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ABSTRACT. In this article we study the scaling limit of the interface model on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\) where the Hamiltonian is given by a mixed gradient and Laplacian interaction. We show that in any dimension the scaling limit is given by the Gaussian free field. We discuss the appropriate spaces in which the convergence takes place. While in infinite volume the proof is based on Fourier analytic methods, in finite volume we rely on some discrete PDE techniques involving finite-difference approximation of elliptic boundary value problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

The \((\nabla + \Delta)\)-model is a special instance of a more general class of random interfaces in which the interaction is governed by the exponential of an energy function \(H\), called Hamiltonian. More specifically, random interfaces are fields \(\varphi = (\varphi_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}\), whose distribution is determined by a probability measure on \(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}\), \(d \geq 1\). The probability measure is given (formally) by

\[
P_\Lambda(d\varphi) := \frac{e^{-H(\varphi)}}{Z_\Lambda} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\varphi_x \prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda} \delta_0(d\varphi_x), \tag{1.1}
\]

where \(\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d\) is a finite subset, \(d\varphi_x\) is the Lebesgue measure on \(\mathbb{R}\), \(\delta_0\) is the Dirac measure at 0, and \(Z_\Lambda\) is a normalizing constant. We are imposing zero boundary conditions: almost surely \(\varphi_x = 0\) for all \(x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda\), but the definition holds for more general boundary conditions. In this article we consider the special case when the Hamiltonian is given by

\[
H(\varphi) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \kappa_1 \|
abla \varphi_x\|^2 + \kappa_2 (\Delta \varphi_x)^2 \right) \tag{1.2}
\]
where \( \| \cdot \| \) denotes the Euclidean norm, \( \nabla \) is the discrete gradient and \( \Delta \) is the discrete Laplacian defined respectively by

\[
\nabla f(x) = (f(x + e_i) - f(x))_{i=1}^d
\]

\[
\Delta f(x) = \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{i=1}^d (f(x + e_i) + f(x - e_i) - 2f(x)).
\]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, f : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R} \), and \( \kappa_1, \kappa_2 \) are two positive constants. In the physics literature, the above Hamiltonian is considered to be the energy of a semiflexible membrane (or semiflexible polymer if \( d = 1 \)) where the parameters \( \kappa_1 \) and \( \kappa_2 \) are the lateral tension and the bending rigidity, respectively. The application of Gibbs measures, in particular the \((\nabla + \Delta)\)-model, to the theory of biological membranes can be found in Leibler (2004), Lipowsky (1995), Ruiz-Lorenzo et al. (2005). In the works of Borecki (2010), Borecki and Caravenna (2010) this model was studied in \( d = 1 \) under the influence of pinning in order to understand the localization behavior of the polymer.

The mixed model interpolates between two well-known random interfaces. Indeed, in the purely gradient case \((\kappa_2 = 0)\) one recovers the measure of the discrete Gaussian free field (DGFF). It has great importance in statistical mechanics, and we refer the reader to the reviews by Sheffield (2007), Sznitman (2012), Zeitouni (2014) for further details and existing results. The case of the pure Laplacian interaction, that is, when \( \kappa_1 = 0 \), is called membrane or bilaplacian model. It differs from the DGFF in that it lacks a random walk representation for the finite volume covariances, and might have negative correlation. Recent developments around the properties of the model concern its extremes (Chiarini et al., 2016b, Cipriani, 2013) and the entropic repulsion event handled in Kurt (2009), Sakagawa (2003).

In Borecki and Caravenna (2010, Remark 9) it was conjectured that, in the case of pinning for the one-dimensional \((\nabla + \Delta)\)-model, the behaviour of the free energy should resemble the purely gradient case. In view of this remark it is natural to ask if the scaling limit of the mixed model is dominated by the gradient interaction, that is, the limit is a continuum Gaussian free field (GFF). The main focus of this article is to show that such a guess is true and indeed in any dimension the mixed model approximates the Gaussian free field.

We will consider the lattice approximation of both domains and \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and investigate the behavior of the rescaled interface when the lattice size decreases to zero. We will use techniques coming from discrete PDEs which were already employed in Cipriani et al. (2018) to derive the scaling limit of the membrane model. We show that in \( d = 1 \) convergence occurs in the space of continuous functions whilst in higher dimensions the limit is no longer a function, but a random distribution, and convergence takes place in a Sobolev space of negative index. In this sense one can also think of the mixed model as a perturbation of the DGFF. This gives rise to some natural questions which we will state after presenting our main results.
2. Main results

2.1. The model. Let $\Lambda$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $P_\Lambda$ and $H(\varphi)$ be as in (1.1) and (1.2) respectively. It follows from Lemma 1.2.2 of Kurt (2008) that the Gibbs measure (1.1) on $\mathbb{R}^{|\Lambda|}$ with Hamiltonian (1.2) exists. Note that (1.2) can be written as

$$H(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \varphi, (-4d\kappa_1\Delta + 2\kappa_2\Delta^2)\varphi \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)}. \quad (2.1)$$

We are interested in the “truly” mixed case, that is when $\kappa_1$ and $\kappa_2$ are strictly positive. Therefore using the fact that the measure induced by (2.1) is Gaussian without any loss of generality we will work with the following Hamiltonian:

$$H(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \varphi, (-\kappa\Delta + \Delta^2)\varphi \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is a constant. Thus if we write $G_\Lambda(x, y) := \mathbb{E}_\Lambda(\varphi_x\varphi_y)$, it follows from Lemma 1.2.2 of Kurt (2008) that $G_\Lambda$ solves the following discrete boundary value problem: for $x \in \Lambda$

$$\begin{cases} (-\kappa\Delta + \Delta^2)G_\Lambda(x, y) = \delta_x(y) & y \in \Lambda \\ G_\Lambda(x, y) = 0 & y \notin \Lambda. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

In the case $\Lambda = [-N, N]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ we will denote the measure (1.1) by $P_N$. It follows from Kurt (2008, Proposition 1.2.3) that in $d \geq 3$ there exists a thermodynamic limit $P$ of the measures $P_N$ as $N \uparrow \infty$. Under $P$, the field $(\varphi_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is a centered Gaussian process with covariance given by

$$G(x, y) = (-\kappa\Delta + \Delta^2)^{-1}(x, y).$$

Note that the infinite volume covariance has a nice random walk representation. Indeed, let $P_x$ be the law of the simple random walk $(S_m)_{m \geq 0}$ on the square lattice started at $x$. Let $\Gamma_\kappa(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the massive Green’s function with mass $\sqrt{\kappa}$, that is,

$$\Gamma_\kappa(x, y) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1 + \kappa)^{m+1}} P_x(S_m = y).$$

We denote by $\Gamma(x, y) := \Gamma_0(x, y)$ the Green’s function for the simple random walk in $d \geq 3$. Then one can show easily

$$G(x, y) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Gamma(x, z) \Gamma_\kappa(z, y).$$

It follows from Sakagawa (2003, Lemma 5.1) that $G(x, y) \asymp \kappa \|x - y\|^{-d}$ as $\|x - y\| \to \infty$.

Since $\kappa$ is a fixed constant, in order to simplify the exposition we will fix it to be 1 throughout. This would not change the nature of the limit except for a scaling constant.
2.2. **Main results.** Since the infinite volume measure of the mixed model exists in $d \geq 3$, we split the scaling limit convergence into two parts: the infinite volume case, in which we study the $(\nabla + \Delta)$-model under $P$, and the finite volume case in which our object of interest is the scaling limit of measures $P_{\Lambda_N}$ for some chosen $\Lambda_N \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We fix once and for all the constant $k := 1/\sqrt{2d}$. The main results are as follows.

