

The Initial Value Problem for Singular SPDEs via Rough Paths

Claudia Raithel ^{*} & Jonas Sauer [†]

January 19, 2022

Abstract

Abstract: In this contribution we are interested in developing a solution theory for singular quasilinear stochastic partial differential equations subject to an initial condition. We obtain our solution theory via a perturbation of the rough path approach developed to handle the space-time periodic problem by Otto and Weber (2019). As in their work, we assume that the forcing is of class $C^{\alpha-2}$ for $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$ and space-time periodic and, additionally, that the initial condition is of class C^α and periodic. We observe that, thanks to bounds for the heat semigroup, enforcing an initial condition within the framework of Otto and Weber does not require any new stochastic results.

Keywords: singular SPDEs, quasilinear equations, initial value problems

^{*}Technische Universität Wien, Karlsplatz 13, 1040 Wien, Austria

[†]Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik in den Naturwissenschaften, Inselstrasse 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany; and Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 06099 Halle (Saale), Germany

[‡]The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences.

[§]The first author gratefully acknowledges partial support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), grants P30000, W1245, and F65.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Some possible extensions	5
1.2	Notation	5
2	Set-up and Overview of our Strategy	5
2.1	Definitions and tools	5
2.2	Usage of the Periodic Offline Products	9
2.3	New “Offline” Products	10
2.4	Reconstruction Lemmas	13
2.5	Discussion and Statement of our Results	15
3	Main PDE Ingredient: Proof of the <i>Safonov</i> Lemma	19
4	Treatment of the Linear Problem	23
4.1	Proof of Proposition 1	23
4.2	Analysis of the Ansatz for the Boundary Correction	28
4.3	Proof of Proposition 3	35
4.4	Proof of Theorem 1	43
5	Proof of Theorem 2	44
6	Construction of the New “Offline” Products and Reconstruction Lemmas	47
6.1	Proof of Lemmas 2 and 3: Bounds for Functions from Definition 2	47
6.2	Proofs for the Construction of the New “Offline” Products	50
6.3	Proof of the Reconstruction Lemmas	52
7	Proof of Lemma 1	56
8	Acknowledgements	58

1 Introduction

In this paper we construct a stable solution operator for a parabolic quasilinear initial value problem in $1 + 1$ dimensions that is driven by a rough right-hand side. We measure the regularity of both the data and the desired solution in terms of parabolic Hölder spaces: Let $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$, we consider the initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_2 U - a(U) \partial_1^2 U + U &= f & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ U &= U_{int} & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for $f \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $U_{int} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$, and $a \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ that is uniformly elliptic and bounded with at least three bounded derivatives. All of the data is also assumed to be periodic; in particular, f is space-time periodic and a and U_{int} are periodic.

To motivate the main difficulty that arises in the treatment of (1), it is useful to extrapolate the results of classical Schauder theory to (1). Notice that, because of the rough right-hand side, this application is *a priori* only a heuristic, which, however, leaves us with two observations: (1) The expected solution space for (1) is functions in $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ that are periodic in space. And (2) The nonlinear term of (1) has no well-defined classical meaning since we expect that $a(U) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\partial_1^2 U \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In particular, recall that two distributions have a well-defined product if the sum of their Hölder exponents is positive; here, however, we have that $\alpha + \alpha - 2 = 2\alpha - 2 < 0$ since $\alpha < 1$. So, it is necessary to specify a definition for the nonlinear term that is reasonable in that we are able to obtain a solution operator that is, in some sense, continuous.

Motivation of our ansatz via [17]: The current contribution can be seen as a continuation of the techniques developed to handle the space-time periodic version of (1) by Otto and Weber in [17]. In particular, here the authors consider the following space-time periodic problem:

$$\partial_2 u - a(u) \partial_1^2 u = \sigma(u) f \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (2)$$

where, on top of the assumptions that we have on our data, σ is of class C^α and satisfies some additional conditions. In [17], the authors clearly face the same issue as we do here, in that the nonlinear terms of (2) are not well-defined classically. Following the intuition from the theory of rough paths [14], where increments of the solution to a nonlinear SDE are locally well-described by a linear counterpart, they first introduce the notion of *modelledness*:

