dx d\mu(\omega) dt. \\
&- \delta \int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} \int_{\Sigma} J_0^e \tilde{\phi}_0^e dS(x) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, dividing the last inequality by δ and passing to the limits, as $\delta \rightarrow \pm 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&c_m \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{v}_0 [\tilde{\phi}_0] dx d\mu(\omega) dt + \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{g}_0 \tilde{\psi} dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
&+ \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \left((c_m \lambda - 1) \hat{v}_0 + \frac{e^{2\lambda t}}{3} \hat{v}_0^3 - \hat{g}_0 \right) [\tilde{\phi}_0] dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
&- \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \left(\theta \hat{v}_0 + a e^{-\lambda t} - (\lambda + b) \hat{g}_0 \right) \tilde{\psi} dx d\mu(\omega) dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{G_T} \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}(\nabla \hat{u}_0^e) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi}_0^e dx dt \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} r(\omega) \hat{\sigma}^i(|\partial_{x_1} \hat{u}_0^i|) \partial_{x_1} \hat{u}_0^i \partial_{x_1} \tilde{\phi}_0^i dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
(6.63) \quad & - \int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} \int_{\Sigma} J_0^e \tilde{\phi}_0^e dS(x) dt = 0
\end{aligned}$$

By taking $\tilde{\psi} = 0$ and $\tilde{\phi}_0^e = \tilde{\phi}_0^i = \tilde{\varphi}_0$ in (6.63) (with an arbitrary $\tilde{\varphi}_0 \in C^2(G_T)$ that equals zero on $S_0 \cup S_L$), we derive that for almost all $t \in [0, T]$, the function $\hat{u}_0^e \in \mathcal{H}_e$ solves the following problem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_G r(\omega) \hat{\sigma}^i(|\partial_{x_1}(\hat{v}_0 + \hat{u}_0^e)|) \partial_{x_1}(\hat{v}_0 + \hat{u}_0^e) \partial_{x_1} \varphi_0 dx d\mu(\omega) \\
(6.64) \quad & + \int_G \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{hom}}^e(\nabla \hat{u}_0^e) \cdot \nabla \varphi_0 dx - e^{-\lambda t} \int_{\Sigma} J_0^e \varphi_0 dS(x) = 0, \quad \forall \varphi_0 \in \mathcal{H}_e.
\end{aligned}$$

We introduce the operator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{hom}}(t, \cdot) : \mathcal{H}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_i$ by setting

$$(6.65) \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{hom}}(t, \hat{v}) = -\frac{r(\omega)}{2} \partial_{x_1} (\hat{\sigma}^i(|\partial_{x_1}(\hat{v} + \hat{u}^e)|) \partial_{x_1}(\hat{v} + \hat{u}^e)),$$

and rewrite (6.63) in the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_m \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{v}_0 [\tilde{\phi}_0] dx d\mu(\omega) dt + \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \partial_t \hat{g}_0 \tilde{\psi} dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
(6.66) \quad & + \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \left((c_m \lambda - 1) \hat{v}_0 + \frac{e^{2\lambda t}}{3} \hat{v}_0^3 - \hat{g}_0 \right) [\tilde{\phi}_0] dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
& - \int_{\Omega} \int_{G_T} \left(\theta \hat{v}_0 + a e^{-\lambda t} - (\lambda + b) \hat{g}_0 \right) \tilde{\psi} dx d\mu(\omega) dt \\
& + \int_0^T (\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{hom}}(t, \hat{v}), [\tilde{\phi}_0])_{L^2(G; L^2(\mathcal{M}, \mu))} dt = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking in (6.66) successively $\tilde{\psi} = 0$ and $\tilde{\phi}_0^e = \tilde{\phi}_0^i = 0$, since $\tilde{\phi}_0^{i,e}(t, x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$, we obtain the weak formulation of the following homogenized problem in terms of \hat{v}_0, \hat{g}_0 :

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.67) \quad & c_m \partial_t \hat{v}_0 + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{hom}}(t, \hat{v}_0) + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})} \hat{I}_{\text{ion}}(\hat{v}_0, \hat{g}_0) = 0 && \text{in } G_T \times \mathcal{M}, \\
& \partial_t \hat{g}_0 + (\lambda + b) \hat{g}_0 - \theta \hat{v}_0 - a e^{-\lambda t} = 0 && \text{in } G_T \times \mathcal{M}, \\
& \hat{v}_0(0, x) = V_0(x), \quad \hat{g}_0(0, x, \omega) = G_0(x, \omega) && \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M},
\end{aligned}$$

where \hat{I}_{ion} is defined by (6.4).