In $d \geq 3$ (Section 3) we consider the infinite volume model $\varphi = (\varphi_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ with law $P$. We define for $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\psi_N(x) := kN^{d/2} \varphi_{N x}, \quad x \in \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{Z}^d.
$$

For $f \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (the Schwartz space) we define

$$
(\Psi_N, f) := N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_N(x) f(x). \quad (2.4)
$$

This definition makes sense since, using Mill’s ratio and the uniform bound on $G$ one can show that as $\|x\| \to \infty$ \[|\psi_N(x)| = O(N^{d/2} \sqrt{\log(1 + \|x\|)}) \text{ a.s.} \]

via a Borel-Cantelli argument. Also it follows that with this definition $\Psi_N \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and the characteristic functional of $\Psi_N$ is given by \[L_{\Psi_N}(f) := \exp(-\text{Var}(\Psi_N, f)/2). \]

As for the limiting field, we have by an application of the Bochner–Minlos theorem that there exists a generalized random field $\Psi$ on $\mathcal{S}^*$ whose characteristic functional $L_{\Psi}$ is given by

$$
L_{\Psi}(f) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{-1/2} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right), \quad f \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (2.5)
$$

where the operator $(-\Delta)^{-1/2} : \mathcal{S} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined by \[(-\Delta)^{-1/2} f(x) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i(x,\xi)} \|\xi\|^{-1} \hat{f}(\xi) \, d\xi. \]

Here $\hat{f}$ is the Fourier transform of $f$. For properties of the field $\Psi$ see also Lodhia et al. (2016, Section 3). We are now ready to state our main result for the infinite volume case.

**Theorem 1** (Scaling limit in $d \geq 3$). One has that $\Psi_N \xrightarrow{\text{d}} \Psi$ in the strong topology of $\mathcal{S}^*$.

In the finite volume case in $d \geq 2$ (Section 4) we take $D$ to be a bounded domain (open, connected set) in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with smooth boundary. We discretise $D$ appropriately and “blow it up”: this discretisation will be called $\Lambda = \Lambda_N$ (it will be defined properly in Section 4). On $\Lambda$ we define the mixed model $\varphi$ with law (1.1) and Hamiltonian (2.2) and define $\Psi_N$ by

$$
\Psi_N := k \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda} N^{-d/2} \varphi_{N x} \delta_x.
$$
One can show \( \Psi_N \) is a distribution living in the negative Sobolev space \( \mathcal{H}^{-s}(D) \) for all \( s > d/2 \), as \( \Psi_N \) is a finite linear combination of Dirac distributions. To describe the limiting field, there are many equivalent ways to define the Gaussian free field \( \Psi_D \) on a domain. One of them is to think of it as a collection of centered Gaussian variables \( (\Psi_D, f) \) indexed by \( C_c^\infty(D) \) with covariance structure given by

\[
E[(\Psi_D, f)(\Psi_D, g)] = \int_D \int_D f(x)g(y)G_D(x,y) \, dx \, dy, \quad f, g \in C_c^\infty(D)
\]

where \( G_D \) is the Green’s function of the continuum Dirichlet problem with zero boundary conditions. We now state the main result for the finite volume \((\nabla + \Delta)\)-interaction.

**Theorem 2** (Scaling limit in \( d \geq 2 \) under finite volume). \( \Psi_N \) converges in distribution to the zero boundary Gaussian free field \( \Psi_D \) as \( N \to \infty \) in the topology of \( \mathcal{H}^{-s}(D) \) for \( s > d \).

A special case for finite volume measures is \( d = 1 \) (Subsection 4.4). In this example, the GFF becomes a Brownian bridge, and the type of convergence we obtain is different from all other dimensions (convergence occurs in the space of continuous functions). In this case we consider the mixed model on the “blow up” \( \Lambda = \Lambda_N \) of an appropriate discretisation of \([0, 1]\). We define a continuous interpolation \( \psi_N \) of the rescaled interface and obtain the following theorem:

**Theorem 3** (Scaling limit in \( d = 1 \)). \( \psi_N \) converges in distribution to the Brownian bridge on \([0, 1]\) in the space \( C[0, 1] \).

As a by-product of this Theorem we obtain the convergence of the discrete maximum in \( d = 1 \).

### 2.3. Idea of the proofs.

We begin by explaining the ideas behind the proofs of the infinite volume case (Section 3). For the whole space GFF the variance of \( (\Psi_D, f) \) can be expressed as

\[
\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\theta\|^{-2}|\hat{f}(\theta)|^2 \, d\theta.
\]

(2.6)

Given the appearance of the Fourier transforms in the limit, we write the discrete Green’s function in terms of the inverse Fourier transform. We see that a scaling factor appears in such a way the contribution from the \( \Delta^2 \) factor in the Hamiltonian vanishes, ensuring convergence to a purely gradient model.

In the finite volume case we show first finite dimensional convergence and secondly tightness. Since the measures are Gaussian the finite dimensional convergence follows from the convergence of the covariance function. However, the behaviour of the covariance of the mixed model is not known explicitly in finite volume (for example, it lacks the classical random walk representation of Ginzburg-Landau models). So we use the expedient of PDE techniques in proving the convergence. The key fact which is used is that the Green’s function satisfies the Dirichlet problem (2.3). We show that the discrete solution is equal to that of the continuum Dirichlet problem with a negligible error. This approximation is obtained from the interesting approach of Thomée (1964). His idea, adapted to
our setting, is the following: if we write the operator \((-\Delta + \Delta^2)\) in the rescaled lattice \(h\mathbb{Z}^d\) for \(h\) small, then due to the scaling we end up dealing with \((-\Delta_h + h^2/(2d)\Delta^2_h)\). To quantify how negligible the presence of \(\Delta^2_h\) is, we use some discrete Sobolev inequalities. While dealing with tightness the explicit dependence of the constants from test functions is needed. This dependence was lacking in Thomée (1964). In Section 5 we therefore derive these precise estimates, in particular showing how derivatives of the test function appear in the constants. This Section is of independent interest, as it concerns the approximation of PDEs. We remark that our methodology seems to be robust enough to deal with different interface models whenever the interaction is given in terms of a discrete elliptic operator.

2.4. Outlook and open problems. The mixed model gives rise to many interesting mathematical questions. Here we list down a few directions of research on this model.

(1) In Borecki (2010), Borecki and Caravenna (2010) the Hamiltonian the authors considered was

\[
H(\varphi) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\kappa_1 V_1(\nabla \varphi_x) + \kappa_2 V_2(\Delta \varphi_x))
\]

where \(V_1\) and \(V_2\) were potentials with minimal assumptions. In general, it would be interesting to see if the scaling limit of such models under general convexity assumptions behaves in a similar manner to the Ginzburg-Landau models, in particular, if they still converge to the GFF.

(2) If one considers the pinned versions of the purely gradient and purely Laplacian model, it is known in different settings that the field exhibits exponential decay of correlations (Bolthausen and Brydges, 2001, Bolthausen et al., 2017, Ioffe and Velenik, 2000). Can one say the same for the mixed model?