Definition 1 (Modelledness). *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$. For $I \in \mathbb{N}$ we have families of functions $(V_1(\cdot, a_0), \dots, V_I(\cdot, a_0))$ indexed by $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ defined on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. A function $U : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be modelled after $(V_1(\cdot, a_0), \dots, V_I(\cdot, a_0))$ on Ω according to functions (a_1, \dots, a_I) and $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_I)$ in $C^\alpha(\Omega)$ if there exists a function ν such that*

$$M := \sup_{x \neq y; x, y \in \Omega} \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{|U(y) - U(x) - \sigma_i(x)(V_i(y, a_i(x)) - V_i(x, a_i(x))) - \nu(x)(y - x)_1|}{d^{2\alpha}(x, y)} \quad (3)$$

is finite. We say that U is “trivially modelled” on Ω if $U \in C^{2\alpha}(\Omega)$, since then we may take $\sigma_i = 0$ and $\nu = \partial_1 U$. As emphasized in the next section, here $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ represents the parabolic metric on \mathbb{R}^2 given by (13).

We remark here that the concept of “modelled after” is essentially a higher dimensional version of “controlled by” in the work of Gubinelli [7]. Correspondingly, the σ_i in Definition 1 correspond to the *Gubinelli derivative*.

With the concept of “modelledness” in-hand, in order to define the nonlinear terms, the authors of [17] then proceed with a probabilistic and a deterministic step:

Probabilistic: They consider the forcing f as a random distribution and denote by $v_{OW}(\cdot, a_0)$ the solution of (2) with coefficients frozen at a_0 –the additional subscript indicates the lack of the massive term in (2). Then, they find that, after a renormalization, they almost surely obtain *offline* products $v_{OW}(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_{OW}(\cdot, a'_0)$ for $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ with $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]} \sup_{0 \leq j, k \leq 2} \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \left\| \partial_{a_0}^j \partial_{a'_0}^k [v_{OW}(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_{OW}(\cdot, a'_0) \right\| \lesssim 1. \quad (4)$$

Here, as in the sequel, $(\cdot)_T$ denotes convolution with a certain kernel (specified in Section 2.1) at scale T . Indeed, (4) should be thought of as a $C^{2\alpha-2}$ -control of the commutator. As discussed in [17], this commutator condition is well-motivated by the previous literature on singular SPDEs (*e.g.* [7, Theorem]).

Deterministic: Assuming they have access to the family of offline products satisfying (4), they then show that if $u, w \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ are modelled after $\{v_{\text{OW}}(\cdot, a_0)\}_{a_0}$, then it is possible to define $u \diamond \partial_1^2 w$ in such a way that (4) is preserved. In analogue to Hairer’s Reconstruction Theorem [11, Theorem 3.10], these lemmas and their counterparts here (Lemmas 6 and 7) are called “Reconstruction Lemmas.”

After the above discussion, we remark that the solution space for (2) is the space of space-time periodic functions in $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that are additionally modelled after the family $\{v_{\text{OW}}(\cdot, a_0)\}_{a_0}$.

Once the issue of the singular products is addressed, one can then proceed to a purely deterministic approach to the well-posedness of (2); of course, taking as input the singular products. Since we are actually interested in the adaption of the technique of [17] to our situation, we will now focus only on (1). Here, the strategy for handling the quasilinear problem (1), which mimics the classical method, is to first treat the linearized problem, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)U &= f && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ U &= U_{\text{int}} && \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

for $a \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ periodic in space, and then to perform a contraction mapping argument. The classical strategy is complicated by the singular products and the *a priori* lack of Schauder estimates (since there is not enough regularity to apply the classical results.)

The main observation of this paper is that: On the level of the linear problem (5), it is natural to take the ansatz $U = \mathbf{U} + u$, where $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ solves

$$(\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)u = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \tag{6}$$

and $\mathbf{U} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)\mathbf{U} &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2 \\ \mathbf{U} &= U_{\text{int}} - u && \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We call our ansatz *perturbative* because the solution u of (6) is obtained using a variation of the arguments in [17] and \mathbf{U} , which we call the “initial boundary layer,” can be obtained classically using bounds for the heat semigroup. We would like to note that the original motivation for our perturbative ansatz comes from the work of Gerencsér and Hairer [5], where the authors treat singular initial boundary value problems within the framework of regularity structures.