Performing the change of unknowns $\hat{u}_0^e = e^{-\lambda t} u_0^e$, $\hat{u}_0^i = e^{-\lambda t} u_0^i$, $\hat{v}_0 = e^{-\lambda t} v_0$, $\hat{g}_0 = e^{-\lambda t} g_0$ in (6.67), we arrive at the homogenized problem (5.13). Since the proof for $t = T$ can be repeated for all $t \in [0, T]$, it completes the proof of Theorem 5.3. \square

6.3. Well-posedness of the limit problem. To prove that the limit problem (5.13) possesses a unique solution, we rewrite (6.67) in the following form

$$(6.68) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t W_0 + B_1(t, W_0) + B_2(t, W_0) + B_3(t, W_0) &= F_0(t) && \text{in } G_T \times \mathcal{M}, \\ W_0(0, x, \omega) &= W_0^0(x, \omega) && \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{v}_0 \\ \hat{g}_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_0^0 = \begin{pmatrix} V_0 \\ G_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_1(t, W_0) &:= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{c_m} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{hom}}(t, \hat{v}_0) - \frac{1}{c_m} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{hom}}(t, 0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_2(t, W_0) &:= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{e^{2\lambda t}}{3c_m} \hat{v}_0^3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_3(t, W_0) := \begin{pmatrix} \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{c_m}\right) \hat{v}_0 - \frac{1}{c_m} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})} \hat{g}_0 \\ (\lambda + b) \hat{g}_0 - \theta \hat{v}_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ F_0(t) &:= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{c_m} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{hom}}(t, 0) \\ a e^{-\lambda t} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$\mathcal{H}_i = \{u^i \in L^2(G; \mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})) : \partial_{x_1} u^i \in L^2(G; \mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})), u^i|_{S_0 \cup S_L} = 0\},$$

with the norm given by

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_i}^2 = \int_{\Omega} \int_G |u|^2 dx d\mu(\omega) + \int_{\Omega} \int_G |\partial_{x_1} u|^2 dx d\mu(\omega).$$

We also introduce the following functional spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= L^2(G; \mathcal{K}_\mu(\mathcal{A})) \times L^2(G; L^2(\Omega, \mu)), \\ \mathcal{V}_1 &= \mathcal{H}_i \times L^2(G; L^2(\Omega, \mu)), \\ \mathcal{V}_2 &= L^4(G; L^4(\Omega, \mu) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})) \times L^2(G; L^2(\Omega, \mu)). \end{aligned}$$

One can check that the operators B_i are monotone and satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.4 in [24] and Remark 1.8 in Chapter 2 (see also Theorem 4.1 in [39]) which proves the existence of a unique solution to problem (6.68).

Appendix A. Examples of random geometry. In Sections A.1, A.2, we present examples of a probability space $(\Omega, \sigma, \mathcal{P})$, a dynamical system $T_{x'}$, and a random set $A(\omega)$ together with \mathcal{A} providing randomly placed axons of a finite number of different radii. We refer to [34] for the case of identical randomly distributed axons.

A.1. Randomly distributed disks of two different radii. In what follows, we will use the ergodicity of the random shifts.

LEMMA A.1 (Random shifts of a periodic structure). *Given a sample space $\Omega = [0, 1]^3$ with the Lebesgue measure and the Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{F} , define the shifts T_x as follows:*

$$(A.1) \quad T_x \omega = \omega + x - [\omega + x], \quad \omega \in \Omega, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Here $[x]$ is the floor of $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ (the integer part of x). Then the group of transformations $T_x : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ is ergodic.

Proof. Note that for the integer shifts $x \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, the semigroup becomes the identity transformation $T_x \omega = \omega$. Clearly, T_x satisfies the semigroup properties. Indeed, $T_0 \omega = \omega$, and

$$\begin{aligned} T_y T_x \omega &= T_y(\omega + x - [\omega + x]) \\ &= \omega + x - [\omega + x] + y - [\omega + x - [\omega + x] + y] \\ &= \omega + x + y - [\omega + x + y] = T_{y+x} \omega. \end{aligned}$$

To check that the transformation is measure-preserving it is sufficient to do it for an arbitrary cell $[a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times [a_3, b_3] \subset [0, 1]^3$ (generating algebra). This is clearly true because the Lebesgue measure is translation-invariant.

Let us check that T_x is ergodic. Take any cell $A = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times [a_3, b_3] \subset [0, 1]^3$ invariant with respect to the transformation T_x , for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. If $x \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, any cell is an invariant set because, in this case, $T_x = \text{Id}$. For non-integer x , the only invariant sets are the empty set and $[0, 1]^3$. No set of the form $T_x A$ with at least one $x_i \notin \mathbb{Z}$ is invariant. Suppose that the first component x_1 is not an integer. Then the projection of the image of A under T_x (which is a finite union of cells) on the x_1 -axis does not coincide with $[a_1, b_1]$. Therefore, the only sets that are invariant for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are the empty set and $[0, 1]^3$, and the group of transformations T_x is ergodic. \square