(3) The extremes of the discrete Gaussian free field in \(d = 2\) are by now well-understood. It is known that the point process of extremes converges to a Cox-cluster process (an overview of the results on this topic is given in Biskup (2017)). In \(d \geq 3\) on the other hand extremal points behave similarly to the case of independent Gaussian variables (Chiarini et al. (2016a)). We believe that a similar behaviour appears in the mixed model and we will address this issue in a future work.

(4) It is known (Schramm and Sheffield, 2009) that SLE\(_4\) arise as scaling limit of the level lines of the DGFF. That is, if one considers the continuous extension of the DGFF with appropriate boundary conditions on a grid approximation of a domain in the complex plane, then the zero-level line converges in distribution, as the grid size goes to 0, to SLE\(_4\). Given our results on the scaling limit in \(d = 2\) one may ask whether this convergence also holds true in the mixed model setting.

(5) Although in this model the flexible membrane, that is the purely gradient field, emerges in the scaling limit, it is not hard to see by means of the methods used in the proofs that something different might happen if \(\kappa_1\) and \(\kappa_2\) are dependent on \(N\), the size of the discretised domain. It is likely that the membrane model might appear in the limit by tuning the lateral tension and the bending rigidity in a suitable way. The methods
used in the present article need to be improved/modified to tackle this problem and we plan to address this issue in a forthcoming article.

Structure of the article. We begin by showing Theorem 1 in Section 3. The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Section 4. We include the one-dimensional Theorem 3 in the section concerning finite volume measures, showing it in Subsection 4.4. The estimates on the discrete solution to the Laplacian problem are derived in Section 5.

Notation. In the rest of the paper, $C$ denotes a generic constant that may change from line to line within the same equation.

3. Infinite volume case

In this section we prove Theorem 1. We begin by giving the theoretical setup behind it and then pass to the actual proof.

3.1. Setup. By a generalized random field we refer to a random variable $X$ defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ with values in $(\mathcal{S}^*, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}^*))$, where $\mathcal{S}^*$, the dual of $\mathcal{S}$, is the space of tempered distributions. For a brief discussion on the space of tempered distributions see Biermé et al. (2017), Cipriani et al. (2018). For $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $X$ generalized random fields with laws $(P_{X_n})_{n \geq 1}$ and $P_X$ respectively, we say that $X_n$ converges in distribution to $X$ (and write $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$) with respect to the strong topology if

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\mathcal{S}^*} \varphi(F) dP_{X_n}(F) = \int_{\mathcal{S}^*} \varphi(F) dP_X(F) \quad \forall \varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{S}^*, \tau_s)$$

where $C_b(\mathcal{S}^*, \tau_s)$ is the space of bounded continuous functions on $\mathcal{S}^*$ given the strong topology $\tau_s$. The convergence in distribution with respect to the weak topology is defined similarly, and one can show that convergence in distribution for generalised random fields with respect to the two topologies is equivalent (Biermé et al., 2017, Corollary 2.4). For a generalized random field $X$ with law $P_X$, we define its characteristic functional by

$$L_X(f) = \mathbb{E}(e^{i \langle X, f \rangle}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}^*} e^{i \langle F, f \rangle} dP_X(F)$$

for $f \in \mathcal{S}$. $L_X$ has the properties that it is positive definite, continuous, and $L_X(0) = 1$. The Bochner–Minlos theorem says that the converse is also true: if a functional $L : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{C}$ is positive definite, continuous at 0 and satisfies $L(0) = 1$ then there exists a generalized random field $X$ defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ such that $L_X = L$. For a proof of this Theorem see for instance Hida and Si (2004, Appendix 1). For $f \in \mathcal{S}$, the Fourier transform of $f$ is defined as

$$\hat{f}(\theta) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i \langle x, \theta \rangle} f(x) \, dx.$$ 

Note that $\hat{f}$ belongs to the Schwartz space too.
3.2. Proof of Theorem 1. By Corollary 2.4 of Bierné et al. (2017) to prove the convergence in distribution it is enough to show that $L_{Ψ_N}(f) \rightarrow L_{Ψ}(f)$ for all $f \in S$. Given the Gaussian nature of the variables we consider, and the fact that they are centered, it suffices to show that for any $f \in S$

$$E \left[ (Ψ_N, f)^2 \right] \rightarrow \|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

By definition of the field and translation invariance we have that

$$E \left[ (Ψ_N, f)^2 \right] = k^2 N^{-(d+2)} \sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{N} Z^d} E[\varphi_{Nx} \varphi_{Ny}] f(x) f(y)$$

$$= k^2 N^{-(d+2)} \sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{N} Z^d} G(0, N(y - x)) f(x) f(y). \quad (3.1)$$

Now our goal is to shift these expression to Fourier coordinates. We deduce from the Fourier inversion formula, in the same fashion of Kurt (2008, Lemmas 1.2.2, 1.2.3), that

$$G(0, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]^d} (\mu(\theta) + \mu(\theta)^2)^{-1} e^{-i \langle x, \theta \rangle} \ d\theta \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mu(\theta) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \cos(\theta_i)).$ We estimate the integrand in $(3.2)$ by the following Lemma, whose proof is deferred to page 9:

**Lemma 4.** There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\theta \in [-N\pi, N\pi]^d \setminus \{0\}$

$$N^{-2} \left( \frac{\|\theta\|^2}{2dN^2} + \frac{\|\theta\|^4}{4d^2N^4} \right)^{-1} \leq N^{-2} \left( \mu\left(\frac{\theta}{N}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{\theta}{N}\right)^2 \right)^{-1} \leq \frac{2d}{\|\theta\|^2} + \frac{Cd}{2N^2}.$$

Returning to the expression $(3.1)$ and plugging in $(3.2)$ we have

$$E \left[ (Ψ_N, f)^2 \right]$$

$$= \frac{k^2 N^{-(d+2)}}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{N} Z^d} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]^d} (\mu(\theta) + \mu(\theta)^2)^{-1} e^{-i \langle N(y - x), \theta \rangle} f(x) f(y) \ d\theta$$

$$= \frac{k^2 N^{-2}}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]^d} \left( \mu\left(\frac{\theta}{N}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{\theta}{N}\right)^2 \right)^{-1} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N} Z^d} e^{-i \langle x, \theta \rangle} f(x) \ d\theta. \quad (3.3)$$

Here we exchange sum and integral due to Lemma 4. We make two claims which will immediately prove the convergence of variance.
Claim 5.
\[
\lim_{N \to +\infty} \int_{[-N\pi,N\pi]^d} \left[ N^{-2} \left( \mu \left( \frac{\theta}{N} \right) + \mu \left( \frac{\theta}{N} \right)^2 \right)^{-1} - 2d\|\theta\|^{-2} \right] \times \\
\times \left( \frac{2\pi}{N^{d/2}} \right)^{-d} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\langle x, \theta \rangle} f(x) \right)^2 \, d\theta = 0.
\]

Next we claim the following convergence which is immediate from the estimates (3.7) and (2.6).

Claim 6.
\[
\lim_{N \to +\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[-N\pi,N\pi]^d} \|\theta\|^{-2} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\langle x, \theta \rangle} f(x) \right)^2 \, d\theta = \|(-\Delta)^{-1/2} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.
\]

Claims 5-6 entail that
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathcal{L}_{\Psi_N}(f) = \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{-1/2} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \right).
\]

Thus we have for all \( f \in \mathcal{S} \), \( \mathcal{L}_{\Psi_N}(f) \to \mathcal{L}_{\Psi}(f) \) and hence convergence in distribution follows.

This completes the proof of convergence in \( d \geq 3 \) modulo Lemma 4 and Claim 5 which we still owe the reader. We proceed to fill this gap.

