

WELL-POSEDNESS AND HOMOGENIZATION OF STOCHASTIC HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS

BENJAMIN SEEGER

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider a class of stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations with spatial dependence. We prove that these equations admit unique solutions, and we show that the solution operator is continuous with respect to the path. We then consider the same equations with oscillatory spatial dependence, and prove that the solutions converge locally uniformly to the solution of a stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equation with a spatially homogenous Hamiltonian. This homogenization result is stronger than one appearing in a previous work by the author, in which the arbitrary continuous path is replaced by a family of smooth approximations to the path.

1. INTRODUCTION

For $\epsilon > 0$, we consider the stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} du^\epsilon = H(Du^\epsilon, x/\epsilon) \circ dW & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ u^\epsilon = u_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}, \end{cases}$$

where the Hamiltonian H , the initial condition $u_0 \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and the continuous real-valued path W are given. The space $BUC(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the space of bounded, uniformly continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^n .

If W is regular enough, the symbol $\circ dW$ is interpreted as $\frac{d}{dt}W(t)$, which is continuous if W is C^1 , or is in L^1 if W is of bounded variation. In either case, the solution u^ϵ is defined in the usual viscosity sense. However, in the most general case, we would like to consider less regular paths. The main example is when W is a sample path of a stochastic process, for example a Brownian motion, in which case the symbol \circ should be thought of as the Stratonovich differential. In this case W is nowhere differentiable, and in fact has infinite variation on every time interval. Throughout the paper, we simply assume that W is an arbitrary continuous path (recall that Brownian paths are almost surely α -Hölder continuous for $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$).

The theory of equations like (1.1) was developed by Lions and Souganidis in the papers [10], [11], [12], and [13], and is discussed in more detail in the forthcoming book [14]. Proving well-posedness for these equations is a challenge particularly when the Hamiltonian has spatial dependence, as in (1.1). The first results required strong regularity assumptions on H , and were restricted to Hölder continuous paths W with a certain range of Hölder exponents. Recently Friz, Gassiat, Lions, and Souganidis in [6] introduced a larger class of spatially-dependent Hamiltonians for which unique solutions could be defined, without restricting the class of continuous paths W . In a future work [9] of Lions and Souganidis, an even more general well-posedness result is given for equation (1.1).

This paper has two goals: to establish well-posedness for equation (1.1), and to show that its solutions homogenize as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

1.1. Well-posedness. We generalize the result in [6], imitating the method in [9], to establish well-posedness for equation (1.1). The specific assumptions we require on H are listed in the next section, specifically subsection 2.1. The main assumptions are that $H = H(p, x)$ is convex and coercive in the p -variable, where the coercivity is superlinear but at most polynomial. To simplify many of the arguments, we also assume that H is positively homogenous in the p variable for some exponent $q' > 1$, i.e.

$$H(tp, y) = t^{q'} H(p, y)$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $(p, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Here, q' is the convex dual exponent of some other exponent $q \in (1, \infty)$, so that $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$.

The definition of Lions-Souganidis stochastic viscosity solutions relies on the existence of smooth-in- x solutions of the equation

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} d\Phi = H(D\Phi, x/\epsilon) \circ dW & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (t_0 - h, t_0 + h) \\ \Phi = \phi & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \times \{t_0\} \end{cases}$$

for each $t_0 > 0$ and for sufficiently small $h > 0$ and sufficiently smooth ϕ . When $q' \geq 2$, the Hamiltonians we consider are C^2 , and this along with the coercivity of H makes it possible find a sufficiently small $h > 0$ and a solution Φ of (1.2) such that $\Phi(\cdot, t) \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $t \in (t_0 - h, t_0 + h)$, whenever $\phi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (i.e., Φ has bounded first and second derivatives in x). This solution is constructed using the method of characteristics; indeed, the classical method of characteristics yields a smooth solution of

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} = H(DU, x/\epsilon) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\tau, \tau) \\ U = \phi & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\} \end{cases}$$

for small enough $\tau > 0$, and then because U is smooth, the function

$$(1.4) \quad \Phi(x, t) = U(x, W_t - W_{t_0})$$

solves (1.2) if $h > 0$ is such that

$$\sup_{|t-t_0| \leq h} |W_t - W_{t_0}| < \tau.$$

This is because we consider the Stratonovich differential $\circ dW$, for which the chain rule (and therefore stability under limits) holds. When W is an arbitrary continuous path, formula (1.4) can be seen as the definition of smooth-in- x solutions of (1.2).

When $q' < 2$, the second derivative $D_p^2 H$ has a singularity at $p = 0$, and therefore (1.3) and (1.2) may not have short time, smooth-in- x solutions unless more restrictions are placed on the initial condition ϕ , for instance if $|D\phi|$ is uniformly bounded away from 0, or if $D\phi(x_0) = 0$ only if $D\phi$ vanishes of high enough order at x_0 .

Solutions of (1.1) are then defined as in [10] with the definition below. As in the classical viscosity case (see [4]), the definition is given in terms of sub and supersolutions, which are allowed to be discontinuous. In particular, we introduce the spaces $LSC(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $USC(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of lower and upper semicontinuous functions on \mathbb{R}^n , respectively.

Definition 1. We say $u^\epsilon \in USC(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (resp. $LSC(\mathbb{R}^n)$) is a *subsolution* (resp. *supersolution*) of (1.1) whenever the following holds: for any $\psi \in C^1((0, \infty))$ and any smooth-in- x solution Φ of (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (t_0 - h, t_0 + h)$, if

$$u^\epsilon(x, t) - \Phi(x, t) - \psi(t)$$

attains a maximum (resp. minimum) at (x_0, t_0) , then

$$\psi'(t_0) \leq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } \psi'(t_0) \geq 0).$$

A function is a solution of (1.1) if it is both a subsolution and a supersolution.

We then have the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that H satisfies the assumptions in subsection 2.1 of Section 2. Then for every $u_0 \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a unique function u^ϵ such that $u^\epsilon \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$ for each $T > 0$ and u^ϵ is a stochastic viscosity solution of (1.1) in the sense of Definition 1.*

Moreover, for every pair $u_0^1, u_0^2 \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists a function

$$\rho_{u_0^1, u_0^2} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

satisfying

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \rho_{u_0^1, u_0^2}(s) = 0$$

and such that for all $W^1, W^2 \in C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ and for all $\epsilon > 0$, the following holds: if u^1 and u^2 are the unique stochastic viscosity solutions of (1.1) with initial conditions u_0^1 and u_0^2 and with paths W^1 and W^2 , respectively, then for all $T > 0$,

$$(1.5) \quad \sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]} |u^1(x,t) - u^2(x,t)| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |u_0^1(x) - u_0^2(x)| \\ + \rho_{u_0^1, u_0^2} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |W_t^1 - W_t^2 - (W^1(0) - W^2(0))| \right).$$

Inequality (1.5) implies that the solution operator for equation (1.1) is continuous in the variable $W \in C([0, \infty))$.

As we show in the proof of Theorem 1.1, ρ_{u_0, v_0} can be explicitly identified. For a modulus of continuity $\omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (i.e., ω is nondecreasing and satisfies $\omega(0+) = 0$) and for $\lambda > 0$, define

$$\theta(\omega, \lambda) = \max_{r \geq 0} (\omega(r) - c_0 \lambda^{q-1} r^q),$$

where q and c_0 are as in (2.5). Observe that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \theta(\omega, \lambda) = 0.$$

Then if ω_{u_0, v_0} is the maximum of the moduli of continuity for u_0 and v_0 , we can take

$$\rho_{u_0, v_0}(s) = \theta \left(\omega_{u_0, v_0}, \frac{1}{s} \right).$$

For example, if u_0 and v_0 are both Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant L , so that $\omega_{u_0, v_0}(r) = Lr$, then

$$\rho_{u_0, v_0}(s) = Cs$$

for some constant $C = C(L) > 0$.

The uniqueness of solutions of (1.1) is established with the comparison principle. The proof of comparison, as well as the proof of the extension estimate (1.5), involves doubling the space variable: for a subsolution u and a supersolution v of (1.1), we define the function

$$z(x, y, t) = u(x, t) - v(y, t)$$

which is a subsolution of the doubled equation

$$(1.6) \quad dz = (H(D_x z, x) - H(-D_y z, y)) \circ dW.$$

Previous proofs imitated the strategy from classical viscosity theory of estimating

$$(1.7) \quad \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x,t) - v(y,t) - (\lambda/2)|x - y|^2)$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. If $H(p, x) = H(p)$ is independent of x , then $L_\lambda(x, y) := (\lambda/2)|x - y|^2$ is a smooth solution of

$$(1.8) \quad H(D_x L_\lambda, x) = H(-D_y L_\lambda, y),$$

and so the definition of stochastic viscosity solution can easily be applied to show that the difference (5.3) is nondecreasing in t . However, when H depends on the spatial variable, L_λ is only an approximate solution of (1.8), and we must consider solutions of (1.6) with initial condition L_λ . Such solutions are smooth in space only on a small interval of time, and so strong regularity assumptions must be made on H and W to ensure that this interval is long enough to establish comparison.

The idea of [6] and [9] is to replace the penalized distance function $(\lambda/2)|x - y|^2$ with a distance function L_λ that is more suited to the Hamiltonian H . This distance function is motivated by representation formulas for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with convex Hamiltonians, and is defined in Section 3, where we show that it is an exact solution to equation (1.8), provided L_λ is differentiable at the point (x, y) . This is not always the case, which is a key difficulty in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

An argument similar to the proof of the comparison principle then yields estimate (1.5). From the work of Lions and Souganidis, Definition 1 is consistent with the classical notion of viscosity solution as in [4] whenever the path W is smooth. In particular, if $\{W^n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a family of smooth paths converging locally uniformly to W as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and if u^n is the classical viscosity solution of (1.1) with the path W^n , then (1.1) implies that $\{u^n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a locally uniform Cauchy sequence. Since Definition 1 is stable under local uniform limits of the paths and of the solutions, it follows that the whole sequence u^n converges to the unique solution of (1.1).

1.2. Homogenization. We consider the behavior of the solutions u^ϵ of (1.1) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. If H satisfies certain structural conditions in the spatial variable, such as periodicity or stationary ergodicity, than one expects that u^ϵ converges locally uniformly to the solution u of a spatially homogenous equation

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{cases} du = \overline{H}(Du) \circ dW & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ u = u_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\} \end{cases}$$

for some function $\overline{H} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and this is indeed the case.

To state the result, which is quantitative, let $\rho : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the modulus of continuity for the continuous path W on $[0, T]$, and let $\omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the inverse of the increasing function $s\rho(s)$. In other words, $\omega(s\rho(s)) = s = \omega(s)\rho(\omega(s))$ for all $s > 0$.