To construct a random structure with disks of two different radii, we start by defining a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Let the sample space be $\Omega = \Omega' \times Y$, where $\Omega' = \{0, 1, 2\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$, $Y = [0, 1]^2$. The elements of the sample space are $\omega = (\omega', \xi)$ describe a system of randomly independently distributed disks centered at the points $\mathbb{Z}^2 + (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) - \xi$. Here, $\omega' \in \Omega'$ determines the scattering of the disks

$$D_k(z) = \left\{ x' \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x' - z - (1/2, 1/2)| < r_k \right\}, \quad k = 1, 2,$$

of two distinct radii $r_1 < r_2 < 1/2$ centered at the nodes of the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2 + (1/2, 1/2)$, and is given by

$$\omega'(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if there is no disk centered at } z + (1/2, 1/2), \\ 1 & \text{if there is a disk } D_1(z), \\ 2 & \text{if there is a disk } D_2(z). \end{cases}$$

We assume that the probabilities of these independent events are positive, and they will be denoted by p_0, p_1 , and p_2 , respectively, such that $p_0 + p_1 + p_2 = 1$. One can interpret ω' as coloring the cells of the grid \mathbb{Z}^2 in three different colors. The random shift of all the disks is given by $\xi \in Y = [0, 1]^2$.

In order to construct a σ -algebra $\sigma' \subset 2^{\Omega'}$ and a probability measure $d\mathcal{P}'(\omega')$, for an arbitrary finite subset $C_N \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, $C_N = \{z_k; k = 1, \dots, N\}$, we consider a cylindrical set $\tilde{\omega}'_N = \{\omega' : \omega'(z_k) = \omega'_k, k = 1, \dots, N\}$, with $\omega'_k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and define its probability by

$$\mathcal{P}'(\tilde{\omega}'_N) = p_0^{N_0} p_1^{N_1} p_2^{N_2}, \quad \text{where } N_i = \#\{k : \omega'_k = i\}.$$

By the Kolmogorov extension theorem [38], this probability measure can be extended to $d\mathcal{P}'$ with the σ -algebra σ' generated by cylindrical sets.

We define then a σ -algebra on Ω by setting $\mathcal{F} = \sigma' \times \mathcal{B}$, with \mathcal{B} being the Borel σ -algebra on the unit cell $Y = [0, 1]^2$, and defining the probability measure on σ as $d\mathcal{P} = d\mathcal{P}'d\xi$, where $d\xi$ is the Lebesgue measure on Y .

In the next step, we introduce a dynamical system $T_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ by setting

$$(A.2) \quad T_{x'}\omega = (\omega'(z + [x' + \xi]), x' + \xi - [x' + \xi]),$$

where $[x' + \xi]$ is the integer part of $x' + \xi$. The mapping (A.2) is a group of measure preserving transformations such that (i)–(iii) are satisfied. Indeed, since $[x' + \xi] = x + [\xi]$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $T_{x'}$ satisfies the group property:

$$\begin{aligned} T_0\omega &= (\omega'(z), \xi), \\ T_{y'}(T_{x'}\omega) &= T_{y'}(\omega'(\tilde{z}), \tilde{\xi}), \quad \tilde{z} = z + [x' + \xi], \quad \tilde{\xi} = x' + \xi - [x' + \xi], \\ T_{y'}(T_{x'}\omega) &= (\omega'(\tilde{z} + [y' + \tilde{\xi}]), y' + \tilde{\xi} - [y' + \tilde{\xi}]) \\ &= (\omega'(z + [y' + x' + \xi]), y' + x' + \xi - [y' + x' + \xi]) = T_{y'+x'}\omega. \end{aligned}$$

The measurability of $T_x\omega$ follows from the definition, as a composition of measurable maps.

LEMMA A.2. $T_{x'} : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ given by (A.2) is ergodic.

Proof. Take any set $A \subset \mathcal{F}$ invariant with respect to T_x , that is $T_x A = A$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. From (A.2) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{x'}\omega &= (S'_{[x'+\xi]}\omega', S''_{x'}\xi), \\ S'_{[x'+\xi]}\omega' &= \omega'(\cdot + [x' + \xi]), \quad S''_{x'}\xi = x' + \xi - [x' + \xi]. \end{aligned}$$

One can see that both shifts $S'_{x'} : (\Omega', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (\Omega', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ and $S''_{x'} : ([0, 1]^2, \mathcal{B}, \lambda) \rightarrow ([0, 1]^2, \mathcal{B}, \lambda)$ are measure preserving groups of transformations, $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$. If $A \subset \mathcal{F}$ is $T_{x'}$ -invariant, then

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{\omega = (\omega', \xi) : \omega \in A', \xi \in A''\}, \\ T_{x'}A &= A \quad \Rightarrow \quad S'_{x'}A' = A', \quad S''_{x'}A'' = A''. \end{aligned}$$