**Proof of Lemma 4.** We know from Cipriani et al. (2017, Lemma 7) that there exists \( C > 0 \) such that for all \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( w \in [-N\pi/2, N\pi/2]^d \setminus \{0\} \)
\[
\frac{1}{\|w\|^2} \leq N^{-4} \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2 \left( \frac{w_i}{N} \right) \right)^{-2} \leq \left( \frac{1}{\|w\|^2} + \frac{C}{N^2} \right)^2.
\]

Therefore
\[
\left( \frac{2dN^2 + Cd}{\|\theta\|^2} \right)^{-1} \leq \mu \left( \frac{\theta}{N} \right) \leq \frac{\|\theta\|^2}{2dN^2}
\]
and hence
\[
N^{-2} \left( \frac{\|\theta\|^2}{2dN^2} + \frac{\|\theta\|^4}{4d^2N^4} \right)^{-1} \leq N^{-2} \left( \mu \left( \frac{\theta}{N} \right) + \mu \left( \frac{\theta}{N} \right)^2 \right)^{-1}
\]
\[
\leq N^{-2} \left( \left( \frac{2dN^2}{\|\theta\|^2} + \frac{Cd}{2} \right)^{-1} + \left( \frac{2dN^2}{\|\theta\|^2} + \frac{Cd}{2} \right)^{-2} \right)^{-1}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{2d}{\|\theta\|^2} + \frac{Cd}{2N^2}.
\]

□
Proof of Claim 5. By Lemma 4 we can sandwich the expression in the statement of the Claim between two infinitesimal quantities. The lower bound is given by
\[
\int_{[-N\pi,N\pi]^d} N^{-2} \left( \frac{\|\theta\|^2}{2dN^2} + \frac{\|\theta\|^4}{4d^2N^4} \right)^{-1} - 2d\|\theta\|^{-2} \left( 2\pi \right)^{-d/2} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\iota(x,\theta)} f(x) \right)^2 d\theta \tag{3.5} \]
and the upper bound is given by
\[
\int_{[-N\pi,N\pi]^d} \frac{C_d}{2N^2} \left( 2\pi \right)^{-d/2} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\iota(x,\theta)} f(x) \right)^2 d\theta. \tag{3.6} \]
We show that both the limit of (3.5) and (3.6) are zero as \( N \to \infty \). Using Lemma 4.7 of Cipriani et al. (2018) we have that for any \( N \) and \( s > 0 \) large enough
\[
\left( 2\pi \right)^{-d/2} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\iota(x,\theta)} f(x) \right)^2 \leq CN^{-s}. \tag{3.7} \]
Using (3.7) it follows that (3.6) converges to zero. For (3.5) observe that the integrand goes to zero and we can apply the dominated convergence theorem due to the following integrable bound:
\[
\left| N^{-2} \left( \frac{\|\theta\|^2}{2dN^2} + \frac{\|\theta\|^4}{4d^2N^4} \right)^{-1} - 2d\|\theta\|^{-2} \left( 2\pi \right)^{-d/2} N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\iota(x,\theta)} f(x) \right)^2 \right| \\
\leq \left( N^{-2} \left( \frac{\|\theta\|^2}{2dN^2} + \frac{\|\theta\|^4}{4d^2N^4} \right)^{-1} - 2d\|\theta\|^{-2} \right) \left( 2CN^{-2s} + |\hat{f}(\theta)|^2 \right) \\
\leq \frac{8d}{\|\theta\|^2} \left( CN^{-2s} + |\hat{f}(\theta)|^2 \right). \]
\quad \hfill \square

4. Finite volume case

4.1. Setup. We begin by deriving a useful upper bound on the variance of the mixed model. Let \( d \geq 1 \) and for any \( \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) let \( P^{\text{GFF}}_\Lambda \) denote the probability measure on \( \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda} \) of the discrete Gaussian free field with zero boundary conditions outside \( \Lambda \). Then the following bound holds:

**Lemma 7.** For all \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \)
\[
G_\Lambda(x, x) \leq \mathbb{E}_\Lambda^{\text{GFF}} (\varphi_x^2). \tag{4.1} \]

**Proof.** Note that we actually have
\[
H(\varphi)|_{\varphi \equiv 0 \text{ on } \Lambda^c} = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \varphi, (-\Delta_\Lambda + \Delta_\Lambda^2)\varphi \right\rangle_{L^2(\Lambda)}
\]
where \( \Delta_\Lambda \) and \( \Delta_\Lambda^2 \) denote the restriction of the operators \( \Delta \) and \( \Delta^2 \) to functions which are zero outside \( \Lambda \), respectively. The bound is thus obtained for any \( x \in \Lambda \) by applying...
Theorem 5.1 of Brascamp and Lieb (1976) with $F((\varphi_x)_{x \in \Lambda}) := \exp[-\frac{1}{2}(\varphi, \Delta^{2}_{\Lambda} \varphi)_{\ell^2(\Lambda)}]$ on $\mathbb{R}^{[\Lambda]}$, $A := -1/2 \Delta_{\Lambda}$ and $\alpha := 2$. The case for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda$ follows easily by the boundary conditions imposed on the interface.

We must set up now the right discretisation of domains to be able to obtain an interface converging to GFF. Let $D$ be any bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with smooth boundary. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $D_N = N \overline{D} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. Let us denote by $\Lambda_N$ the set of points $x \in D_N$ such that $x \pm (e_i \pm e_j) \in D_N$ for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, d$ (we denote by $e_i$ the unit vector in direction $i$). Let us now consider the mixed model with $\Lambda = \Lambda_N$ and zero boundary conditions outside $\Lambda_N$. The key result of this Subsection is to show that the variance of $(\Psi_N, f)$ converges to that of $(\Psi_D, f)$, that is, to the norm of the solution of a suitable Dirichlet problem.

**Remark 8.** The reduction from smooth boundary to piece-wise smooth boundaries can perhaps be achieved but we will not aim for such a generalization in this article.

**Proposition 9.** Let $f$ be a smooth and compactly supported function on $D$ and consider

$$(\Psi_N, f) = k \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} N^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \varphi_{N x} f(x).$$

Then

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \text{Var}[(\Psi_N, f)] = \int_D u(x) f(x) \, dx,$$

where $u$ is the solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_c u(x) = f(x) & x \in D \\ u(x) = 0 & x \in \partial D \end{cases}$$

and $\Delta_c$ is the Laplace operator defined by $\Delta_c = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial_x^2$.