Theorem 1.2. *In addition to the assumptions in subsection 2.1, assume the initial condition u_0 lies in $C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and assume either (2.8a) or (2.8b). Then for all $T \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|Du_0\|_\infty$ and T such that for all $0 < \epsilon < 1$, the following hold:*

- (1) *In the periodic case (2.8a),*

$$\sup_{\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]} |u^\epsilon(x, t) - u(x, t)| \leq C(\rho \circ \omega)(\epsilon^{1/3}) = C \frac{\epsilon^{1/3}}{\omega(\epsilon^{1/3})}.$$

(2) *In the stationary ergodic case (2.8b),*

$$\sup_{B_T \times [0, T]} |u^\epsilon(x, t) - u(x, t)| \leq C\rho(\epsilon^{\beta/2})$$

where the exponent $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is as in (2.8b).

As an example of more explicit rates, suppose W is α -Hölder continuous. Then in the periodic case,

$$\sup_{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]} |u^\epsilon(x, t) - u(x, t)| \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{3(\alpha+1)}},$$

while in the stationary ergodic case,

$$\sup_{(x, t) \in B_T \times [0, T]} |u^\epsilon(x, t) - u(x, t)| \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}}.$$

Thus, if W is a Brownian path, and therefore is α -Hölder continuous for every $\alpha < 1/2$, homogenization occurs with an algebraic rate approaching $\frac{1}{9}$ in the periodic case and approaching $\frac{\beta}{4}$ in the stationary ergodic case. We do not claim that any of these rates are sharp, especially since the existing quantitative homogenization results are not known to be sharp.

The main difficulty in obtaining even qualitative homogenization results is the presence of the continuous path W . To understand this difficulty, consider for simplicity the periodic case. In this context, the effective Hamiltonian \overline{H} is generally identified by considering the so-called “cell problem.” For equation (1.1), this means we formally consider, for each $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the equation

$$(1.10) \quad H(D_y v + p, y) \circ dW = \lambda \circ dW.$$

If there exists a unique constant λ for which (1.10) admits periodic solutions v , called “correctors”, we then define $\overline{H}(p) := \lambda$. Unfortunately, the problem (1.10) has no meaning for an arbitrary path W .

To make the study of (1.10) tractable, we regularize the path W to obtain a path W^η that is monotone on only finitely many intervals. We then consider the classical viscosity solution $u^{\epsilon, \eta}$ of the equation

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{cases} u_t^{\epsilon, \eta} = H(Du^{\epsilon, \eta}, x/\epsilon) \dot{W}^\eta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ u^{\epsilon, \eta} = u_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

The solution $u^{\epsilon, \eta}$ can be obtained from solutions of either

$$U_t = H(DU, x/\epsilon)$$

or

$$U_t = -H(DU, x/\epsilon)$$

via local changes in time, depending on the sign of \dot{W}^η . The problematic cell problem (1.10) then reduces to the two cell problems

$$(1.12) \quad H(D_y v_+ + p, y) = \lambda_+$$

and

$$(1.13) \quad -H(D_y v_- + p, y) = \lambda_-.$$

These equations may only have solutions defined in the viscosity sense, and are therefore sensitive to multiplication by -1 . Indeed, it is not necessarily true that we can find a common corrector $v = v_+ = v_-$ unless this corrector is smooth, which is not always the case. Therefore, it may not be true that $\lambda_- = -\lambda_+$.

However, when H is convex, as we assume in this paper, then the effective Hamiltonian \overline{H} has an alternative variational derivation, from which it is possible to see that $\lambda_- = -\lambda_+$, although it still is not always true that the same corrector solves both cell problems. As explained in [15], the corresponding problems (1.12) and (1.13) in the stationary ergodic setting, where they are known as the “macroscopic problem”, do not always admit appropriate solutions v , i.e. solutions that grow strictly sublinearly at infinity. However, it will still be the case that the effective Hamiltonian only changes by multiplication by -1 whenever W^η changes direction. For more on these facts, see the discussion in [17].

Therefore, for fixed η and as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $u^{\epsilon,\eta}$ converges locally uniformly to the solution of the equation

$$(1.14) \quad \begin{cases} \overline{u}^\eta = \overline{H}(D\overline{u}^\eta)\dot{W}^\eta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ \overline{u}^\eta = u_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

Of course, we need to balance the effect of homogenization as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ with the process of obtaining solutions of (1.1) and (1.9) as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. To do so, we write the difference $u^\epsilon - u$ as the sum of the differences

$$(1.15) \quad u^\epsilon - u^{\epsilon,\eta},$$

$$(1.16) \quad u^{\epsilon,\eta} - \overline{u}^\eta,$$

and

$$(1.17) \quad \overline{u}^\eta - u.$$

We can use known homogenization error estimates, on successive intervals of time on which W^η is monotone, to obtain an error estimate for (1.16). However, this error estimate depends on the number of intervals on which W^η is monotone, since each time W^η changes direction, we need to consider a different macroscopic problem (1.12) or (1.13). The number of times that W^η changes direction may increase to infinity as $\eta \rightarrow 0$.

Therefore, the next step is to obtain error estimates for (1.15) and (1.17) that are independent of $\epsilon > 0$. Since equations (1.9) and (1.14) are independent of $\epsilon > 0$, this is possible for the difference (1.17) using estimates from [11]. We have already used this strategy in [17], in which we combine estimates for both (1.16) and (1.17) to prove that $u^{\epsilon,\eta}$ converges to u as ϵ and η converge to 0, as long as the rate at which W^η converges to W is controlled.

What remains is to estimate (1.15) independently of ϵ . This estimate is exactly given by (1.5) in Theorem 1.1. Combining the three estimates and optimizing over $\eta > 0$ gives the homogenization result.

1.3. Outline of paper. This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state the exact assumptions on the Hamiltonian H . In Section 3, we introduce the distance function $L(x, y)$ associated to the Hamiltonian H and discuss its properties. In Section 4, we give a proof of the well-posedness result Theorem 1.1 and present an equicontinuity result for the solutions u^ϵ . Finally, in Section 5, we give a proof of Theorem 1.2.

2. ASSUMPTIONS

In this section, we list the assumptions that we make on the Hamiltonian H . For the sake of organization, we specify which assumptions are used mainly for Theorem 1.1 and which are used mainly for Theorem 1.2. However, throughout all sections of this paper, we assume that all of the following assumptions are in force.

2.1. Assumptions for Theorem 1.1. As stated in the Introduction, we always assume that H is convex in the gradient variable. This will allow us to use a known representation formula for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with convex Hamiltonians. This formula, stated in Section 3, is given in terms of the convex dual of H , which is defined using the Legendre transform by

$$H^*(p, x) := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} (p \cdot z - H(z, x)).$$

We will actually assume slightly more than convexity, namely that

$$(2.1) \quad p \mapsto H^*(p, y) \text{ is locally uniformly convex on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The local uniform convexity simplifies the variational methods used below in defining the distance function.

We also assume that

$$(2.2) \quad H^* \in C_b^2(B_R \setminus \overline{B_{1/R}} \times \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ for all } R > 0,$$

$$(2.3) \quad p \mapsto H^*(p, y) \text{ is positively } q\text{-homogenous for some } q > 1,$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad H^*(p, y) > 0 \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } p \neq 0.$$

Observe that the homogeneity assumption (2.3) implies that the derivatives of H^* are also positively homogenous of degree $q-i$, where i is the number of derivatives taken in p . Meanwhile, the positivity assumption (2.4) along with the homogeneity means that H^* is coercive. This coercivity implies that

$$D_p H^*(p, y) = 0 \text{ if and only if } p = 0,$$

since otherwise $D_p H^*$ would be zero along a ray extending from the origin, contradicting the coercivity of H^* . Finally, the local uniform convexity implies that

$$D_p^2 H^*(p, y) > 0 \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } p \neq 0.$$

We summarize the above observations with the following list of growth estimates on H^* and its derivatives. For some constants $0 < c_0 \leq C_0$ and $C > 0$, the following hold for all $(p, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} c_0 |p|^q &\leq H^*(p, y) \leq C_0 |p|^q \\ c_0 |p|^{q-1} &\leq |D_p H^*(p, y)| \leq C_0 |p|^{q-1} \\ c_0 |p|^{q-2} \text{Id} &\leq D_p^2 H^*(p, y) \leq C_0 |p|^{q-2} \text{Id} \\ |D_y H^*(p, y)| &\leq C |p|^q \\ |D_{py}^2 H^*(p, y)| &\leq C |p|^{q-1} \\ |D_y^2 H^*(p, y)| &\leq C |p|^q. \end{aligned}$$

Here Id denotes the d -by- d identity matrix.

Note that when $1 \leq q < 2$, H^* is not twice-differentiable at $p = 0$, while if $q > 2$, H^* fails to be uniformly convex at $p = 0$. Notice also that (2.3) implies that H is positively homogenous of degree q' , where

$$q' := \frac{q}{q-1} \in (1, \infty)$$

is the dual exponent of q . Also, since H^* is locally uniformly convex away from $p = 0$, it follows by the implicit function theorem that, for each $p \neq 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the equation

$$p = D_p H^*(z, y)$$

is uniquely solvable for some $z(p, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, and the map $(p, y) \mapsto z(p, y)$ is in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $(H^*)^* = H$, this means that

$$H(p, y) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} (p \cdot z - H^*(z, y)) = p \cdot z(p, y) - H^*(z(p, y), y).$$

Therefore $z(p, y) = D_p H(p, y)$; in other words,

$$H(p, y) = p \cdot D_p H(p, y) - H^*(D_p H(p, y), y),$$

and the same holds with H^* and H interchanged. Note also that

$$D_y H(p, y) = -D_y H^*(D_p H(p, y), y),$$

also with H and H^* interchanged. Finally, observe that these formulas are also satisfied at $p = 0$ by the homogeneity of H and H^* . Since q and q' are strictly larger than 1, H and H^* are both differentiable at $p = 0$ with $D_p H^*(0, y) = D_p H(0, y) = 0$ for all y , although one or the other may not be twice-differentiable at $p = 0$. In any case, we conclude that, making c_0 smaller and C_0 and C larger if necessary, that $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and the bounds in (2.5) hold with H replacing H^* and the exponent q' replacing q .

An example of a Hamiltonian which satisfies the above properties is the generalized eikonal Hamiltonian

$$H(p, x) = \frac{1}{q'} \langle a(x)p, p \rangle^{q'/2},$$

where $a \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a symmetric, positive-definite matrix, in which case

$$H^*(p, x) = \frac{1}{q} \langle a^{-1}(x)p, p \rangle^{q/2}.$$

In the case $q = q' = 2$, H^* defines a Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^d , and the distance function defined below is in fact the Riemannian energy on the manifold \mathbb{R}^d with metric $g(x) := a^{-1}(x)$. This is the case treated in [6], so that our work is a generalization of theirs. In fact, our estimate (1.5) is actually an improvement of the corresponding estimate in [6], since we do not require a restriction on the size of $\|W^1 - W^2\|_\infty$ in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

2.2. Assumptions for Theorem 1.2. To obtain the homogenization result, we will need the spatial environment (in other words, the spatial dependence of H) to have certain structural properties. We consider only the *periodic* and the *stationary ergodic* cases.