Since the measure $d\mathcal{P} = d\mathcal{P}' \times d\lambda$ is a product measure, a set A of pairs (ω', ξ) is invariant if A' and A'' are invariant with respect to the corresponding shifts. We have already proved that the shifts of the periodic structure are ergodic (see Example A.1), so $S''_{x'}$ is ergodic. As for $S'_{x'}$, we need to prove the ergodicity only for integer x' . Let us show that $S'_{x'}$ is ergodic for $x' \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Take an invariant w.r.t $S'_{x'}$ set A' , and suppose that $\mathcal{P}'(A')$ is not zero or one. There exists a cylinder set A'_δ approximating A' , that is for any $\delta < 0$,

$$(A.3) \quad \mathcal{P}(A' \Delta A'_\delta) \leq \delta, \quad \mathcal{P}(S'_{x'}A' \Delta S'_{x'}A'_\delta) \leq \delta,$$

where we have used the measure preserving property of $S'_{x'}$. Now, since A' is $S'_{x'}$ -invariant,

$$(A.4) \quad \mathcal{P}'(A' \cap S'_{x'}A') = \mathcal{P}'(A').$$

At the same time, there exists (maybe large) $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that the cylinder sets A'_δ and $S'_{x_0}A'_\delta$ are supported by the finite sets of points in \mathbb{Z}^2 that do not intersect. The

events A'_δ and $S'_{x_0}A'_\delta$ have the same measure since the number of disks with different radii is not affected by a shift. That implies

$$(A.5) \quad \mathcal{P}'(A'_\delta \cap S'_{x'}A'_\delta) = \mathcal{P}'(A'_\delta)^2.$$

Combining (A.3)–(A.5) we get

$$\mathcal{P}'(A') = \mathcal{P}'(A'_\delta)^2 + O(\delta), \delta \rightarrow 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{P}'(A') = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

Since \mathcal{P} is a product measure, the ergodicity of $S'_{x'}$ and $S''_{x'}$ implies the ergodicity of T_x with respect to \mathcal{P} . \square

Next proposition specifies the prototypes \mathcal{A}_k , $k = 1, 2$ of the random sets $A_k(\omega)$.

LEMMA A.3. *Let $A(\omega)$ be a collection of disks of two different radii r_1, r_2 :*

$$A(\omega) = \bigcup_{k=1}^2 \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^2: \omega'(j)=k} (D_k(j) - \xi), \quad D_k(j) = \{x' : |x' - j - (1/2, 1/2)| \leq r_k\}.$$

Then

$$(A.6) \quad \mathcal{A}_k = \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega'(0) = k, \xi \in D_k(0)\}, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Proof. A given point $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ either belongs or not to a disk $D_k(j) - \xi$ for some k and j . Suppose first that $x' \in (D_k(j) - \xi)$. Then $(x' + \xi) \in D_k(j)$, and $[x' + \xi] = j$. Then

$$T_{x'}\omega = (\omega'(z + j), x' + \xi - j) \in \mathcal{A}_k$$

since $\omega'(j) = k$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

If x does not belong to $D_k(j) - \xi$ for any j, k , a similar argument leads to $T_{x'}\omega \notin \mathcal{A}_k$, that proves Lemma A.3. \square

The construction in Lemma A.3 gives a random placement of disks in \mathbb{R}^2 . Figure 2 illustrates this example for specific p_0, p_1 , and p_2 .

Note that due to (A.6), the limit densities (2.7) can be computed explicitly

$$(A.7) \quad \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_k) = \pi r_k^2 p_k,$$

since the probability to have a disk of radius r_k at $z = 0$ is p_k , and the Lebesgue measure of D_0^k is πr_k^2 .

To write down the limit problem (5.13) in the example under consideration, we start by characterizing the Palm measure and computing the projection on $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$. Recall Lemma 5.2 and take $f = 1$ on $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_k$ and zero otherwise. Equality (5.5) takes the form

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_k) = \frac{r_k}{2} \int_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_k} d\mu(\omega),$$

that yields $\mu(\mathcal{A}_k) = 2\pi r_k p_k$. We also introduce components of the prototype set \mathcal{M}

$$(A.8) \quad \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2, \quad \mathcal{M}_k = \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega'(0) = k, \xi \in \partial D_k(0)\}, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Next, we compute the projection of the limit function $g_0(x, \omega)$ on $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mu)$. Choosing an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$, $e_k = \chi_{\mathcal{M}_k}(\omega)/\sqrt{\mu(\mathcal{M}_k)}$, $k = 1, 2$, the projection takes the form

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})}g_0(t, x, \omega) = \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\chi_{\mathcal{M}_k}}{\mu(\mathcal{M}_k)} \int_{\mathcal{M}_k} g_0(t, x, \omega) d\mu(\omega).$$

The Palm measure $\mu(\omega)$ is

$$d\mu(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^2 \delta(\omega'(0) - k) \delta(|\xi| - r_k) d\mathcal{P}'(\omega') ds_\xi,$$

where ds_ξ denote the arc length measure on $\partial D_{r_k}(0)$. By the definition of \mathcal{M}_k (A.8),

$$(A.9) \quad \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})}g_0(t, x, \omega) = \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\delta(\omega'(0) - k) \delta(|\xi| - r_k)}{\mu(\mathcal{M}_k)} \int_{\omega'(0)=k} \int_{\partial D_{r_k}(0)} g_0(t, x, \omega', \xi) d\mathcal{P}'(\omega') ds_\xi.$$