Combining our perturbative ansatz with the framework suggested by [17], we then search for solutions $U = \mathbf{U} + u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ that are periodic in space and modelled after the family $\{(v + \mathbf{V})(\cdot, a_0)\}_{a_0}$, where $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0)$ denotes the solution of (7) with coefficients frozen at a_0 and initial condition $U_{\text{int}} - v(\cdot, a_0)$. This, of course, means that we must define new *offline* products that now involve $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0)$; as is detailed in Section 2.3, this does not require any probabilistic input. The main novel contribution of the current work is the treatment of (7) contained in Propositions 2 and 3. We notice that at this point it is already easy to point out one of the more technical problems we must overcome—notice that the initial conditions of \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{U} do not match-up.

Previous literature: Before continuing, we do an abbreviated literature review; we ask that the reader consults, *e.g.*, the introductions of [7], [11], and [17] and the comprehensive review of rough paths and regularity structures in [2] for a more complete picture. Here, we would only like to mention that the parametric technique of Otto and Weber embeds into a well-developed and active landscape concerned with singular SPDEs. In particular, the development of *rough paths* goes back to the work of Lyons [14], which treated SDEs with rough drivers. The work of Lyons was the starting point, which then developed in two different, but interconnected, directions: (1) It was generalized and combined with Fourier analytic methods (the paracalculus developed by Bony) by Gubinelli [7] and Gubinelli, Imkeller, and Perkowski [8] in order to treat subcritical singular semilinear SPDEs via the method of paracontrolled distributions. And (2) It inspired the work of Hairer on regularity structures [9, 10, 11], which handles subcritical singular semilinear SPDEs in the most general framework. Since [17], both methods have been extended to the quasilinear case—in the framework of paracontrolled distributions

[3] and for regularity structures [6]. Within the theory of regularity structures, there has also been the recent work of Gerencsér [4] in which a Wong-Zakai type characterization is given for solutions of the stochastic quasilinear heat equation forced by space-time white noise in $1+1$ dimensions. We remark that in the framework of Otto and Weber, the regularity assumptions on the forcing have been dropped to $C^{\alpha-2}$ for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3})$ in the case of a special (space-time periodic) example by the second author, Smith, Otto and Weber in [16] –their result will be extended to $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ in an upcoming contribution [15]. It should be mentioned that the results in [15] and [16] rely on the concept of (in the language Hairer) *modelled distributions*. Before ending this review, we would lastly like to mention that around the same time as [17], there was a work by Bailleul, Debussche, and Hofmanová on the parabolic Anderson model [1], the result of which is now included in [3], but avoids the extension of the theory of paracontrolled distributions contained in [3] by transforming their equation into a semilinear equation that could be handled within the standard theory.

1.1 Some possible extensions

Higher dimensions: While our arguments in this paper are given for the case of one spatial dimension, we believe that our analysis carries through to the general case of $1 + d$ dimensions, for $d \geq 2$, without any further issues. This observation is supported by the fact that the results in [15] will be proven in $1 + d$ dimensions –the higher dimensions present a notational, but not theoretical, difficulty.

Spatial boundaries: We would like to point out that in the current contribution, we do not handle initial boundary value problems. It is to be expected that, again as in [5], the presence of an additional spatial boundary could also be treated with a perturbative ansatz. For the spatial boundary, the hope would be to replace the use of the heat kernel in the below analysis by that of a Poisson kernel. This issue will be treated in a future work.

Different kinds of noise: We mention two directions that this could go in. First, we remark that the noise in our equation is additive, while that in [17] is multiplicative. As the reader will see in our analysis, we do benefit from this simplification. Of course, even with additive noise, it would also be interesting to lower the regularity assumptions for the forcing f . This could possibly be done by using *modelled distributions* as in [15] and [16].

1.2 Notation

When we say “periodic,” the period will always be 1 and is, therefore, not emphasized. Throughout this article, we will use the Einstein summation convention. Also, we use the notation $\mathbb{R}_+^2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 > 0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_-^2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 < 0\}$. Additionally, for $L > 0$ we use $\mathbb{R}_L^2 = \mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, -L]$. We write “ \lesssim ” to indicate “ $\leq C$ ”, where C is a universal constant that usually may depend only on the ellipticity ratio $\lambda > 0$. We use the notation that $x_i = x \cdot e_i$ for a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$; in particular, $x = (x_1, x_2)$.