In the periodic setting, we assume that

$$(2.6) \quad y \mapsto H(p, y) \text{ is } \mathbb{Z}^d\text{-periodic for each } p.$$

Periodic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations was first discussed in the unpublished paper of Lions, Papanicolaou, and Varadhan in [8]. Their work is also discussed and expanded upon in Evans [5], where a new method for obtaining convergence is considered, known as the “perturbed test function method.” To obtain these results, the only other assumption on H that is needed besides continuity is coercivity.

The stationary ergodic setting is more complicated to formulate. In this setting, the Hamiltonian belongs to the probability space Ω of functions $H \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying the various growth assumptions in the previous subsection. The σ -algebra \mathcal{F} is generated by maps

$$H \mapsto H(p, y) \text{ for } (p, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We then take a probability measure \mathbb{P} on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) that satisfies the following two properties:

(1) \mathbb{P} is *stationary*; i.e. for the translation operator

$$T_z H := \{(p, y) \mapsto H(p, y + z)\},$$

we have

$$(2.7a) \quad \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P} \circ T_z \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(2) \mathbb{P} is *ergodic*; i.e., for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$(2.7b) \quad T_z A = A \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ implies } \mathbb{P}[A] = 1 \text{ or } \mathbb{P}[A] = 0.$$

The first qualitative results for Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the stationary-ergodic setting were obtained independently by Souganidis in [19] and Rezakhanlou and Tarver in [16]. Armstrong and Souganidis later obtained homogenization results in [2] by studying the so-called “metric problem”, which is better suited to obtaining quantitative homogenization rates. Due to the probabilistic setting, these results are usually formulated in an almost-sure sense; in other words, homogenization occurs for \mathbb{P} -almost every Hamiltonian H in Ω . The common assumption in all these results is that H is convex (or at least level-set convex).

Still more assumptions in either setting are needed to obtain explicit homogenization error estimates. Rather than listing these assumptions, which can be quite complicated, especially in the stationary-ergodic setting, we simply assume H is the type of Hamiltonian for which homogenization is known to occur with a certain rate.

We define four semigroup solution operators as follows. For $t \geq 0$, S_+^ϵ and S_-^ϵ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S_\pm^\epsilon(t) : BUC(\mathbb{R}^d) &\rightarrow BUC(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ \phi &\mapsto S_\pm^\epsilon(t)\phi = U_\pm^\epsilon(\cdot, t) \end{aligned}$$

where U_\pm^ϵ solves the respective equations

$$\begin{cases} (U_\pm^\epsilon)_t = \pm H(DU_\pm^\epsilon, x/\epsilon) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ U_\pm^\epsilon = \phi & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}, \end{cases}$$

and, for some function $\overline{H} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, S_+ and S_- are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S_\pm(t) : BUC(\mathbb{R}^d) &\rightarrow BUC(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ \phi &\mapsto S_\pm(t)\phi = U_\pm(\cdot, t) \end{aligned}$$

where U solves the respective equations

$$\begin{cases} (U_\pm)_t = \pm \overline{H}(DU_\pm) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ U_\pm = \phi & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

The assumption we make is as follows: there exists a function \overline{H} satisfying the bounds of the previous subsection and there exists a constant $C(L)$ increasing in L such that for all $\phi \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\tau > 0$, and $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$(2.8a) \quad \sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \tau]} |S_\pm^\epsilon(t)\phi(x) - S_\pm(t)\phi(x)| \leq C(\|D\phi\|_\infty)(1 + \tau)\epsilon^{1/3}$$

in the periodic case; or, for some universal exponent $\beta > 0$,

$$(2.8b) \quad \sup_{(x,t) \in B_\tau \times [0, \tau]} |S_\pm^\epsilon(t)\phi(x) - S_\pm(t)\phi(x)| \leq C(\|D\phi\|_\infty)(1 + \tau)\epsilon^\beta.$$

in the stationary ergodic case.

In the periodic case, (2.8a) is automatically satisfied, since besides coercivity, the only extra assumption needed is a local Lipschitz bounds on H . The proof uses a quantitative version of the perturbed test function method to obtain the algebraic rate of $\frac{1}{3}$, and is given in [3] for the time-independent equation

$$u^\epsilon + H(Du^\epsilon, x, x/\epsilon) = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

A standard adaptation of the argument leads to the time dependent result (2.8a).

In the stationary-ergodic setting, the algebraic rate (2.8b) is obtained in [1] by quantifying the results of [2], with the precise value of the exponent β depending on the various assumptions on H . In this case, more complicated assumptions are needed. The most important of these is that the probability measure \mathbb{P} satisfy a unit range of dependence. More precisely, for an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let the σ -algebra $\mathcal{F}(U) \subset \mathcal{F}$ be generated by maps

$$H \mapsto H(p, y) \text{ for } (p, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times U.$$

The assumption is that whenever the Euclidean distance $d(U, V)$ for open sets U and V is greater than 1, the σ -algebras $\mathcal{F}(U)$ and $\mathcal{F}(V)$ are independent. This assumption is usually strictly stronger than the ergodicity requirement (2.7b). A full list of assumptions that ensure (2.8b) for some $\beta > 0$ can be found in [1].

3. THE DISTANCE FUNCTION

The distance function has a variational form in terms of the convex dual H^* . First, for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the class of admissible paths by

$$\mathcal{A}(x, y) = \left\{ \gamma \in W^{1,\infty}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \gamma_0 = x, \gamma_1 = y \right\}.$$

We define $\ell = \ell(x, y) \in \mathcal{A}(x, y)$ by

$$\ell_s = x + s(y - x),$$

the straight line between x and y , and note that

$$\mathcal{A}(x, y) = W_0^{1,\infty}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d) + \ell(x, y),$$

an affine translation of $W_0^{1,\infty}$.

The distance function associated to the Hamiltonian $H(\cdot, \cdot/\epsilon)$ is then defined by

$$(3.1) \quad L^\epsilon(x, y) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 H^* \left(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \frac{\gamma_s}{\epsilon} \right) ds \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{A}(x, y) \right\}.$$

We remark that $L^\epsilon(x, y) = \tilde{L}^\epsilon(x, y, 1)$, where

$$\tilde{L}^\epsilon(x, y, t) := \inf \left\{ \int_0^t H^* \left(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \frac{\gamma_s}{\epsilon} \right) ds \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{A}(x, y, t) \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}(x, y, t) := \left\{ \gamma \in W^{1,\infty}([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \gamma_0 = x, \gamma_t = y \right\}.$$

Then from known control formulas for Hamilton-Jacobi equations, \tilde{L}^ϵ is a viscosity solution of the equations

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \tilde{L}^\epsilon}{\partial t} + H(D_x \tilde{L}^\epsilon, x/\epsilon) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ \tilde{L}^\epsilon(x, y, 0) = +\infty & \text{if } x \neq y \\ \tilde{L}^\epsilon(y, y, 0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \tilde{L}^\epsilon}{\partial t} + H(-D_y \tilde{L}^\epsilon, y/\epsilon) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ \tilde{L}^\epsilon(x, y, 0) = +\infty & \text{if } x \neq y \\ \tilde{L}^\epsilon(x, x, 0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Because we assume H^* is positively q -homogenous, we actually have

$$\tilde{L}^\epsilon(x, y, t) = \frac{L^\epsilon(x, y)}{t^{q-1}},$$

which leads to the following corollary.

Lemma 3.1. *L^ϵ is a viscosity solution of the equations*

$$-(q-1)L^\epsilon + H(D_x L^\epsilon, x/\epsilon) = 0$$

and

$$-(q-1)L^\epsilon + H(-D_y L^\epsilon, y/\epsilon) = 0.$$

In particular, whenever L^ϵ is differentiable at (x, y) , the equality

$$H(D_x L^\epsilon, x/\epsilon) = H(-D_y L^\epsilon, y/\epsilon)$$

is satisfied in the classical sense.

We next prove that $L^\epsilon(x, y)$ is comparable to $|x - y|^q$ independently of ϵ . This is a consequence of the coercivity estimate on H^* given in the first line of (2.5).

Lemma 3.2. *For all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$c_0|x - y|^q \leq L^\epsilon(x, y) \leq C_0|x - y|^q.$$

Proof. By setting $\gamma = \ell$, the straight-line path between x and y , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L^\epsilon(x, y) &\leq \int_0^1 H^* \left(x - y, \frac{x + s(y - x)}{\epsilon} \right) ds \\ &\leq C_0|x - y|^q. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}(x, y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 H^* \left(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \frac{\gamma_s}{\epsilon} \right) ds &\geq c_0 \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}_s|^q ds \\ &\geq c_0 \left| \int_0^1 \dot{\gamma}_s ds \right|^q \quad \text{by Jensen's inequality} \\ &= c_0|x - y|^q, \end{aligned}$$

so taking the infimum over $\mathcal{A}(x, y)$ gives the lower bound. \square

Throughout the rest of the section, we prove various regularity estimates for L^ϵ that are used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. These estimates may or may not depend on ϵ , but the exact dependence is not important for what follows. Therefore, for simplicity, for the rest of this section we take $\epsilon = 1$ and write

$$L(x, y) := L^1(x, y).$$

Before proving regularity estimates, we show that the infimum in (3.1) is actually attained, and that the speed of the minimizer is comparable to the Euclidean distance between x and y .

Lemma 3.3. *There exists $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}(x, y)$ such that*

$$L(x, y) = \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds.$$

Furthermore, γ satisfies the pointwise bound

$$\left(\frac{c_0}{C_0}\right)^{1+q'} |x - y|^q \leq |\dot{\gamma}_s|^q \leq \left(\frac{C_0}{c_0}\right)^{2+q'} |x - y|^q$$

for almost every $s \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Let $\gamma^n \in \mathcal{A}(x, y)$ be a sequence of paths such that

$$\int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s^n) ds \leq L(x, y) + \frac{1}{n}.$$

From Lemma 3.2 and the lower bound on H^* , this means that

$$c_0 \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}_s^n|^q ds \leq C_0 |x - y|^q + \frac{1}{n}.$$

It follows that

$$\{\gamma^n\}_n \subset W_0^{1,q}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d) + \ell$$

is a bounded sequence, and therefore weakly precompact. Upon taking a subsequence (which we relabel as γ^n to avoid notational complexity), it follows that there exists $\gamma \in W_0^{1,q}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d) + \ell$ such that

$$\gamma^n \rightharpoonup \gamma$$

weakly in $W^{1,q}$. By Morrey's inequality,

$$\{\gamma^n\} \subset C^{0,1-\frac{1}{q}}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$$

is bounded, so that upon taking a further subsequence,

$$\gamma^n \rightarrow \gamma$$

uniformly.