Thus,

$$(A.10) \quad \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})}g_0(t, x, \omega)|_{\omega \in \mathcal{M}_k} = g_0^k(t, x) = \frac{1}{2\pi r_k p_k} \int_{\omega'(0)=k} \int_{\partial D_{r_k}(0)} g_0(t, x, \omega', \xi) d\mathcal{P}'(\omega') ds_\xi.$$

Denoting $u_0^i(t, x, \omega)|_{\omega \in \mathcal{M}_k} = u_0^{ik}(t, x)$, we obtain the following limit problem

$$(A.11) \quad \begin{aligned} c_m \partial_t v_0^k + I_{ion}(v_0^k, g_0^k) &= \frac{r_k}{2} \partial_{x_1}(\sigma^i(|\partial_{x_1} u_0^{ik}|)) && \text{in } G_T, \\ \sum_{k=1}^2 \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_k)(c_m \partial_t v_0^k + I_{ion}(v_0^k, g_0^k)) &= -\text{div}(\sigma_{hom}^e(\nabla u_0^e)) && \text{in } G_T, \\ \partial_t g_0 &= \theta v_0 + a - b g_0, && \text{in } G_T \times \mathcal{M} \\ v_0^k &= u_0^{ik} - u_0^e && \text{in } G, \\ u_0^e &= u_0^{ik} = 0 && \text{on } S_0 \cup S_L, \\ \sigma_{hom}^e(\nabla u_0^e) \cdot \nu &= J_0^e && \text{on } \Sigma, \\ v_0^k(0, x) &= V_0(x), \quad g_0(0, x, \omega) = G_0(x, \omega) && \text{in } G \times \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

A.2. Disks with a finite number of different radii and random shifts.

With small modifications, we generalize the example in the previous section and include random independent shifts inside the grid. Let $R < 1/2$, and let $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots)$ be uniformly distributed random variables with values in $B_{1/2-R}(0)$ (ball of radius $1/2 - R$ centered at the origin).

We introduce a sample space $\Omega = \Omega' \times \Omega'' \times Y$, where Ω' will determine the scattering of the disks of N different radii (equivalently, the coloring of the cells in the periodic grid in $N + 1$ colors); Ω'' represents the random shifts of disks inside the cells, and $Y = [0, 1]^2$ is an auxiliary shift of the whole structure to ensure that the group property is satisfied.




Fig. 2: Random distribution of discs in Section A.1: $p_0 = 1/3$ (no disk), $p_1 = 1/2$ (orange disk with radius $r_1 = 0.2$), $p_2 = 1/6$ (blue disk with radius $r_2 = 0.3$).

The elements ω' of the sample space Ω' are functions from \mathbb{Z}^2 to $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$, and describe a system of randomly independently distributed disks centered at the points $\mathbb{Z}^2 + (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) - \xi$. As before, we denote the disks by

$$D_k(z) = \left\{ x' \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x' - z - (1/2, 1/2)| < r_k \right\}, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

The coloring is defined by

$$\omega'(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if there is no disk centered at } z + (1/2, 1/2), \\ k & \text{if there is a disk } D_k(z), \quad k = 1, \dots, N. \end{cases}$$

We assume that the probabilities of these independent events are positive, and they will be denoted by p_k , $k = 1, \dots, N$, such that $\sum_{k=1}^N p_k = 1$. Next, the random shifts of each disk are represented by the elements of $\Omega'' : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow B_{1/2-R}(0)$. The random shift of all the disks is given by $\xi \in Y = [0, 1]^2$.

The sample space is then the product $\Omega = \Omega' \times \Omega'' \times Y$. The sigma-algebra and a probability measure for Ω' are constructed in the previous example.

To use the Kolmogorov theorem and construct a sigma-algebra and a probability measure for Ω'' , we introduce the cylinder sets. For an arbitrary finite number of points on the grid $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N\}$, we consider a cylindrical set

$$C_N(I_{j_1}, \dots, I_{j_N}) = \{\eta_{j_1}(\omega) \in I_{j_1}, \dots, \eta_{j_N}(\omega) \in I_{j_N}\}, \quad I_{j_k} \subset B_{1/2-R}(0),$$

and define its probability by

$$\mathcal{P}''\{\eta_{j_1}(\omega) \in I_{j_1}, \dots, \eta_{j_N}(\omega) \in I_{j_N}\} = \prod_{k=1}^N \frac{|I_{j_k}|}{|B_{1/2-R}(0)|}.$$

By the Kolmogorov extension theorem, \mathcal{P}'' can be extended to $d\mathcal{P}''$ with the σ -algebra σ'' generated by cylindrical sets.