**Proof.** We denote $G_N(x, y) := E_{\Lambda_N}[\varphi_{N x} \varphi_{N y}]$ for $x, y \in N^{-1} D_N$. Note that if $\Delta_N$ (defined in (5.2)) is the discrete Laplacian on $N^{-1} \mathbb{Z}^d$ then by (2.3) we have, for all $x \in N^{-1} \Lambda_N$,

$$\begin{cases} \left( -\frac{1}{2N^2} \Delta_N + \frac{1}{N^2} \Delta_N^2 \right) G_N(x, y) = \delta_x(y) & y \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N \\ G_N(x, y) = 0 & y \notin \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N. \end{cases}$$

We have

$$\text{Var}[(\Psi_N, f)] = k^2 \sum_{x, y \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} N^{-d-2} G_N(x, y) f(x) f(y)$$

$$= \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} N^{-d} H_N(x) f(x).$$
where $H_N(x) = k^2 \sum_{y \in \Lambda_N} N^{-2} C_{\Lambda_N}^+ (x, y) f (y)$ for $x \in N^{-1} D_N$. It is immediate from (4.3) that $H_N$ is the solution of the following Dirichlet problem:

$$
\begin{cases}
\left( -\Delta_{\Lambda_N} + \frac{1}{2dN^2} \Lambda^2 \right) H_N(x) = f(x) & x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N \\
H_N(x) = 0 & x \notin \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N.
\end{cases}
$$

(4.4)

Define the error between the solutions of (4.4) and (4.2) by $e_N(x) := H_N(x) - u(x)$ for $x \in N^{-1} D_N$. Then using Theorem 15 we have

$$N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} e_N(x)^2 \leq CN^{-1}.
$$

(4.5)

Rewriting the variance we deduce

$$\text{Var}[(\Psi_N, f)] = \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} e_N(x) f(x) N^{-d} + \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} u(x) f(x) N^{-d}.
$$

Note that by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (4.5) the first summand goes to zero as $N \to \infty$. The second term is a Riemann sum and converges to $\int_D u(x) f(x) \, dx$. □

4.2. The continuum Gaussian free field. In this case we consider $d \geq 2$ and $D$ and $\Lambda_N$ as in the previous Subsection. First we discuss briefly some definitions about the GFF. In $d = 2$ the results can be found already in the literature, see for example Berestycki (2015, Section 1.3).

By the spectral theorem for compact self-adjoint operators we know that there exist eigenfunctions $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $-\Delta_{\Lambda_N}$ corresponding to the eigenvalues $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots \to \infty$ such that $(u_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(D)$. By elliptic regularity, we have that $u_j$ is smooth for all $j$. Let $s > 0$ and we define the following inner product on $C^\infty_c(D)$:

$$\langle f, g \rangle_s := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j^{-s} \langle f, u_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle u_j, g \rangle_{L^2}.
$$

Then $\mathcal{H}^s_0(D)$ can be defined to be the completion of $C^\infty_c(D)$ with respect to this inner product and $\mathcal{H}^{-s}(D)$ is defined to be its dual. Here we note that $\mathcal{H}^s_0(D) \subset L^2(D) \subset \mathcal{H}^{-s}(D)$ for any $s > 0$.

In case $f \in L^2(D)$ then we have

$$\|f\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j^{-s} \langle f, u_j \rangle_{L^2}^2.
$$

Using first Green’s identity one can see that on $C^\infty_c(D)$ the norm $\| \cdot \|_s$ is equivalent to the standard Sobolev norm $\| \cdot \|_{H^s}$ for non-negative integer values of $s$. Hence we conclude that the space $\mathcal{H}^s_0(D)$ is the same as the standard $H^s_0(D)$ up to equivalent norms when $s \in \mathbb{N}$. By definition the same conclusion holds for $\mathcal{H}^{-s}(D)$ and $H^{-s}(D)$.

Also observe that $(\lambda_j^{-1/2} u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}^1_0(D)$. In the following Proposition we give the definition of the zero boundary continuum Gaussian free field $\Psi_D$ via its Wiener series, generalising the two-dimensional result of Dubédat (2009, Subsection 4.2).
Proposition 10. Let \((\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\) be a collection of i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables. Set the GFF with zero boundary conditions outside \(D\) to be

\[
\Psi_D := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j^{-1/2} \xi_j u_j.
\]

Then \(\Psi_D \in \mathcal{H}^{-s}(D)\) a.s. for all \(s > d/2 - 1\).

Proof. Fix \(s > d/2 - 1\). Clearly \(u_j \in L^2(D) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{-s}(D)\). We want to show that \(\|\Psi_D\|_{-s} < \infty\) with probability one. We have

\[
\|\Psi_D\|_{-s}^2 = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j^{-1-s} \xi_j^2.
\]

The last sum is finite a.s. by Kolmogorov’s two series theorem as we have

\[
\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_j^{-1-s} \xi_j^2] \asymp \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^{-\frac{4}{d}(1+s)} < \infty
\]

and

\[
\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Var}[\lambda_j^{-1-s} \xi_j^2] \asymp \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^{-\frac{4}{d}(1+s)} < \infty.
\]

Here we have used the Weyl’s asymptotic \(\lambda_j \sim C j^{\frac{d}{2}}\) for some explicit constant \(C\). Thus we have \(\Psi_D \in \mathcal{H}^{-s}(D)\) a.s. \(\square\)

4.3. Proof of Theorem 2. We are now ready to show the main result on the scaling limit in the finite volume case. All notations are borrowed from Subsections 4.1-4.2.

Proof of Theorem 2. We first show that for \(f \in C_c^\infty(D)\)

\[
(\Psi_N, f) \xrightarrow{d} (\Psi_D, f).
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.6)

This follows from the following two observations: on the one hand by Proposition 9 and integration by parts we obtain

\[
\text{Var}[(\Psi_N, f)] \to \int_D u(x) f(x) \, dx = \|f\|_{-1}^2.
\]

On the other hand from the definition of GFF it follows that

\[
\text{Var}[(\Psi_D, f)] = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle u_j, f \rangle_{L^2}^2 = \|f\|_{-1}^2.
\]

Consequently we obtain (4.6) since both \((\Psi_N, f)\) and \((\Psi_D, f)\) are centered Gaussians.

Next we want to show that the sequence \((\Psi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}\) is tight in \(\mathcal{H}^{-s}(D)\) for all \(s > d\). It is enough to show that

\[
\limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda_N} [\|\Psi_N\|_{-s}^2] < \infty \quad \forall s > d.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.7)
The tightness of \((\Psi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}\) would then follow immediately from (4.7) and the fact that, for \(0 \leq s_1 < s_2\), \(\mathcal{H}^{-s_1}(\mathcal{D})\) is compactly embedded in \(\mathcal{H}^{-s_2}(\mathcal{D})\). In order to show (4.7) we first observe that for any \(f \in \mathcal{H}_0^s(\mathcal{D})\)

\[
|\langle \Psi_N, f \rangle| = \left| k \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} N^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \varphi_{Nx} \sum_{j \geq 1} \langle f, u_j \rangle_{L^2} u_j(x) \right|
\]

where in the first equality we have used the fact that \(f \in \mathcal{H}_0^s(\mathcal{D})\) and therefore \(f = \sum_{j \geq 1} \langle f, u_j \rangle_{L^2} u_j\). Thus we have, using the definition of dual norm,

\[
\| \Psi_N \|_{s}^{-2} \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda_j^{-s} k^2 N^{-\frac{s(d+2)}{2}} \left( \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} \varphi_{Nx} u_j(x) \right)^2.
\]

By monotone convergence we obtain

\[
E_{\Lambda_N} \| \Psi_N \|_{s}^{-2} \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda_j^{-s} k^2 N^{-\frac{s(d+2)}{2}} \sum_{x,y \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} G_{\frac{1}{N}}(x,y) u_j(x) u_j(y)
\]

where for any grid function \(f\) we define

\[
\| f \|_{\ell^2\left(\frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N\right)}^2 := N^{-d} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N} f(x)^2.
\]