We now write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s^n) ds &= \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s) ds - \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s^n) ds - \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The map

$$\eta \mapsto \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\eta}_s, \eta_s) ds$$

is convex because of the convexity of H^* , and therefore $W^{1,q}$ -weakly lower-semicontinuous. In other words,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s) ds - \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds \right) \geq 0.$$

Meanwhile, from the bound on $D_y H^*$ in (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s^n) ds - \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds \right| &\leq C_0 \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}_s^n|^q |\gamma_s^n - \gamma_s| ds \\ &\leq C_0 \|\gamma^n - \gamma\|_\infty (C_0 |x - y|^q + 1) \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s^n, \gamma_s^n) ds \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(x, y) + \frac{1}{n} \\ &= L(x, y) \\ &\leq \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

so γ is indeed a minimizer over the larger space $W_0^{1,q}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d) + \ell$.

Since γ is a minimizer, it is a weak solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} [D_p H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s)] + D_y H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) = 0.$$

Set

$$p_s = D_p H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s),$$

so that

$$\dot{\gamma}_s = -D_p H(p_s, \gamma_s).$$

Then from the Euler-Lagrange equation, p is absolutely continuous and satisfies

$$\dot{p}_s = -D_y H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) = D_y H(p_s, \gamma_s).$$

In other words, γ and p solve the Hamilton ODEs from classical mechanics. Thus H is a conserved quantity; in other words,

$$(3.4) \quad H(p_s, \gamma_s) = \mathcal{Q}$$

for some constant \mathcal{Q} independent of $s \in [0, 1]$.

We estimate \mathcal{Q} by integrating (3.4) on $[0, 1]$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} &= \int_0^1 H(p_s, \gamma_s) ds \\ &\geq c_0 \int_0^1 |p_s|^{q'} ds \\ &= c_0 \int_0^1 |D_p H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s)|^{q'} ds \\ &\geq c_0^{1+q'} \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}_s|^q ds \\ &\geq c_0^{1+q'} |x - y|^q \end{aligned}$$

by Jensen's inequality. A similar argument yields

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq C_0^{1+q'} \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}_s|^q ds \leq \frac{C_0^{1+q'}}{c_0} L(x, y) \leq \frac{C_0^{2+q'}}{c_0} |x - y|^q.$$

The same argument without the integrals then shows that $|\dot{\gamma}_s|$ is pointwise comparable to \mathcal{Q} . Rearranging terms, we obtain the desired estimate, which also shows that γ is Lipschitz and therefore lies in $\mathcal{A}(x, y)$. \square

We now study the regularity of L . For $R > 0$, define the open set

$$\Delta_R := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d : |x - y| < R \right\}.$$

We first obtain Lipschitz estimates on neighborhoods Δ_R .

Lemma 3.4. *For every $R_0 > 0$, there exists a constant C depending only on R_0 such that for any $0 < R \leq R_0$, L is Lipschitz with the bound*

$$|DL(x, y)| \leq CR^{q-1}$$

on the open set Δ_R .

By Rademacher's theorem, this means that L actually solves the equations in Lemma 3.1 almost everywhere.

Proof. The Lipschitz bound is equivalent to showing that the first distributional derivative of L is in L_{loc}^∞ , which is equivalent to showing that

$$\limsup_{|h|, |k| \rightarrow 0} \frac{|L(x + h, y + k) - L(x, y)|}{|h| + |k|} \leq CR^{q-1}.$$

Pick $(x, y) \in \Delta_R$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}(x, y)$ be a minimizer for $L(x, y)$. Then the path $s \mapsto \gamma_s + sh$ lies in $\mathcal{A}(x, y + h)$. Recalling that $|\dot{\gamma}_s| \leq C|x - y|$ almost everywhere, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, y + h) - L(x, y) &\leq \int_0^1 (H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s - h, \gamma_s + sh) - H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s)) ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^1 [(|\dot{\gamma}_s|^{q-1} + |h|^{q-1}) |h| + (|\dot{\gamma}_s|^q + |h|^q) |sh|] ds \\ &\leq C|h| \int_0^1 (|\dot{\gamma}|^{q-1} + |h|^{q-1} + |\dot{\gamma}|^q + |h|^q) ds \\ &\leq C|h| \int_0^1 (R^{q-1} + |h|^{q-1} + R^q + |h|^q) ds \\ &\leq C|h|(R^q + R^{q-1}) + o(|h|) \\ &\leq CR^{q-1}|h| + o(|h|). \end{aligned}$$

By switching the roles of y and $y + h$, and taking h small enough that $(x, y + h) \in \Delta_R$, we obtain the opposite inequality, so that

$$|L(x, y) - L(x, y + h)| \leq CR^{q-1}|h| + o(|h|).$$

To obtain the bound for $D_x L$, one may apply a similar argument, or simply note that the function

$$\hat{L}(x, y) := L(y, x)$$

is the distance function for the Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}(p, y) := H(-p, y)$, whose convex dual satisfies the same bounds in (2.5). \square

In the case where $H^*(p, y) = \frac{1}{2}\langle g(y)p, p \rangle$, the distance function is the Riemannian energy associated to \mathbb{R}^d with the metric g . Therefore, in some small geodesic neighborhood of the diagonal, L is actually C^1 , as explained in [6]. In [9], a similar result is obtained for the distance functions they consider. We give such a result here, which is more general than in the Riemannian manifold context, but still simpler than [9].

Lemma 3.5. *For some $r_0 > 0$,*

$$L \in C^1(\Delta_{r_0}).$$

Proof. Define the map

$$\begin{aligned} I : W_0^{1,q}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (\gamma, x, y) &\mapsto \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s + x - y, \gamma_s + x + s(y - x)) \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$L(x, y) = \min_{\gamma \in W_0^{1,q}} I(\gamma, x, y),$$

and that by Lemma 3.3, the minimum is attained for some $\gamma \in W_0^{1,\infty}$ satisfying

$$c|x - y| \leq |\dot{\gamma}_s + y - x| \leq C|x - y|$$

for some universal constants $0 < c \leq C$. Because of this, for bounded $|x - y|$, we can assume that H^* grows at most quadratically by redefining H^* outside of $B_R \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for some large $R > 0$. It follows that the map I can be defined as before on

$$W_0^{1,2} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and that I has the same minimizers.

Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be such a minimizer. Then the Fréchet derivative

$$D_\gamma I : W_0^{1,2} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (W_0^{1,2})^*$$

satisfies

$$D_\gamma I(\tilde{\gamma}, x, y) = 0.$$

We also calculate the second Fréchet derivative

$$D_\gamma^2 I : W_0^{1,2} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{L}\left(W_0^{1,2}, (W_0^{1,2})^*\right),$$

obtaining, for arbitrary $\xi, \eta \in W_0^{1,2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\gamma^2 I(\tilde{\gamma}, x, y)[\xi, \eta] &= \int_0^1 \langle D_p^2 H^*(\Gamma_s) \dot{\xi}_s, \dot{\eta}_s \rangle - \langle D_{px}^2 H^*(\Gamma_s) \dot{\xi}_s, \eta_s \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle D_{xp}^2 H^*(\Gamma_s) \xi_s, \dot{\eta}_s \rangle + \langle D_x^2 H^*(\Gamma_s) \xi_s, \eta_s \rangle \, ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we write $\Gamma_s = (-\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_s + x - y, \tilde{\gamma}_s + x + s(y - x))$ for simplicity. Using the second derivative bounds in (2.5), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 I(\tilde{\gamma}, x, y)[\eta, \eta] &\geq c \int_0^1 (|x - y|^{q-2} |\dot{\eta}_s|^2 - |x - y|^{q-1} |\dot{\eta}_s| |\eta_s| - |x - y|^q |\eta_s|^2) ds \\ &= c |x - y|^{q-2} \int_0^1 (|\dot{\eta}_s|^2 - C |x - y| |\dot{\eta}_s| |\eta_s| - C |x - y|^2 |\eta_s|^2) ds \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants c and C .

For any $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $C = C_\delta > 0$ such that

$$|x - y| |\dot{\eta}_s| |\eta_s| \leq \delta |\dot{\eta}_s|^2 + C |x - y|^2 |\eta_s|^2$$

by Young's inequality. Therefore, taking δ small enough, we obtain

$$D_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 I(\tilde{\gamma}, x, y)[\eta, \eta] \geq c |x - y|^{q-2} \int_0^1 (|\dot{\eta}_s|^2 - C |x - y|^2 |\eta_s|^2) ds$$

for a possibly smaller c and larger C .

By Poincaré's inequality, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^1 |\eta_s|^2 ds \leq C \int_0^1 |\dot{\eta}_s|^2 ds$$

for all η . We conclude that

$$D_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 I(\tilde{\gamma}, x, y)[\eta, \eta] \geq c |x - y|^{q-2} (1 - C |x - y|^2) \int_0^1 |\dot{\eta}_s|^2 ds$$

for constants c and C . It follows that there exists small enough $r_0 > 0$ such that for some constant $c > 0$, for all $(x, y) \in \Delta_{r_0}$, for any minimizer γ , and for any $\eta \in W_0^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$D_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 I(\tilde{\gamma}, x, y)[\eta, \eta] \geq c |x - y|^{q-2} \|\eta\|_{W_0^{1,2}}^2.$$

As a consequence, for $(x, y) \in \Delta_{r_0}$ with $x \neq y$, the map $I(\cdot, x, y)$ has a *unique* minimizer $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma(x, y)$. Also, for any $\eta \in W_0^{1,2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 I(\gamma(x, y), x, y)[\cdot, \eta]\|_{(W_0^{1,2})^*} &= \sup_{\|\xi\|_{W_0^{1,2}}=1} |D_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 I(\gamma(x, y), x, y)[\xi, \eta]| \\ &\geq D_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 I(\gamma(x, y), x, y) \left[\frac{\eta}{\|\eta\|_{W_0^{1,2}}}, \eta \right] \\ &\geq c |x - y|^{q-2} \|\eta\|_{W_0^{1,2}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the implicit function theorem that $(x, y) \mapsto \gamma(x, y)$ is actually C^1 , and therefore

$$L(x, y) = I(\gamma(x, y), x, y)$$

is C^1 on Δ_{r_0} away from the diagonal. That L is differentiable at (x, x) for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a consequence of Lemma 3.2. \square

By scaling in ϵ , this means that

$$L^\epsilon \in C^1(\Delta_{\epsilon r_0}).$$

Therefore, the strip in which L^ϵ is differentiable is shrinking as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. It turns out that this is not enough to prove the extension estimate (1.5) appearing in Theorem 1.1 without putting a

restriction on the size of $\|W^1 - W^2\|_\infty$, as in [6], that shrinks with ϵ . Instead, we must study the regularity of L away from the fixed strip Δ_{r_0} , which leads to the next Lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *The function L is locally semiconcave. More precisely, for every $R_0 > 0$, there exists a constant C depending only on R_0 such that for any $0 < R \leq R_0$, the following holds:*

(1) *If $q \geq 2$, then*

$$D^2L(x, y) \leq CR^{q-2}$$

on Δ_R .