We define then a σ -algebra on Ω by setting $\mathcal{F} = \sigma' \times \sigma'' \times \mathcal{B}$, with \mathcal{B} being the Borel σ -algebra on the unit cell $Y = [0, 1]^2$, and the probability measure on σ as $d\mathcal{P} = d\mathcal{P}' d\mathcal{P}'' d\xi$, where $d\xi$ is the Lebesgue measure on Y .

Finally, we introduce a dynamical system $T_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$:

$$(A.12) \quad T_{x'}\omega = (\omega'(z + [x' + \xi]), \eta(z + [x' + \xi]), x' + \xi - [x' + \xi]),$$

where $[x' + \xi]$ is the integer part of $x' + \xi$. The mapping (A.12) is a group of measure preserving transformations such that (i)–(iii) are satisfied, and $T_{x'}$ is ergodic. For

$$(A.13) \quad \mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \mathcal{A}_k = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega'(0) = k, \eta(0) \in B_{1/2-R}(0), \xi \in D_k(0) + \eta(0)\},$$

we obtain a collection of disks of N different radii r_k , $k = 1, \dots, N$:

$$A(\omega) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \omega'(j)=k} (D_k(j) + \eta(j) - \xi), \quad D_k(j) = \{\zeta : |\zeta - j - (1/2, 1/2)| \leq r_k\}.$$

Using (A.13), one can see that the limit densities are the same as in the previous example: $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_k) = \pi r_k^2 p_k$.

Among other examples of random geometry are those involving Voronoi tessellation structures (see, e.g., Example 4 in [8], and Example 3 in [28]).

A.3. Monotonicity of the nonlinear terms.

LEMMA A.4. *Let $\sigma(\eta)$ satisfy (H4), that is*

$$0 < \underline{\sigma} \leq \sigma(\eta) \leq \bar{\sigma}, \quad \eta \frac{d}{d\eta} \sigma(\eta) + \eta > 0.$$

Then for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathbf{R}^3$ it holds

$$(A.14) \quad (\sigma(|\xi|)\xi - \sigma(|\eta|)\eta) \cdot (\xi - \eta) \geq \underline{\sigma} |\xi - \eta|^2,$$

with $\underline{\sigma}$ in assumption (H4).

Proof. Introduce $\zeta(t) = \eta + t(\xi - \eta)$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and consider $F(t) = \sigma(|\zeta(t)|)\zeta(t)$. Since $F(0) = \eta$, $F(1) = \xi$, (A.14) is equivalent to the inequality

$$(F(1) - F(0)) \cdot (\zeta(1) - \zeta(0)) = F'(\zeta(t_0)) \cdot (\xi - \eta) > 0.$$

Differentiating F in t , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F'(\zeta(t)) \cdot \zeta'(t) &= \sigma'(|\zeta(t)|) \frac{\zeta'(t) \cdot \zeta(t)}{|\zeta(t)|} \zeta(t) \cdot \zeta'(t) + \sigma(|\zeta(t)|) |\zeta'(t)|^2 \\ &= |\zeta(t)| \sigma'(|\zeta(t)|) (\text{proj}_{\zeta/|\zeta|} \zeta'(t))^2 + \sigma(|\zeta(t)|) |\zeta'(t)|^2 \\ &= (\text{proj}_{\zeta/|\zeta|} \zeta'(t))^2 (|\zeta(t)| \sigma'(|\zeta(t)|) + \sigma(|\zeta(t)|)) \\ &\quad + \sigma(|\zeta(t)|) (|\zeta'(t)|^2 - (\text{proj}_{\zeta/|\zeta|} \zeta'(t))^2) \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{proj}_{\zeta/|\zeta|} \zeta'(t) = \frac{\zeta'(t) \cdot \zeta(t)}{|\zeta(t)|}$ is the projection of $\zeta'(t)$ on the unit vector $\zeta(t)/|\zeta(t)|$. By assumption (H4), we can estimate the last expression from below, using $\zeta'(t) = \xi - \eta$:

$$F'(\zeta(t)) \cdot \zeta'(t) \geq \underline{\sigma} |\zeta'(t)|^2 = \underline{\sigma} |\xi - \eta|^2. \quad \square$$

Appendix B. Nondimensionalization of the problem. The asymptotic analysis of the microscopic problem is done under the assumption that a typical diameter of individual axons in the fascicle is much smaller than its length. In order

to motivate the choice of the scaling parameter ε in the nonlinear dynamics on the membrane, one needs to perform the nondimensionalization of the problem. In the current section, we provide an example of how such an analysis can be done for specific applications of electrical stimulation. For the dimension analysis of the ionic current, we refer to [37], and for the dimension analysis in the homogenization context to [32] and [11].