From (4.3) it follows that \(G_{\frac{1}{N}}\) is the Green’s function for \(-\frac{1}{2dN^2} \Delta_{\frac{1}{N}} + \frac{1}{4dN^2} \Delta^2_{\frac{1}{N}}\). Let \(\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots\) be the eigenvalues of \(G_{\frac{1}{N}}\). Define \(P_i\) to be the projection on the \(i\)-th eigenspace. Then using orthogonality we have

\[
\| G_{\frac{1}{N}} u_j \|_{\ell^2\left(\frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N\right)}^2 \leq \sum_i \nu_i^2 \| P_i u_j \|_{\ell^2\left(\frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N\right)}^2 \leq \nu_{\text{max}}^2 \| u_j \|_{\ell^2\left(\frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N\right)}^2
\]

where \(\nu_{\text{max}}\) is the largest eigenvalue of \(G_{\frac{1}{N}}\). Using (4.9) in (4.8) we obtain

\[
E_{\Lambda_N} \| \Psi_N \|_{s}^{-2} \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda_j^{-s} k^2 N^{-\frac{s(d+2)}{2}} \nu_{\text{max}}^2 \| u_j \|_{\ell^2\left(\frac{1}{N} \Lambda_N\right)}^2
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda_j^{-s} k^2 N^{-\frac{s(d+2)}{2}} \nu_{\text{max}}^2 \left( \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}} u_j(x) \right)^2.
\]
From Theorem 1.4 in Van Den Berg and Bolthausen (1999) we know that for any \( x \in D \), 
\(|u_j(x)| \leq \lambda_j^{d/4} \). Theorem 17 on the other hand gives that \( N^{-2}\nu_{\text{max}} \) is bounded above (as \( \lambda_1 \) is bounded away from zero). Using these observations we have

\[
\limsup_{N \to \infty} E_{\Lambda_N} \| \psi_N \|_{-s}^2 \leq C \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda_j^{-s+\frac{d}{2}}.
\]

The last sum is finite whenever \( s > d \).

Thus we have proved (4.7). A standard uniqueness argument using the facts that \( H^{-s}(D) \) is the topological dual of \( H_0^s(D) \) and \( C_c^\infty(D) \) is dense in \( H_0^s(D) \) (see proof of Theorem 3.11 of Cipriani et al. (2018)) completes the proof of Theorem 2. \( \square \)

4.4. One-dimensional case.

4.4.1. Setup. In this case for simplicity we consider \( D = (0, 1) \) and the corresponding
\( D_N \) and \( \Lambda_N \) as defined in Subsection 4.1, in particular \( \Lambda_N = \{2, \ldots, N - 2\} \). To study the scaling limit we define a continuous interpolation \( \psi_N \) for each \( N \) as follows:

\[
\psi_N(t) = kN^{-\frac{d}{2}} \left[ \varphi_{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} + (Nt - \lfloor Nt \rfloor)(\varphi_{\lfloor Nt \rfloor + 1} - \varphi_{\lfloor Nt \rfloor}) \right], \quad t \in \overline{D}.
\]

In the proof of Theorem 3 we use the following result, whose proof follows from that of Theorem 14.9 of Kallenberg (2006).

**Theorem 11.** Let \( X^1, X^2, \ldots \) be continuous processes on \( \overline{D} \) with values in a complete separable metric space \( (S, \rho) \). Assume that \( (X^n_t) \) is tight in \( S \) and that for constants \( \alpha, \beta > 0 \)

\[
E[\rho(X^n_s, X^n_t)^\alpha] \leq C \| s - t \|^{d+\beta}, \quad s, t \in \overline{D}
\]

uniformly in \( n \). Then \( (X^n) \) is tight in \( C(\overline{D}, S) \) and for every \( c \in (0, \beta/\alpha) \) the limiting processes are almost surely Hölder continuous with exponent \( c \).

Another bound we will need is the following:

**Lemma 12.** There exists \( C > 0 \) such that for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z} \)

\[
E_{\Lambda_N}[(\varphi_x - \varphi_y)^2] \leq C|y - x|.
\]

**Proof.** Note that it is enough to show the inequality for \( x, y \in \{1, \ldots, N - 1\} \). The Brascamp-Lieb inequality as in the proof of Lemma 7 yields

\[
E_{\Lambda_N}[(\varphi_x - \varphi_y)^2] \leq E_{\Lambda_N}^{DGF}[(\varphi_x - \varphi_y)^2].
\]

Let \( (X_m)_{m=2}^{N-1} \) be a collection of i.i.d. \( N(0, 2) \) random variables and let \( S = (S_i)_{i=1}^{N-1} \) be the simple random walk on \( \mathbb{Z} \) with \( X_m \)'s as increments. We have that the field \( (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{N-2}, \varphi_{N-1}) \) under \( P_{\Lambda_N}^{DGF} \) has the same law of \( S \) conditionally on \( S_1 = S_{N-1} = 0 \). Now we define the process \( (S'_1, \ldots, S'_{N-1}) \) by

\[
S'_i := S_i - \frac{i-1}{N-2}S_{N-1}.
\]

As a consequence

\[
(S_1, \ldots, S_{N-1}) | S_1 = S_{N-1} = 0 \overset{d}{=} (S'_1, \ldots, S'_{N-1}).
\]
Then for $1 \leq i < j \leq N - 1$ we have

\[
E[(S_j' - S_i')^2] = E \left[ \sum_{m=i+1}^{j} X_m - \frac{j-i}{N-2} S_{N-1} \right]^2
= 2(j-i) + 2 \frac{(j-i)^2}{N-2} - 2 \frac{(j-i)^2}{N-2}^2
= 2(j-i) \left[ 1 - \frac{j-i}{N-2} \right].
\]

This shows the statement. \hfill \square

4.4.2. Proof of Theorem 3. To prove weak convergence we show tightness and finite dimensional convergence. It is easy to see that $(\psi_N(0))_{N \geq 1}$ is tight. Therefore tightness will follow from Theorem 11 if we show that (4.10) is satisfied. Using the properties of Gaussian laws, to show (4.10) it is enough to prove the following: there exists $C > 0$ such that

\[
E_{\Lambda_N} [|\psi_N(t) - \psi_N(s)|^2] \leq C |t - s| \tag{4.12}
\]

for all $t, s \in \overline{D}$ uniformly in $N$. To show (4.12) we consider the following two cases.

- Suppose $t, s \in [x, x + 1/N]$ for some $x \in N^{-1}D_N$. Then we have

\[
\psi_N(t) - \psi_N(s) = kN^{-\frac{1}{2}} [(Nt -Ns)(\varphi_{Nt+1} - \varphi_{Nt})].
\]

Now using (4.11) and the fact that $|t - s| \leq 1/N$ we get (4.12).

- Next suppose $s \in [x, x + 1/N)$ and $t \in [y, y + 1/N)$ for some $x, y \in N^{-1}D_N$ and $t > x + 1/N$. In this case if $|t - s| \leq 1/N$ then one can obtain (4.12) using the above case and a suitable point in between. So we assume $|t - s| > 1/N$. We first note that

\[
E_{\Lambda_N} [|\psi_N(y) - \psi_N(x)|^2] = k^2 N^{-1} E_{\Lambda_N}[(\varphi_{Ny} - \varphi_{Nx})^2] \\
\leq C N^{-1} E_{\Lambda_N}^{DGFF}[(\varphi_{Ny} - \varphi_{Nx})^2] \tag{4.11} \\
\leq C (y - x).
\]

Now

\[
E_{\Lambda_N} [|\psi_N(t) - \psi_N(s)|^2] \leq C \left( E_{\Lambda_N} [|\psi_N(t) - \psi_N(y)|^2] + E_{\Lambda_N} [|\psi_N(y) - \psi_N(x)|^2] \right.
+ E_{\Lambda_N} [|\psi_N(x) - \psi_N(s)|^2]) \leq C |t - s|.
\]

Thus the sequence $(\psi_N)_N$ is tight in $C[0, 1]$.