(2) *If $q < 2$, then for $r > 0$,*

$$D^2L(x, y) \leq C \left(R^{q-1} + \frac{1}{r^{2-q}} \right)$$

on $\Delta_R \setminus \overline{\Delta_r}$.

Proof. The semiconcavity estimate is equivalent to showing that

$$\limsup_{|h|, |k| \rightarrow 0} \frac{L(x+h, y+k) + L(x-h, y-k) - 2L(x, y)}{|h|^2 + |k|^2}$$

satisfies the same bound.

Pick a minimizer $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}(x, y)$ for $L(x, y)$. Let $h, k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and define

$$\eta_s = h + s(k - h),$$

the straight line path between h and k . Observe that

$$(3.5) \quad |\eta_s| + |\dot{\eta}_s| \leq C(|h| + |k|)$$

for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Also, $\gamma + \eta \in \mathcal{A}(x+h, y+k)$ and $\gamma - \eta \in \mathcal{A}(x-h, y-k)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} L(x+h, y+k) + L(x-h, y-k) &\leq \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s - \dot{\eta}_s, \gamma_s + \eta_s) ds + \int_0^t H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s + \dot{\eta}_s, \gamma_s - \eta_s) ds \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^1 H^*(-\dot{\gamma}_s, \gamma_s) ds + C(\text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= \int_0^1 (|\dot{\gamma}_s + \dot{\eta}_s|^{q-2}) |\dot{\eta}_s|^2 ds, \\ \text{II} &= \int_0^1 (|\dot{\gamma}_s|^{q-1} + |\dot{\eta}_s|^{q-1}) |\dot{\eta}_s| |\eta_s| ds, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{III} = \int_0^1 (|\dot{\gamma}_s|^q + |\dot{\eta}_s|^q) |\eta_s|^2 ds.$$

The quantities II and III can be bounded using (3.5) and the upper bound on $|\dot{\gamma}|$ in Lemma 3.3, yielding

$$\text{II} \leq CR^{q-1}(|h|^2 + |k|^2) + o(|h|^2 + |k|^2)$$

and

$$\text{III} \leq CR^q(|h|^2 + |k|^2) + o(|h|^2 + |k|^2).$$

When $q \geq 2$, we can do the same for the quantity I to obtain

$$\text{I} \leq CR^{q-2}(|h|^2 + |k|^2) + o(|h|^2 + |k|^2).$$

When $q < 2$, so that the exponent $q - 2$ is negative, we use the lower bound in Lemma 3.3 and the fact that $|x - y| > r$. If h and k are taken small enough, then

$$|\dot{\gamma}_s + \dot{\eta}_s| \geq |\dot{\gamma}_s| - |\dot{\eta}_s| \geq cr$$

for some constant $c > 0$, and therefore

$$I \leq C \frac{1}{r^{2-q}}(|h|^2 + |k|^2) + o(|h|^2 + |k|^2).$$

Since $R < R_0$, we conclude that

$$L(x + h, y + k) + L(x - h, y - k) \leq 2L(x, y) + CR^{q-2}(|h|^2 + |k|^2) + o(|h|^2 + |k|^2)$$

when $q \geq 2$ and

$$L(x + h, y + k) + L(x - h, y - k) \leq 2L(x, y) + C \left(R^{q-1} + \frac{1}{r^{2-q}} \right) (|h|^2 + |k|^2) + o(|h|^2 + |k|^2)$$

when $q < 2$. □

For a function f on \mathbb{R}^m , the semiconcavity bound

$$D^2f \leq C$$

is equivalent to the statement that $f(x) - \frac{C}{2}|x|^2$ is concave. Because concave functions have a supporting hyperplane from above at every point, Lemma 3.6 implies that the *superjet* to L at (x, y) , defined by

$$J^+L(x, y) := \left\{ (p, q) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \mid L(\xi, \eta) \leq L(x, y) + \langle p, \xi - x \rangle + \langle q, \eta - y \rangle + o(|\xi - x| + |\eta - y|) \right\},$$

is nonempty for every point (x, y) (with $x \neq y$ for $q < 2$). This means that whenever the *subject* to L at (x, y) , given by

$$J^-L(x, y) := \left\{ (p, q) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \mid L(\xi, \eta) \geq L(x, y) + \langle p, \xi - x \rangle + \langle q, \eta - y \rangle + o(|\xi - x| + |\eta - y|) \right\},$$

is nonempty for some (x, y) , then L must be differentiable at (x, y) (this is true even if $x = y$ and $q < 2$, since by Lemma 3.2, L is always differentiable on the diagonal). This proves useful in the proof of inequality (1.5) in the next section.

4. WELL-POSEDNESS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. This has two parts: uniqueness of solutions through the comparison principle, and existence by proving the extension estimate (1.5).

4.1. Uniqueness. We first prove that for each fixed $\epsilon > 0$, solutions of (1.1) are unique. For simplicity, we assume $\epsilon = 1$ in this subsection. Then we have the following comparison principle:

Proposition 4.1. *Let u and v be bounded sub and supersolutions, respectively, of the equation*

$$(4.1) \quad dw = H(Dw, x) \circ dW.$$

Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, t) - v(x, t)) \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, 0) - v(x, 0)).$$

Uniqueness follows by letting u and v both be solutions with the same initial condition $u_0 \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and applying the comparison principle interchangeably with u and v .

Using Proposition 4.1, we can apply Perron's method as in [18] to construct the unique solution of (1.1), at least when $1 < q \leq 2$ (the case when H is C^2 everywhere). The statement of Perron's method is that the solution is equal to the "maximal subsolution" of (1.1), giving an alternative characterization of solutions of (1.1), the other being as the limit of solutions of equations with regularized paths through estimate (1.5) (which holds even when $q > 2$).

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Suppose the comparison principle does not hold for some u and v , so that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, t) - v(x, t)) > \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, 0) - v(x, 0))$$

for some $t > 0$.

By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$c_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q \leq \lambda^{q-1} L(x, y) \leq C_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, for some $T > 0$ and $t_0 \in (0, T]$, there is a small enough $\mu > 0$ such that, for all large enough $\lambda > 0$, the function

$$t \mapsto \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \lambda^{q-1} L(x, y)) - \mu t$$

attains its maximum on $[0, T]$ at $t = t_0$.

For $\lambda > 0$, define

$$\Phi_\lambda(x, y, s, t) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda(W_t - W_s)} \right)^{q-1} L(x, y).$$

Then by Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.5, the functions

$$(x, s) \mapsto \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s, t) \text{ with } (y, t) \text{ fixed}$$

and

$$(y, t) \mapsto -\Phi_\lambda(x, y, s, t) \text{ with } (x, s) \text{ fixed}$$

are C^1 in x (resp. y) and solve (4.1) whenever $(x, y) \in \Delta_{r_0}$ and $\rho(|s - t|) < \frac{1}{2\lambda}$ (recall that ρ is the modulus of continuity for W). This can be computed with standard calculus if W is C^1 , or with stochastic calculus if W is some stochastic process, since the Stratonovich differential satisfies the chain rule.

Let $M > 0$ be a common bound for $|u|$ and $|v|$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$. For

$$(4.2) \quad \lambda > \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{2M}{c_0 r_0^q} \right)^{\frac{1}{q-1}}$$

and for $\theta > 0$, consider the auxiliary function

$$(4.3) \quad (s, t) \mapsto \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, s) - v(y, t) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s, t)) - \frac{|s - t|^2}{2\theta} - \mu \frac{s + t}{2},$$

which attains a maximum at some (s_θ, t_θ) in the closed set

$$S_\lambda = \left\{ (s, t) \in [0, T]^2 : \rho(|s - t|) \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} \right\}.$$

We then have

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{|s_\theta - t_\theta|^2}{2\theta} = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, s_\theta) - v(y, t_\theta) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s_\theta, t_\theta)) - \frac{|s_\theta - t_\theta|^2}{2\theta} - \mu \frac{s_\theta + t_\theta}{2} \\
&= \max_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \lambda^{q-1} L(x, y)) - \mu t \\
&= \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, t_0) - v(y, t_0) - \lambda^{q-1} L(x, y)) - \mu t_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the maximum points s_θ and t_θ can be chosen such that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} (s_\theta, t_\theta) = (t_0, t_0),$$

and so for all small $\theta > 0$, we have $s_\theta > 0$, $t_\theta > 0$, and $\rho(|s_\theta - t_\theta|) < \frac{1}{2\lambda}$.

We first claim that

$$(4.4) \quad s \mapsto \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, s) - v(y, t_\theta) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s, t_\theta))$$

is nonincreasing in the interval

$$[a, b] := \left\{ s \in [0, T] : \rho(|s - t_\theta|) < \frac{1}{2\lambda} \right\}.$$

To do so, it suffices to prove that

$$s \mapsto \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, s) - v(y, t) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s, t_\theta))$$

is nonincreasing in $[a, b]$ for each fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that this is not the case for some $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for sufficiently small $\alpha > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, s) - \Phi_\lambda(x, \bar{y}, s, t_\theta)) - \alpha s$$

attains a local maximum at some $\hat{s} > a$. Since $\rho(|s - t_\theta|) < \frac{1}{2\lambda}$, we have

$$c_0 \left(\frac{2}{3} \lambda \right)^{q-1} |x - \bar{y}|^q \leq \Phi_\lambda(x, \bar{y}, \hat{s}, t_\theta),$$

so that the supremum over $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is attained; in other words,

$$(x, s) \mapsto u(x, s) - \Phi_\lambda(x, \bar{y}, s, t_\theta) - \alpha s$$

attains a maximum at (\hat{x}, \hat{s}) for some $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Furthermore, we have

$$c_0 \left(\frac{2}{3} \lambda \right)^{q-1} |x - \bar{y}|^q \leq u(x, s) - u(\bar{y}, s) \leq 2M,$$

so by (4.2), we must have $(\hat{x}, \bar{y}) \in \Delta_{r_0}$. Because $\Phi_\lambda(\cdot, \bar{y}, \cdot, t_\theta)$ is smooth at (\hat{x}, \hat{s}) , we can apply Definition 1 to obtain

$$\alpha \leq 0,$$

which is a contradiction because α is positive. We conclude that the function (4.4) is nonincreasing on $[a, b]$. A similar argument, using that v is a supersolution, yields that

$$(4.5) \quad t \mapsto \inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d} (v(y, t) - u(x, s_\theta) + \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s_\theta, t))$$

is nondecreasing in the interval

$$[c, d] := \left\{ t \in [0, T] : \rho(|s_\theta - t|) < \frac{1}{2\lambda} \right\}.$$

We now apply this information to the maximum point (s_θ, t_θ) of (4.3). First, the map

$$s \mapsto \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, s) - v(y, t_\theta) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s, t_\theta)) - \frac{|s - t_\theta|^2}{2\theta} - \mu \frac{s}{2}$$

attains a maximum at s_θ with $s_\theta > a$ (since $\rho(|s_\theta - t_\theta|) < \frac{1}{2\lambda}$ with strict inequality). Because (4.4) is nonincreasing, we must have

$$\frac{\mu}{2} + \frac{s_\theta - t_\theta}{\theta} \leq 0.$$

Similarly, the map

$$t \mapsto \inf_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d} (v(y, t) - u(x, s_\theta) + \Phi_\lambda(x, y, s_\theta, t)) + \frac{|s_\theta - t|^2}{2\theta} + \mu \frac{t}{2}$$

attains a minimum at t_θ with $t_\theta > c$, so because (4.5) is nondecreasing, we must have

$$-\frac{\mu}{2} + \frac{s_\theta - t_\theta}{\theta} \geq 0.$$

Combining the two inequalities, we conclude that

$$\mu \leq 0,$$

which contradicts the fact that μ is positive, and the result follows. \square

4.2. Extension of solution operator. We now prove the second part of Theorem 1.1, namely estimate (1.5). The main ingredient in the proof is the following slightly more general statement.