Let L_0 be a characteristic length of a nerve, T_0 a characteristic time of signal propagation, Σ_0 a characteristic conductivity, and $U_0 = V_{max} - V_{min}$ with V_{min} and V_{max} being characteristic upper and lower bounds for the membrane potential. We also introduce G_0 , a characteristic value of the variable g . We set

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{x}{L_0}, \quad \tilde{t} = \frac{t}{T_0}, \quad u^\alpha(x, t) = U_0 \tilde{u}^\alpha(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}), \quad \sigma^\alpha(|\nabla u^\alpha|) = \Sigma_0 \tilde{\sigma}^\alpha(|\nabla_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{u}^\alpha|), \quad \alpha = i, e.$$

We set also $I_{ion}(v, g) = I_0 \tilde{I}_{ion}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{g})$ and $g = G_0 \tilde{g}$. The cell membrane is modeled as a combined resistor and a capacitor, which results in the total current being decomposed into two parts

$$c_m \partial_t v + I_{ion}(v, g) = -\sigma^i(|\nabla u^i|) \nabla u^i \cdot \nu.$$

Nondimensionalizing the last equations yields

$$\frac{L_0}{\Sigma_0 U_0} \left(\frac{c_m U_0}{T_0} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \tilde{v} + I_0 \tilde{I}_{ion}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{g}) \right) = -\tilde{\sigma}^i(|\nabla_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{u}^i|) \nabla_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{u}^i \cdot \nu.$$

We adopt the parameter values used in [26] for a numerical study of an axonal bipolar electrical stimulation (see also [11] for the typical parameter values used in cardiac electrophysiology). A typical diameter of an axon is taken to be $2 \mu\text{m}$ and a typical sample size $L_0 = 1 \text{ cm}$. We introduce a small parameter ε as the ratio between a typical axon diameter and L_0 , which gives ε of the order of 10^{-4} . Taking $c_m = 0.6 \mu\text{F/m}$, U_0 of order 10^{-1} V , I_0 of order 10^{-3} A/m^2 , and $T_0 = 500 \mu\text{s}$, we see that $c_m U_0 / T_0$ and I_0 are of the same order of magnitude. The dimensionless coefficient $L_0 I_0 / (\Sigma_0 L_0)$ is then of the same order as ε , that is 10^{-4} , which motivates the choice of the scaling parameter in (4.2). Note that since the FitzHugh-Nagumo model is phenomenological, the ODE for the variable g is written in nondimensional form.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. AMAR, D. ANDREUCCI, P. BISEGNA, R. GIANNI, ET AL., *A hierarchy of models for the electrical conduction in biological tissues via two-scale convergence: The nonlinear case*, DIFFERENTIAL AND INTEGRAL EQUATIONS, 26 (2013), pp. 885–912.
- [2] P. J. BASSER AND B. J. ROTH, *New currents in electrical stimulation of excitable tissues*, Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng., 2 (2000), pp. 377–397.
- [3] M. BENDAHDANE, F. MROUE, M. SAAD, AND R. TALHOUK, *Unfolding homogenization method applied to physiological and phenomenological bidomain models in electrocardiology*, Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications, 50 (2019), pp. 413–447.
- [4] S. BIHOREAU, G. CALUORI, A. COLLIN, P. JAÏS, M. LEGUÈBE, AND C. POIGNARD, *Mathematical modeling of pulsed electric field cardiac ablation*, in RICAM-Workshop 4th Modeling and simulation of ablation treatments³, 2023.
- [5] S. BINCZAK, J. EILBECK, AND A. C. SCOTT, *Ephaptic coupling of myelinated nerve fibers*, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 148 (2001), pp. 159–174.
- [6] X. BLANC, C. LE BRIS, AND P.-L. LIONS, *Stochastic homogenization and random lattices*, Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées, 88 (2007), pp. 34–63.
- [7] H. BOKIL, N. LAARIS, K. BLINDER, M. ENNIS, AND A. KELLER, *Ephaptic interactions in the mammalian olfactory system*, Journal of Neuroscience, 21 (2001), pp. RC173–RC173.