To conclude the finite dimensional convergence we first show the convergence of the covariance matrix. Let $G_D$ be the Green’s function for the problem

\[
\begin{cases}
-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} u(x) = f(x) & x \in D \\
u(x) = 0 & x \in \partial D.
\end{cases}
\]

We note here that

\[
G_D(x, y) = x \wedge y - xy, \quad x, y \in \overline{D}
\]
which also turns out to be the covariance function of the Brownian bridge, denoted by $(B^0_t : 0 \leq t \leq 1)$. For $x, y \in \overline{D} \cap N^{-1} \mathbb{Z}$ we define

$$G_{\frac{1}{N}}(x, y) := \frac{k^2}{N} G_{\Lambda_N}(Nx, Ny).$$

We now interpolate $G_{\frac{1}{N}}$ in a piece-wise constant fashion on small squares of $D \times D$ to get a new function $G_{\frac{1}{N}}$: we define the value of $G_{\frac{1}{N}}$ in the square $[x, x+1/N) \times [y, y+1/N)$ to be equal to $G_{\frac{1}{N}}(x, y)$ for all $x, y$ in $D \cap N^{-1} \mathbb{Z}$. We show that $G_{\frac{1}{N}}$ converges uniformly to $G_D$ on $\overline{D} \times \overline{D}$. Indeed, let $F_N := G_{\frac{1}{N}} - G_D$. From the proof of Proposition 9 it follows that, for any $f, g \in C^\infty_c(D)$,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{x, y \in \frac{1}{N}D_N} N^{-2} G_{\frac{1}{N}}(x, y) f(x) g(y) = \iint_{D \times D} G_D(x, y) f(x) g(y) \, dx \, dy.$$

Again from Riemann sum convergence we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{x, y \in \frac{1}{N}D_N} N^{-2} G_D(x, y) f(x) g(y) = \iint_{D \times D} G_D(x, y) f(x) g(y) \, dx \, dy.$$

Thus we get

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{x, y \in \frac{1}{N}D_N} N^{-2} F_N(x, y) f(x) g(y) = 0. \tag{4.13}$$

Note that $G_D$ is bounded and

$$\sup_{x, y \in \frac{1}{N}D_N} |G_{\Lambda_N}(Nx, Ny)| \leq C \sup_{z \in D_N} E_{\Lambda_N}[\varphi^2_z] \leq CN.$$

These imply that

$$\sup_{x, y \in \frac{1}{N}D_N} |F_N(x, y)| \leq C.$$

Thus $F_N$ has a subsequence converging uniformly to some function $F$ which is bounded by $C$. With abuse of notation we denote this subsequence by $F_N$. We then have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{x, y \in \frac{1}{N}D_N} N^{-2} F_N(x, y) f(x) g(y) = \iint_{D \times D} F(x, y) f(x) g(y) \, dx \, dy.$$

Uniqueness of the limit gives

$$\iint_{D \times D} F(x, y) f(x) g(y) \, dx \, dy = 0$$

by (4.13). From this we obtain that $F(x, y) = 0$ for almost every $x$ and almost every $y$. The definition by interpolation of $G_{\frac{1}{N}}$ ensures that $F$ is pointwise equal to zero. Finally, the fact that the original sequence $F_N$ converges uniformly to zero follows using the subsequence argument.
We now show the finite dimensional convergence. First let \( t \in \overline{D} \). We write
\[
\psi_N(t) = \psi_{N,1}(t) + \psi_{N,2}(t)
\]
where \( \psi_{N,1}(t) := kN^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi_{[Nt]} \) and \( \psi_{N,2}(t) := kN^{-\frac{1}{2}}(Nt - \lfloor Nt \rfloor)(\varphi_{[Nt+1]} - \varphi_{[Nt]}) \). From (4.11) it follows that \( \mathcal{E}_{\Lambda_N}[\psi_{N,2}(t)^2] \) goes to zero as \( N \) tends to infinity. Therefore to show
\[
\psi_N(t) \xrightarrow{d} B_{t}^\circ
\]
we have
\[
\text{Var}[\psi_{N,1}(t)] \rightarrow G_D(t, t)
\]
and
\[
\text{Var}[\psi_{N,2}(t)] \rightarrow G_D(t, t)
\]
since the sequence \( F_N \) converges to zero uniformly. Since the variables under consideration are Gaussian, one can show the finite dimensional convergence using the convergence of the Green’s functions.

Remark 13. From 4.12 we have, for any \( \alpha > 2 \), that there exists a constant \( C \) such that the following holds uniformly in \( N \) with \( \beta := \alpha/2 - d/2 \):
\[
\mathcal{E}_{\Lambda_N}[|\psi_N(s) - \psi_N(t)|^\alpha] \leq C|s - t|^{d+\beta}, \quad s, t \in \overline{D}.
\]
Thus from Theorem 11 we recover the well-known Hölder continuity of the Brownian bridge with exponent \( \eta \) for any \( \eta \in (0, 1/2) \).

Remark 14. In \( d = 1 \), by the continuous mapping theorem together with Theorem 3 we have
\[
\sup_{t \in \overline{D}} \psi_N(t) \xrightarrow{d} \sup_{t \in \overline{D}} B_t^\circ
\]
which gives the scaling limit for \( M_N := \max_{x \in D_N} \varphi_x \): 
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathcal{P}_{\Lambda_N}(kN^{-\frac{1}{2}}M_N \leq z) = \begin{cases} 
1 - e^{-2z^2} & \text{if } z > 0 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

5. ERROR ESTIMATE IN THE DISCRETE APPROXIMATION OF THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM

This Section is devoted to showing that the solution of the continuum Dirichlet problem can be approximated well by the Green’s function of the mixed model, and we will give a quantitative meaning to this statement. We shall use the ideas from Thomée (1964), namely, to employ a truncated operator with which the problems of approximation around the boundary of the discretised domain can be ignored in a nice manner. We recall that the quantitative version of the results derived in Thomée (1964) was essential to the proof of Theorem 2. We begin by introducing some definitions.

In this Section we consider \( V \) to be any bounded domain in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with boundary \( \partial V \) which is \( C^2 \). We consider the following continuum Dirichlet problem
\[
\begin{cases}
Lu(x) = f(x) & x \in V \\
u(x) = 0 & x \in \partial V.
\end{cases}
\]
where \( L \) is the elliptic differential operator \( L := -\Delta_c \).
Let $h > 0$. We will call the points in $h\mathbb{Z}^d$ as the grid-points in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We consider

$$L_h = -\Delta_h + \frac{h^2}{2d}\Delta_h^2$$

to be an approximation of $L$, where $\Delta_h$ is defined by

$$\Delta_h f(x) := \frac{1}{h^2} \sum_{i=1}^{d} (f(x + he_i) + f(x - he_i) - 2f(x))$$

(5.2)

and $f$ is any function on $h\mathbb{Z}^d$. We call such a function a grid function. We have, for $x \in h\mathbb{Z}^d$, that

$$L_h f(x) = \frac{1}{h^2} \sum_{i=1}^{d} (f(x + he_i) + f(x - he_i) - 2f(x))$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2dh^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} [f(x + h(e_i + e_j)) + f(x - h(e_i + e_j)) + f(x + h(e_i - e_j))$$

$$+ f(x - h(e_i - e_j)) - 2f(x + he_i)$$

$$- 2f(x - he_i) - 2f(x + he_j) - 2f(x - he_j) + 4f(x)].$$

A concept crucially used in Thomée (1964) is that the discrete approximation of an elliptic operator must be consistent with its continuum counterpart. In our case it is possible to see, using Taylor’s expansion, that the operator $L_h \in \{i, j\}$ as $h$ is, if $W$ is a neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in C^2(W)$ then $L_h u(0) = Lu(0) + o(1)$ as $h \to 0$. Also from the definition of ellipticity of a difference operator given in Thomée (1964, page 302) it follows that $L_h$ is elliptic.