Proposition 4.2. *For $u_0, v_0 \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\xi, \zeta \in C^1([0, \infty))$, let u be a subsolution of*

$$\begin{cases} u_t = H(Du, x/\epsilon) \dot{\xi}_t & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ u = u_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\} \end{cases}$$

and let v be a supersolution of

$$\begin{cases} v_t = H(Dv, x/\epsilon) \dot{\zeta}_t & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ v = v_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

Assume $\xi_0 = \zeta_0$. Then for all $T > 0$, $t \in [0, T]$, and all $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{\|\xi - \zeta\|_{C([0, T])}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(u(x, t) - v(y, t) - C_0 \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda(\xi_t - \zeta_t)} \right)^{q-1} |x - y|^q \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u_0(x) - v_0(y) - c_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q). \end{aligned}$$

Before proving Proposition 4.2, we derive some corollaries from it, the first being the proof of estimate (1.5).

Proof that (1.5) holds. Assume first that $W^1, W^2 \in C^1((0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$. Also assume without loss of generality that $W^1(0) = W^2(0)$, since otherwise we can subtract a constant from either path. Fix $T > 0$ and write

$$\|W^1 - W^2\|_\infty = \|W^1 - W^2\|_{C([0, T])}.$$

Since both u^1 and u^2 are sub and supersolutions, we may apply Proposition 4.2 with u^1 and u^2 interchangeably. Taking $x = y$ in the first supremum, we obtain

$$|u^1(x, t) - u^2(x, t)| \leq \|u_0^1 - u_0^2\|_\infty + \max_{\phi=u_0^1, u_0^2} \left\{ \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\phi(x) - \phi(y) - c_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q) \right\}$$

for all $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{\|W^1 - W^2\|_\infty}$ and $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$.

Recall from the Introduction that for a modulus of continuity ω and $\lambda > 0$, we define

$$\theta(\omega, \lambda) = \sup_{r \geq 0} (\omega(r) - c_0 \lambda^{q-1} r^q).$$

Taking $\omega_{u_0^1, u_0^2}$ to be the maximum of the moduli of continuity for u_0^1 and u_0^2 , this means

$$|u^1(x, t) - u^2(x, t)| \leq \|u_0^1 - u_0^2\|_\infty + \theta(\omega_{u_0^1, u_0^2}, \lambda)$$

for all $\lambda < \frac{1}{\|W^1 - W^2\|_\infty}$. Taking $\lambda \uparrow \frac{1}{\|W^1 - W^2\|_\infty}$ completes the proof, at least when W^1 and W^2 are smooth.

As discussed in the Introduction, since (1.5) holds for smooth paths, we can extend the solution operator to continuous paths by a standard density argument and by the uniqueness for solutions of equation (1.1). It then follows that (1.5) holds for all continuous paths W^1 and W^2 . \square

Another important corollary is the fact that solutions of (1.1) are uniformly continuous with a modulus of continuity depending only on u_0 , and not on the path W or $\epsilon > 0$.

Corollary 4.1. *Let u^ϵ solve (1.1) with initial condition $u_0 \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^d)$. If ω_{u_0} is the modulus of continuity for u_0 , define*

$$\omega(s) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} (C_0 \lambda^{q-1} s^q + \theta(\omega_{u_0}, \lambda)).$$

Then for all $t \geq 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|u^\epsilon(x, t) - u^\epsilon(y, t)| \leq \omega(|x - y|).$$

For instance, if $u_0 \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with Lipschitz constant L , so that $\omega_{u_0}(r) = Lr$, then for some constant $C = C(L) > 0$,

$$\theta(\omega_{u_0}, \lambda) = C(L) \lambda^{-1}$$

and so for another constant $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(L) > 0$,

$$\omega(s) = \tilde{C}(L) s.$$

Therefore solutions of the equation in Corollary 4.1 with Lipschitz initial condition are Lipschitz in space for all time, with Lipschitz constant independent of ϵ or W . This is a fact that we exploit in the proof of Theorem 1.2 in the next section.

Proof of Corollary 4.1. Assume first that W is C^1 . We apply Proposition 4.2 with $u_0^1 = u_0^2 = u_0$ and $\xi = \zeta = W$ to obtain, for any $\lambda > 0$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} u^\epsilon(x, t) - u^\epsilon(y, t) &\leq C_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q + \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u_0(x) - u_0(y) - c_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q) \\ &\leq C_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q + \sup_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d} (\omega_{u_0}(|x - y|) - c_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q) \\ &\leq C_0 \lambda^{q-1} |x - y|^q + \theta(\omega_{u_0}, \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over λ finishes the proof for smooth paths W . A standard density argument and (1.5) complete the proof for arbitrary continuous paths W . \square

We now present the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. For simplicity, we first assume $\epsilon = 1$. Standard viscosity theory yields that

$$z(x, y, t) = u(x, t) - v(y, t)$$

is a subsolution of the doubled equation

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} z_t = H(D_x z, x) \dot{\xi}_t - H(-D_y z, y) \dot{\zeta}_t & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \\ z(x, y, 0) = u_0(x) - v_0(y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$\Phi_\lambda(x, y, t) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda(\xi_t - \zeta_t)} \right)^{q-1} L(x, y),$$

which is well-defined and a positive multiple of L whenever $0 < \lambda < \|\xi - \zeta\|_\infty$.

Observe that

$$\Phi_\lambda(x, y, 0) = \lambda^{q-1} L(x, y),$$

and that by Lemma 3.1, Φ satisfies the doubled equation (4.6) whenever L is differentiable at (x, y) .

For parameters $0 < \beta < 1$ and $\mu > 0$, consider the auxiliary function

$$\Psi(x, y, t) = u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, t) - \frac{\beta}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) - \mu t.$$

Fix $T > 0$. Because u and v are bounded, Ψ attains a maximum on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$ at some point $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t})$ that depends on the parameters β and μ . Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\hat{t} > 0$.

By rearranging terms in the inequality $\Psi(0, 0, \hat{t}) \leq \Psi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t})$ and using the fact that $\Phi_\lambda(x, y, t) \geq 0$ with equality if $x = y$, we obtain

$$\frac{\beta}{2}(|\hat{x}|^2 + |\hat{y}|^2) \leq u(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) - v(\hat{y}, \hat{t}) - (u(\hat{0}, \hat{t}) - v(\hat{0}, \hat{t})),$$

so that

$$\beta(|\hat{x}|^2 + |\hat{y}|^2) \leq 4(\|u\|_\infty + \|v\|_\infty).$$

In particular,

$$\beta(|\hat{x}| + |\hat{y}|) \leq C\beta^{1/2}$$

for some constant C depending only on the data (by “the data” we mean the functions (u_0, ξ) and (v_0, ζ) , and not either of the parameters β or μ). Therefore

$$\|(\hat{x}, \hat{y})\| \leq \frac{R}{\beta^{1/2}}$$

for some constant R depending only on the data.

By rearranging terms in the inequality $\Psi(\hat{y}, \hat{y}, \hat{t}) \leq \Psi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t})$ and using Lemma 3.2, we obtain the estimate

$$c_0 \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda(\xi_{\hat{t}} - \zeta_{\hat{t}})} \right)^{q-1} |\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^q \leq u(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) - u(\hat{y}, \hat{t}) + \frac{\beta}{2} (|\hat{y}|^2 - |\hat{x}|^2) \leq C$$

for some constant C depending only on the data. It follows that, enlarging R if necessary (but so that it still only depends on the data), we have

$$(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \Delta_R.$$

Note that R may depend on λ , but that increasing λ does not increase R . Since we never consider λ close to 0, we may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda \geq 1$.

If Φ_λ is differentiable at $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t})$, we may apply the definition of viscosity solution to obtain the result. This will be the case if λ is large enough, since then, as in the proof the comparison principle in Proposition 4.1, where we need (4.2), we will have $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \Delta_{r_0}$ for r_0 as in Lemma 3.5. But for λ to be large enough, this requires an upper bound on $\|\xi - \zeta\|_\infty$ that depends on r_0 , as in [6]. For arbitrary ϵ , this requires an upper bound on $\|\xi - \zeta\|_\infty$ depending on ϵr_0 (see the remark following Lemma 3.5). This would prevent estimate (1.5) from being independent of $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, we need to find points of differentiability of L away from Δ_{r_0} .