- [8] A. BOURGEAT, A. MIKELIĆ, AND A. PIATNITSKI, *On the double porosity model of a single phase flow in random media*, *Asymptotic Analysis*, 34 (2003), pp. 311–332.
- [9] A. BOURGEAT, A. MIKELIĆ, AND S. WRIGHT, *Stochastic two-scale convergence in the mean and applications.*, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 456 (1994), pp. 19–52.
- [10] D. L. COHN, *Measure theory*, vol. 5, Springer, 2013.
- [11] A. COLLIN AND S. IMPERIALE, *Mathematical analysis and 2-scale convergence of a heterogeneous microscopic bidomain model*, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 28 (2018), pp. 979–1035.
- [12] I. P. CORNFELD, S. V. FOMIN, AND Y. G. SINAI, *Ergodic theory*, vol. 245, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [13] R. FITZHUGH, *Mathematical models of threshold phenomena in the nerve membrane*, *The Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics*, 17 (1955), pp. 257–278.
- [14] P. C. FRANZONE AND G. SAVARÉ, *Degenerate evolution systems modeling the cardiac electric field at micro-and macroscopic level*, in *Evolution Equations, Semigroups and Functional Analysis*, Springer, 2002, pp. 49–78.
- [15] E. GRANDELIUS AND K. H. KARLSEN, *The cardiac bidomain model and homogenization*, *Networks & Heterogeneous Media*, 14 (2019), p. 173.
- [16] M. HEIDA, *Stochastic homogenization on perforated domains ii—application to nonlinear elasticity models*, *ZAMM—Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics/Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 102 (2022), p. e202100407.
- [17] E. HILLE AND R. S. PHILLIPS, *Functional analysis and semi-groups*, vol. 31, American Mathematical Soc., 1996.
- [18] A. L. HODGKIN AND A. F. HUXLEY, *A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve*, *The Journal of physiology*, 117 (1952), p. 500.
- [19] A. IVORRA, J. VILMEJANE, AND L. M. MIR, *Electrical modeling of the influence of medium conductivity on electroporation*, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 12 (2010), pp. 10055–10064.
- [20] G. JANKOWIAK, C. TAING, C. POIGNARD, AND A. COLLIN, *Comparison and calibration of different electroporation models. application to rabbit livers experiments*, *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys*, 67 (2020), pp. 242–260.
- [21] C. JEREZ-HANCKES, I. A. MARTÍNEZ ÁVILA, I. PETERSSON, AND V. RYBALKO, *Derivation of a bidomain model for bundles of myelinated axons*, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 70 (2023), p. Paper No. 103789.
- [22] C. JEREZ-HANCKES, I. PETERSSON, AND V. RYBALKO, *Derivation of cable equation by multiscale analysis for a model of myelinated axons*, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B*, 25 (2020), pp. 815–839.
- [23] V. V. JIKOV, S. M. KOZLOV, AND O. A. OLEINIK, *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [24] J.-L. LIONS, *Quelques méthodes de résolution de problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod, 1969.
- [25] A. J. MAJDA AND A. L. BERTOZZI, *Vorticity and Incompressible Flow*, *Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [26] E. MANDONNET AND O. PANTZ, *The role of electrode direction during axonal bipolar electrical stimulation: a bidomain computational model study*, *Acta Neurochirurgica*, 153 (2011), pp. 2351–2355.
- [27] J. MECKE, *Stationäre zufällige maße auf lokalkompakten abelschen gruppen*, *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 9 (1967), pp. 36–58.
- [28] A. MIKELIĆ AND A. PIATNITSKI, *Homogenization of the linearized ionic transport equations in random porous media*, *Nonlinearity*, 36 (2023), p. 3835.
- [29] G. MINTY, *Monotone (nonlinear) operators in hilbert space*, *Duke Math. J.*, 29 (1962), pp. 341–346.
- [30] M. MIYAZAWA, *Note on generalizations of mecke’s formula and extensions of $h = \lambda g$* , *Journal of applied probability*, 32 (1995), pp. 105–122.
- [31] J. NAGUMO, S. ARIMOTO, AND S. YOSHIZAWA, *An active pulse transmission line simulating nerve axon*, *Proceedings of the IRE*, 50 (1962), pp. 2061–2070.
- [32] J. C. NEU AND W. KRASSOWSKA, *Homogenization of syncytial tissues.*, *Critical reviews in biomedical engineering*, 21 (1993), pp. 137–199.
- [33] M. PENNACCHIO, G. SAVARÉ, AND P. C. FRANZONE, *Multiscale modeling for the bioelectric activity of the heart*, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 37 (2005), pp. 1333–1370.
- [34] I. PETERSSON, A. RYBALKO, AND V. RYBALKO, *Bidomain model for axon bundles with random geometry*, in *Gas Dynamics with Applications in Industry and Life Sciences: On Gas*

- Kinetic/Dynamics and Life Science Seminar, March 25–26, 2021 and March 17–18, 2022, vol. 429, Springer Nature, 2023, p. 93.
- [35] A. PIATNITSKI AND M. PTASHNYK, *Homogenization of biomechanical models of plant tissues with randomly distributed cells*, *Nonlinearity*, 33 (2020), p. 5510.
 - [36] G. RICHARDSON AND S. J. CHAPMAN, *Derivation of the bidomain equations for a beating heart with a general microstructure*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 71 (2011), pp. 657–675.
 - [37] M. RIOUX AND Y. BOURGAULT, *A predictive method allowing the use of a single ionic model innumerical cardiac electrophysiology*, *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 47 (2013), pp. 987–1016.
 - [38] A. N. SHIRYAEV, *Probability-1*, vol. 95, Springer, 2016.
 - [39] R. E. SHOWALTER, *Monotone operators in Banach space and nonlinear partial differential equations*, vol. 49, American Mathematical Soc., 2013.
 - [40] S. STANDRING, *Gray's anatomy e-book: the anatomical basis of clinical practice*, Elsevier Health Sciences, 2021.
 - [41] P. WALTERS, *Ergodic theory—introductory lectures*, vol. 458, Springer, 2007.
 - [42] V. V. ZHIKOV, *Averaging in perforated random domains of general type*, *Mathematical Notes*, 53 (1993), pp. 30–42.