Now let $V_h$ be the set of grid points in $\nabla$, i.e. $V_h = \nabla \cap h\mathbb{Z}^d$. We say that $\xi$ is an interior grid point in $V_h$ or $\xi \in R_h$ if $\xi, \xi \pm h(e_i \pm e_j), \xi \pm he_i$ are all in $V_h$ for every $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. We denote $B_h$ to be $V_h \setminus R_h$. For a grid function $f$ we define by $R_h f$ a new grid function vanishing outside $R_h$ as

$$R_h f(\xi) = \begin{cases} 
  f(\xi) & \text{if } \xi \in R_h \\
  0 & \text{if } \xi \notin R_h.
\end{cases}$$

We will divide $R_h$ further into $R_h^*$ and $B_h^*$ where $R_h^*$ is the set of $\xi$ in $R_h$ such that $\xi \pm h(e_i \pm e_j), \xi \pm he_i$ are all in $R_h \cup (B_h \cap \partial V)$ for every $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ and $B_h^*$ is the set of remaining points in $R_h$. Thus we have

$$V_h = B_h \cup R_h = B_h \cup B_h^* \cup R_h^*.$$ 

We now define the finite difference analogue of the Dirichlet’s problem (5.1). For given $h$, we look for a function $u_h(\xi)$ defined on $V_h$ such that

$$L_h u_h(\xi) = f(\xi), \quad \xi \in R_h.$$ 

(5.3)

We consider furthermore the boundary conditions

$$u_h(\xi) = 0, \quad \xi \in B_h.$$ 

(5.4)
One can argue that the finite difference Dirichlet problem \((5.3)\) and \((5.4)\) has exactly one solution for arbitrary \(f\) (Thomée, 1964, Theorem 5.1).

For grid functions vanishing outside \(V_h\) we define the norm \(\| \cdot \|_{h}\) by

\[
\| f \|_{h}^2 := h^d \sum_{\xi \in V_h} f(\xi)^2.
\]

Mind that we are using this norm only in the current Section and thus there is no risk of confusion with the norm defined in Subsection 4.2. We now prove the main result of this Section.

**Theorem 15.** Let \(u \in C^3(V)\) be a solution of the Dirichlet’s problem \((5.1)\) and \(u_h\) be the solution of the discrete problem \((5.3)\) and \((5.4)\). If \(e_h := u - u_h\) then for sufficiently small \(h\) we have

\[
\| R_h e_h \|_{h}^2 \leq C \left[ M_3^2 h^2 + h(M_3^2 h^4 + M_1^2) \right]
\]

where \(M_k = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \sup_{x \in V} |D^\alpha u(x)|\).

**Proof.** We denote by \(C\) all constants which do not depend on \(u, f\). A standard Taylor’s expansion gives for all \(x \in V\) and for small \(h\)

\[
L_h u(x) = Lu(x) + h^{-2} R_3(x)
\]

where

\[
|R_3(x)| \leq CM_3 h^3.
\] (5.5)

So we obtain for \(\xi \in R_h\)

\[
L_h e_h(\xi) = L_h u(\xi) - L_h u_h(\xi)
\]

\[
= Lu(\xi) + h^{-2} R_3(\xi) - L_h u_h(\xi)
\]

\[
= h^{-2} R_3(\xi).
\]

The truncated operator \(L_{h,1}\) is defined as follows:

\[
L_{h,1} f(x) := \begin{cases} 
L_h f(x) & x \in R_h^* \\
h L_h f(x) & x \in B_h^* \\
0 & x \not\in R_h.
\end{cases}
\]

For \(\xi \in R_h^*\) we have

\[
L_{h,1} R_h e_h(\xi) = L_h R_h e_h(\xi) = L_h e_h(\xi) = h^{-2} R_3(\xi).
\] (5.6)

For \(\xi \in B_h^*\) at least one of \(\xi \pm h(e_i \pm e_j), \xi \not\in B_h \setminus (B_h \cap \partial V)\). As the value of the solution of \((5.1)\) is known to be zero on the boundary \(\partial V\), we have for \(\eta \in B_h\)

\[
u(\eta) = u_h(\eta) + R_1(\eta)
\]

where \(|R_1(\eta)| \leq CM_1 h\). For \(\xi \in B_h^*\) denote by

\[
S_{i,j}(\xi) = \{ \eta : \eta \in B_h \setminus (B_h \cap \partial V) \cap \{ \xi \pm h e_i, \xi \pm h(e_i \pm e_j) \} \}.
\]
Therefore, for $\xi \in B_h^*$,
\[
L_{h,1} R_h e_h(\xi) = h L_h R_h e_h(\xi)
\]
\[
= h \left\{ L_h e_h(\xi) - h^{-2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \sum_{\eta \in S_{i,j}(\xi)} C(\eta) e_h(\eta) \right\}
\]
\[
= h^{-1} R_3(\xi) + h^{-1} R_1'(\xi)
\]  
(5.7)
where $C(\eta)$ is a constant depending on $\eta$ and
\[
|R_1'(\xi)| \leq C M_1 h.
\]  
(5.8)
Hence
\[
\| L_{h,1} R_h e_h \|_h^2 = h^d \sum_{x \in R_h} (L_{h,1} R_h e_h(x))^2
\]
\[
= h^d \left[ \sum_{x \in R_h^*} (L_{h,1} R_h e_h(x))^2 + \sum_{x \in B_h^*} (L_{h,1} R_h e_h(x))^2 \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{h^d}{h^{-2} M_3^2 h^2 + h (M_3^2 h^4 + M_1^2)}
\]
\[
\leq C \left[ M_3^2 h^2 + h (M_3^2 h^4 + M_1^2) \right]
\]  
(5.9)
where the last inequality holds as the number of points in $B_h^*$ is $O(h^{-(d-1)})$ which follows from Penrose (2003, Lemma 5.4) due to assumption of a $C^2$ boundary. Finally using Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 3.1 of Thomée (1964) we obtain
\[
\| R_h e_h \|_h^2 \leq C \left[ M_3^2 h^2 + h (M_3^2 h^4 + M_1^2) \right]
\]  
(5.9)
which completes the proof. $\square$

**Remark 16.** Note that in the above proof we used Theorem 4.2 of Thomée (1964) which requires the domain to satisfy a property called $B_1^*$. In the same article it is pointed out that for any domain $B_1^*$ holds by definition.

**Theorem 17.** Let $A_h$ be the matrix $h^2 L_h$ and let $\mu_1^{(h)}$ be the smallest eigenvalue of $A_h$. Then
\[
\lambda_1 = \lim_{h \to 0} h^{-2} \mu_1^{(h)},
\]
where $\lambda_1$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $-\Delta_c$.

The proof of the above result follows by imitating the proof of Theorem 8.1 of Thomée (1964) which we skip here.
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