To do so, we double variables once more and take advantage of the semiconcavity of L . For another parameter $0 < \delta < 1$, define the second auxiliary function

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\delta(x, y, z, w, t) &= u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \frac{1}{2}|x - \hat{x}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|y - \hat{y}|^2 - \frac{1}{2\delta}(|x - z|^2 + |y - w|^2) \\ &\quad - \Phi_\lambda(z, w, t) - \frac{\beta}{2}(|z|^2 + |w|^2) - \mu t - \frac{1}{2}|t - \hat{t}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\Omega_{R,\beta} = \left\{ (x, y) \in \Delta_{2R} \mid \|(x, y)\| < 2R\beta^{-1/2} \right\}$$

and let $(x_\delta, y_\delta, z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta)$ be a maximum point of Ψ_δ on the set

$$\overline{\Omega_{R,\beta} \times \Omega_{R,\beta} \times [0, T]}.$$

By Lemma 3.4, the function $\Phi_\lambda(z, w, t) + (\beta/2)(|z|^2 + |w|^2)$ is Lipschitz on this bounded set, with

$$\|D_{z,w}\Phi_\lambda + (\beta/2)(|\cdot|^2 + |\cdot|^2)\| \leq C(R^{q-1} + R\beta^{1/2}) \leq CR^{q-1}$$

where C depends only on the data. Then by rearranging terms in the inequality $\Psi_\delta(x_\delta, y_\delta, x_\delta, y_\delta, t_\delta) \leq \Psi_\delta(x_\delta, y_\delta, z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\delta} (|x_\delta - z_\delta|^2 + |y_\delta - w_\delta|^2) &\leq \Phi_\lambda(x_\delta, y_\delta, t_\delta) - \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) + \frac{\beta}{2} (|x_\delta|^2 + |y_\delta|^2 - |z_\delta|^2 - |w_\delta|^2) \\ &\leq CR^{q-1} (|x_\delta - z_\delta| + |y_\delta - w_\delta|). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|x_\delta - z_\delta| + |y_\delta - w_\delta| \leq CR^{q-1}\delta.$$

Observe now that $\Psi_\delta(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t}) = \Psi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t})$. In particular, since

$$(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t}) \in \Omega_{R,\beta} \times \Omega_{R,\beta} \times [0, T],$$

we have the sequence of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t}) &= u(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) - v(\hat{y}, \hat{t}) - \Phi_\lambda(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t}) - \frac{\beta}{2}(|\hat{x}|^2 + |\hat{y}|^2) - \mu\hat{t} \\
&\leq u(x_\delta, t_\delta) - v(y_\delta, t_\delta) - \frac{1}{2}|x_\delta - \hat{x}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|y_\delta - \hat{y}|^2 - \frac{1}{2\delta}(|x_\delta - z_\delta|^2 + |y_\delta - w_\delta|^2) \\
&\quad - \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) - \frac{\beta}{2}(|z_\delta|^2 + |w_\delta|^2) - \mu t_\delta - \frac{1}{2}|t_\delta - \hat{t}|^2 \\
&\leq \Psi(x_\delta, y_\delta, t_\delta) + \Phi_\lambda(x_\delta, y_\delta, t_\delta) - \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) + \frac{\beta}{2}(|x_\delta|^2 + |y_\delta|^2 - |z_\delta|^2 - |w_\delta|^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}(|x_\delta - \hat{x}|^2 + |y_\delta - \hat{y}|^2 - |t_\delta - \hat{t}|^2) \\
&\leq \Psi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t}) + C(|x_\delta - z_\delta| + |y_\delta - w_\delta|) - \frac{1}{2}(|x_\delta - \hat{x}|^2 + |y_\delta - \hat{y}|^2 - |t_\delta - \hat{t}|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms, this yields

$$|x_\delta - \hat{x}|^2 + |y_\delta - \hat{y}|^2 + |t_\delta - \hat{t}|^2 \leq C\delta$$

for a constant C depending only on u and v . Therefore, if δ is small enough, we see that

$$(x_\delta, y_\delta, z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) \in \Omega_{R,\beta} \times \Omega_{R,\beta} \times (0, T]$$

is a local interior maximum. A standard argument from the theory of time-dependent viscosity solutions yields that we may assume $t_\delta < T$, since otherwise we can subtract a penalization function of the form $\frac{\nu}{T-t}$ from Ψ_δ for some $\nu \rightarrow 0$ (see [4]).

First, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(x, y, t) &\mapsto u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \frac{1}{2}|x - \hat{x}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|y - \hat{y}|^2 - \frac{1}{2\delta}(|x - z_\delta|^2 + |y - w_\delta|^2) \\
&\quad - \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t) - \mu t - \frac{1}{2}|t - \hat{t}|^2
\end{aligned}$$

attains an interior maximum at $(x_\delta, y_\delta, t_\delta)$. Applying the definition of viscosity solution for the doubled equation (4.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu + t_\delta - \hat{t} + \frac{\partial \Phi_\lambda}{\partial t}(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) &\leq H\left(\frac{x_\delta - z_\delta}{\delta} + x_\delta - \hat{x}, x_\delta\right) \dot{\xi}_{t_\delta} \\
&\quad - H\left(-\frac{y_\delta - w_\delta}{\delta} - (y_\delta - \hat{y}), y_\delta\right) \dot{\zeta}_{t_\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that

$$(z, w) \mapsto \Phi_\lambda(z, w, t_\delta) + \frac{1}{2\delta}(|x_\delta - z|^2 + |y_\delta - w|^2) + \frac{\beta}{2}(|z|^2 + |w|^2)$$

attains a minimum at (z_δ, w_δ) . By the discussion following Lemma 3.6, Φ_λ is in fact differentiable at (z_δ, w_δ) , and so we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_x \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) &= \frac{x_\delta - z_\delta}{\delta} - \beta z_\delta, \\
D_y \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) &= \frac{y_\delta - w_\delta}{\delta} - \beta w_\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_\lambda}{\partial t}(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) = H(D_x \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta), z_\delta) \dot{\xi}_{t_\delta} - H(-D_y \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta), w_\delta) \dot{\zeta}_{t_\delta}.$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu + t_\delta - \hat{t} + \frac{\partial \Phi_\lambda}{\partial t}(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) &\leq H(D_x \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) + \beta z_\delta + x_\delta - \hat{x}, x_\delta) \dot{\xi}_{t_\delta} \\ &\quad - H(-D_y \Phi_\lambda(z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta) - \beta w_\delta - (y_\delta - \hat{y}), y_\delta) \dot{\zeta}_{t_\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

All of the data inside the p -variable of H in the inequality above is bounded independently of δ and β . Therefore, using the bound on $D_p H$ in (2.5) and the fact that Φ_λ is an exact solution, we eliminate the terms on the right-hand side up to some error. Using the bounds on $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{t})$ and $(x_\delta, y_\delta, z_\delta, w_\delta, t_\delta)$, we finally obtain

$$\mu \leq C(\beta^{1/2} + \delta^{1/2} + \delta) \left(\|\dot{\xi}\|_\infty + \|\dot{\zeta}\|_\infty \right).$$

Sending $\delta \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$\mu \leq C\beta^{1/2} \left(\|\dot{\xi}\|_\infty + \|\dot{\zeta}\|_\infty \right),$$

where the constant C is independent of β and μ . Taking β small enough yields a contradiction, because $\mu > 0$. Therefore, for all sufficiently small β and for all $\mu > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, t) - \frac{\beta}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u_0(x) - v_0(y) - \lambda^{q-1} L(x, y)) + \mu t \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Taking first $\beta \rightarrow 0$ and then $\mu \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \Phi_\lambda(x, y, t)) \\ &\leq \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u_0(x) - v_0(y) - \lambda^{q-1} L(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the same argument above can be repeated for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, yielding the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(u(x, t) - v(y, t) - \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda(\xi_t - \zeta_t)} \right)^{q-1} L^\epsilon(x, y) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (u_0(x) - v_0(y) - \lambda^{q-1} L^\epsilon(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.2 finishes the proof. \square

5. HOMOGENIZATION

In this section we present the proof of Theorem 1.2 following the general outline given in the Introduction. For completeness, we repeat this outline here.

For $\eta > 0$, set

$$W_t^\eta = W_{k\eta} + \frac{W_{(k+1)\eta} - W_{k\eta}}{\eta}(t - k\eta)$$

for $t \in [k\eta, (k+1)\eta]$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. In other words, W^η is the piecewise linear interpolation of W with partition size η . Observe that

$$\|W^\eta - W\|_\infty \leq \rho(\eta/2) \leq \rho(\eta),$$

where ρ is the modulus of continuity of W .

As in the Introduction, let $u^{\epsilon,\eta}$ be the solution of the equation

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} u_t^{\epsilon,\eta} = H(Du^{\epsilon,\eta}, x/\epsilon) \dot{W}_t^\eta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T] \\ u^{\epsilon,\eta} = u_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\} \end{cases}$$

and let \bar{u}^η be the solution of the equation

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} \bar{u}_t^\eta = \bar{H}(D\bar{u}^\eta) \dot{W}_t^\eta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T] \\ \bar{u}^\eta = u_0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

We then write

$$(5.3) \quad u^\epsilon - u = \underbrace{u^\epsilon - u^{\epsilon,\eta}}_{\text{Lemma 5.1}} + \underbrace{u^{\epsilon,\eta} - \bar{u}^\eta}_{\text{Lemma 5.2}} + \underbrace{\bar{u}^\eta - u}_{\text{Lemma 5.4}},$$

which each difference estimated using the corresponding Lemmas.

As a corollary of Theorem 1.1 (specifically the comments following its statement in the Introduction regarding Lipschitz initial conditions), we have the following:

Lemma 5.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|Du_0\|_\infty$ such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$,*

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]} |u^{\epsilon,\eta}(x,t) - u^\epsilon(x,t)| \leq C \|W - W^\eta\|_\infty.$$

For fixed $\eta > 0$, because W^η is piecewise monotone (indeed, piecewise linear), using either assumption (2.8a) or (2.8b) implies that, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $u^{\epsilon,\eta}$ converges locally uniformly to \bar{u}^η . A more quantitative statement is in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|Du_0\|_\infty$ such that for all $0 < \eta < 1$ and all $T \geq 1$, the following holds:*

(1) *In the periodic setting (i.e. (2.8a) holds),*

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]} |u^{\epsilon,\eta}(x,t) - \bar{u}^\eta(x,t)| \leq C \frac{T}{\eta} \epsilon^{1/3}.$$

(2) *In the stationary ergodic setting (i.e. (2.8b) holds),*

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in B_T \times [0,T]} |u^{\epsilon,\eta}(x,t) - \bar{u}^\eta(x,t)| \leq C \frac{T^2 \rho(\eta)}{\eta^2} \epsilon^\beta,$$

where the exponent β is as in (2.8b).

The proof requires applying the prescribed homogenization rate from (2.8) iteratively on intervals on which W^η is monotone. There are on order η^{-1} of these intervals, which is why the estimates in Lemma 5.2 involve powers of η^{-1} . The argument resembles those appearing in [17], but is made simpler by the uniform Lipschitz estimates implied by Corollary 4.1.

In the stationary ergodic case, for which (2.8b) gives homogenization only locally in space, we will need a finite speed of propagation property. We present such a result without proof; see for instance [7].

Lemma 5.3. *Let U^1 and U^2 be a subsolution and supersolution, respectively, of*

$$U_t^i + H(DU^i, x) = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty),$$

and assume $\|DU^i\|_\infty < \infty$ for $i = 1, 2$. Define

$$\mathcal{L} := \sup \left\{ D_p H(p, y) \mid y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |p| \leq \max_{i=1,2} \|DU^i\|_\infty \right\}.$$

Let $R > 0$. Then for any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{R}{\mathcal{L}}$,

$$\sup_{x \in B_{R-\mathcal{L}t}} (U^1(x, t) - U^2(x, t)) \leq \sup_{x \in B_R} (U^1(x, 0) - U^2(x, 0)).$$

As a consequence, if U^1 and U^2 are both exact solutions, then U^1 and U^2 can be interchanged in the suprema above to obtain the inequality

$$\sup_{x \in B_{R-\mathcal{L}t}} |U^1(x, t) - U^2(x, t)| \leq \sup_{x \in B_R} |U^1(x, 0) - U^2(x, 0)|.$$

In other words, the semigroups S_+^ϵ and S_-^ϵ satisfy a contraction property on balls increasing with finite speed.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Observe first that

$$(5.4) \quad \|Du^{\epsilon, \eta}\|_\infty \leq C \|Du_0\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|D\bar{u}^\eta\|_\infty \leq \|Du_0\|_\infty$$

for some constant C independent of ϵ and η . The first estimate is a result of applying Corollary 4.1 to Lipschitz initial conditions. The second estimate follows from the fact that, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $(x, t) \mapsto \bar{u}^\eta(x + y, t)$ is a solution of (5.2) by the space homogeneity of the equation. Therefore the contraction property of that equation yields

$$|\bar{u}^\eta(x + y, t) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t)| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |u_0(x + y) - u_0(x)| \leq \|Du_0\|_\infty |y|.$$

We divide the proof of the lemma into cases, depending on whether we consider a periodic or stationary-ergodic environment. Assume without loss of generality that $T = N\eta$ for some positive integer N , and define $t_i = i\eta$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$.

(1) We consider first the periodic case. Define the quantity

$$\Delta_i = \sup \left\{ |u^{\epsilon, \eta}(x, t_i) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t_i)| : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}.$$

We claim that

$$(5.5) \quad \Delta_{i+1} \leq \Delta_i + C(1 + |W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}|) \epsilon^{1/3}$$

for a constant C that depends only on $\|Du_0\|_\infty$. To see this, fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume without loss of generality that W^η is increasing on the interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$. Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\epsilon, \eta}(x, t_{i+1}) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t_{i+1}) &= S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) u^{\epsilon, \eta}(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x) \\ &= \text{I} + \text{II} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{I} := S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) u^{\epsilon, \eta}(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x)$$

and

$$\text{II} := S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x).$$

(If W^η is decreasing, we instead apply the operators $S_-^\epsilon(|W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}|)$ and $S_-(|W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}|)$ above and in what follows.)

By the contraction property for the semigroup S_+^ϵ , we can estimate I as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{I}| &= |S_+^\epsilon (W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) u^{\epsilon,\eta}(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+^\epsilon (W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x)| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |u^{\epsilon,\eta}(x, t_i) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t_i)| \\ &= \Delta_i. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate II, we use assumption (2.8a) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{II}| &= |S_+^\epsilon (W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+ (W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x)| \\ &\leq C (1 + |W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}|) \epsilon^{1/3}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C depends only on $\|Du_0\|_\infty$ by (5.4). Combining the estimates for I and II gives (5.5).

Inductively, we see that for any $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$,

$$\Delta_N \leq \Delta_{N-k} + C \sum_{i=k}^{N-1} (1 + |W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}|) \epsilon^{1/3},$$

Taking $k = N$, and noting that $\Delta_0 = 0$ because $u^{\epsilon,\eta} = \bar{u}^\eta = u_0$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_N &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (1 + |W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}|) \epsilon^{1/3} \\ &\leq C(N + N\rho(\eta))\epsilon^{1/3} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{T}{\eta} + \frac{T\rho(\eta)}{\eta} \right) \epsilon^{1/3} \\ &\leq C \frac{T}{\eta} \epsilon^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for any $t \in [0, T]$, an almost identical iterative argument gives the same bound for

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |u^{\epsilon,\eta}(x, t) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t)|$$

in place of Δ_N , which is the statement of the Lemma.

(2) We next consider the stationary-ergodic case. For all $R > 0$, define the quantity

$$\Delta_i(R) = \sup \{ |u^{\epsilon,\eta}(x, t_i) - u^\eta(x, t_i)| : |x| \leq R \}.$$

Also set

$$\mathcal{L} = \sup \left\{ D_p H(p, y) \mid y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |p| \leq \max(\|Du^{\epsilon,\eta}\|_\infty, \|Du^\eta\|_\infty) \right\},$$

and observe that \mathcal{L} is finite and independent of ϵ and η , because of (5.4) and because H satisfies the Lipschitz bounds in (2.5).

We claim that

$$(5.6) \quad \Delta_{i+1}(R) \leq \Delta_i(R + \mathcal{L}\rho(\eta)) + C(1 + R)\epsilon^\beta.$$

To see this, fix $x \in B_R$. Assume without loss of generality that W^η is increasing on the interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$. Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\epsilon, \eta}(x, t_{i+1}) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t_{i+1}) &= S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) u^{\epsilon, \eta}(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x) \\ &= \text{I} + \text{II} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{I} := S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) u^{\epsilon, \eta}(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x)$$

and

$$\text{II} := S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x).$$

Using Lemma 5.3, we can estimate I as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{I}| &= |S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) u^{\epsilon, \eta}(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x)| \\ &\leq \sup \{|u^{\epsilon, \eta}(x, t_i) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t_i)| : |x| \leq R + \mathcal{L}\rho(\eta)\} \\ &= \Delta_i(R + \mathcal{L}\rho(\eta)). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate II, we use assumption (2.8b) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{II}| &= |S_+^\epsilon(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x) - S_+(W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \bar{u}^\eta(\cdot, t_i)(x)| \\ &\leq C(1 + R)\epsilon^\beta \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C depends only on $\|Du_0\|_\infty$ by (5.4). Combining the estimates for I and II gives (5.6).

Inductively, we see that for any $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$,

$$\Delta_N(T) \leq \Delta_{N-k}(T + k\mathcal{L}\rho(\eta)) + C \sum_{i=1}^k (1 + T + (i-1)\mathcal{L}\rho(\eta))\epsilon^\beta.$$

Taking $k = N$, and noting that $\Delta_0 = 0$ because $u^{\epsilon, \eta} = \bar{u}^\eta = u_0$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_N(T) &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^N (1 + T + (i-1)\mathcal{L}\rho(\eta))\epsilon^\beta \\ &\leq C(N + NT + N^2\mathcal{L}\rho(\eta))\epsilon^\beta \\ &\leq C \frac{T^2\rho(\eta)}{\eta^2} \epsilon^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for any $t \in [0, T]$, an almost identical iterative argument gives the same bound for

$$\sup \{|u^{\epsilon, \eta}(x, t) - \bar{u}^\eta(x, t)| : |x| \leq T\}$$

in place of $\Delta_N(T)$, which is the statement of the Lemma. □

Finally, the only remaining ingredient is to estimate the difference between \bar{u}^η and u . Such an estimate is proven in [11] and [17], and therefore we do not repeat the proof here. The proof takes advantage of the fact that \bar{H} is convex (because H is convex) and the explicit representation of \bar{u}^η given iteratively by Hopf's formula.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists $C > 0$ depending only on $\|Du_0\|_\infty$ such that for all $\eta > 0$ and all $T > 0$,*

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]} |u^\eta(x,t) - u(x,t)| \leq C \|W^\eta - W\|_\infty.$$

Combining Lemmas 5.1, 5.2, and 5.4, we prove Theorem 1.2 by estimating (5.3) and optimizing in η .

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We divide the proof once more into the periodic and stationary-ergodic settings.

(1) In the periodic setting, for fixed ϵ and η , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]} |u^\epsilon(x,t) - u(x,t)| &\leq C\rho(\eta) + C\frac{T}{\eta}\epsilon^{1/3} \\ &\leq C\left(\rho(\eta) + \eta^{-1}\epsilon^{1/3}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $T \geq 1$, where the constant C depends only on T and $\|Du_0\|_\infty$. Picking η such that

$$\eta\rho(\eta) = T\epsilon^{1/3}$$

optimizes the above formula, so that

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]} |u^\epsilon(x,t) - u(x,t)| \leq C\rho(\omega(\epsilon^{1/3})) = C\frac{\epsilon^{1/3}}{\omega(\epsilon^{1/3})}.$$

(2) In the stationary ergodic setting, for fixed ϵ and η , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(x,t) \in B_T \times [0,T]} |u^\epsilon(x,t) - u(x,t)| &\leq C\rho(\eta) + C\frac{T^2\rho(\eta)}{\eta^2}\epsilon^\beta \\ &\leq C\rho(\eta)\left(1 + \epsilon^\beta\eta^{-2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $T \geq 1$, where the constant C depends only on T and $\|Du_0\|_\infty$. Picking

$$\eta = \epsilon^{\beta/2}$$

optimizes the above formula, so that

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in B_T \times [0,T]} |u^\epsilon(x,t) - u(x,t)| \leq C\rho(\epsilon^{\beta/2}).$$

□

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to my advisor, Professor Panagiotis E. Souganidis, for suggesting the topic of this paper, and to Professor Pierre-Louis Lions for some helpful remarks.

REFERENCES

- [1] Armstrong, Scott N.; Cardaliaguet, Pierre; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Error estimates and convergence rates for the stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 27 (2014), no. 2, 479-540.
- [2] Armstrong, Scott N.; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Stochastic homogenization of level-set convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2013 (2013), no. 17, 3420-3449.
- [3] Capuzzo-Dolcetta, I.; Ishii, H. On the rate of convergence in homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 50 (2001), no. 3, 1113-1129.
- [4] Crandall, Michael G.; Ishii, Hitoshi; Lions, Pierre-Louis. User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 27 (1992), no. 1, 1-67.

- [5] Evans, L. C. Periodic homogenization of certain partial differential equations . Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh 120A (1992), 245-265.
- [6] Friz, Peter K.; Gassiat, Paul; Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Eikonal equations and pathwise solutions to fully non-linear SPDEs. Preprint, arXiv:1602.04746 [math.PR].
- [7] Lions, P.-L. Some properties of the viscosity semigroups for Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Nonlinear differential equations (Granada, 1984), 43-63, Res. Notes in Math., 132, Pitman, Boston, MA, 1985.
- [8] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Papanicolaou, George; Varadhan, S. R. Srinivasa. Homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Unpublished paper.
- [9] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. To appear.
- [10] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 326 (1998), no. 9, 1085-1092.
- [11] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations: non-smooth equations and applications. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 327 (1998), no. 8, 735-741.
- [12] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Uniqueness of weak solutions of fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 331 (2000), no. 10, 783-790.
- [13] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations with semi-linear stochastic dependence. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 331 (2000), no. 8, 617-624.
- [14] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. Book, in preparation.
- [15] Lions, Pierre-Louis; Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Correctors for the homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the stationary ergodic setting. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 56 (2003), no. 10, 1501-1524.
- [16] Rezakhanlou, Fraydoun; Tarver, James E. Homogenization for stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 151 (2000), no. 4, 277-309.
- [17] Seeger, Benjamin. Homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with rough time dependence. Preprint, arXiv:1602.05213 [math.AP].
- [18] Seeger, Benjamin. Perron's method for stochastic viscosity solutions. Preprint, arXiv:1605.01108 [math.AP].
- [19] Souganidis, Panagiotis E. Stochastic homogenization for Hamilton-Jacobi equations and applications. Asymptot. Anal. 20 (1999), no. 1, 1-11.