In this paper functions/ distributions will either be defined on \mathbb{R}^2 or on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . The domain is usually clear from the context and is, therefore, not mentioned. When the domain that a norm is taken over is slightly ambiguous we indicate it with a subscript. To give an example, we remark that $\|u\|_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}_+^2}$ is the C^α -norm of u on \mathbb{R}_+^2 .

When we do not explicitly specify the σ_i in the modelling of a function, then $\sigma_i = 1$. Also, for brevity, instead of saying that a function “is modelled after a family $\{v(\cdot, a_0)\}_{a_0}$ for $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$,” we simply say that is “modelled after v .”

2 Set-up and Overview of our Strategy

In the current section our goal is to solidify notation and formally state our results.

2.1 Definitions and tools

Modelling and freezing of the non-linearity: We have already introduced the concept of modelledness (Definition 1) and have explained that we expect the solution U of (1) to be modelled after $V(\cdot, a_0)$

solving

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)V(\cdot, a_0) &= f & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ V(\cdot, a_0) &= U_{int} & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where this function decomposes as

$$V(\cdot, a_0) = v(\cdot, a_0) + \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U_{int} - v(a_0)). \quad (9)$$

Here, we use the following convention:

Definition 2 (Parameterized constant coefficient solutions). *Let $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and $\mathbf{V}_{int}(\cdot, a_0) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. Then $v(\cdot, a_0) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ denotes the space-time periodic solution of*

$$(\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)v(\cdot, a_0) = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (10)$$

and $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ denotes the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)) &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)) &= \mathbf{V}_{int}(\cdot, a_0) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which is periodic in space.

For two right-hand sides f_i or two initial conditions $U_{int,i}$ with $i = 0, 1$, the corresponding solutions of (10) and (11) are denoted by $v_i(\cdot, a_0)$ and $\mathbf{V}_i(\cdot, a_0)$ respectively.

In the sequel, for brevity, when the forcing $f \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and initial condition $U_{int} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ are fixed, we use the notation

$$\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0) := \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U_{int} - v(a_0)), \quad (12)$$

which allows us to rewrite (9) as

$$V(\cdot, a_0) = (v + \mathbf{V})(\cdot, a_0).$$

Norms and Seminorms: In this contribution we are interested in regularity in terms of *parabolic* Hölder spaces. In particular, when we write $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ or $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we are referring to the Hölder space that is defined in terms of the Carnot-Carathéodory metric induced by the parabolic operator $\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , given by

$$d(x, y) := |x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (13)$$

Of course, when we write $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ we are referring to the standard (*elliptic*) Hölder space.

We will use the standard convention that for $\beta \in (1, 2)$ one defines

$$[u]_\beta := [\partial_1 u]_{\beta-1}$$

and analogously for $\beta \in (2, 3)$ we have

$$[u]_\beta := [\partial_1^2 u]_{\beta-2} + [\partial_2 u]_{\beta-2}. \quad (14)$$

Throughout this paper we use the notation

$$\|u\| := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|.$$

If we have a family of functions $\{u(\cdot, a_0, a'_0)\}$ parametrized by $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, then we use the convention

$$\|u\| := \sup_{a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]} \|u(\cdot, a_0, a'_0)\|.$$

This is used in the following definition:

Definition 3 (Negative Hölder norm). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2)$. We define the $C^{\alpha-2}$ -norm of a distribution u as*

$$[u]_{\alpha-2} := \inf_{(u^1, u^2, u^3)} ([u^1]_{\alpha} + [u^2]_{\alpha} + [u^3]_{\alpha} + \|u^3\|), \quad (15)$$

where the infimum is taken over triplets of functions (u^1, u^2, u^3) such that $u = \partial_1^2 u^1 + \partial_2 u^2 + u^3$.

Notice that even though we choose to use a seminorm notation on the left-hand side of (15), thanks to the $\|u^3\|$ -term on the right-hand side, this is actually a norm.

At one point in our arguments it is necessary to use a local version of the C^{α} -seminorm. Here is the definition:

Definition 4 (Local Hölder seminorm). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We define the local C^{α} -seminorm of a function u as*

$$[u]_{\alpha}^{loc} := \sup_{d(x,y) \leq 1} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{d^{\alpha}(x, y)}.$$

For a family of functions $\{u(\cdot, a_0, a'_0)\}$ parametrized by $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, we use the notation

$$\|u\|_{j,k} := \sup_{m \leq j} \sup_{n \leq k} \|\partial_{a_0}^m \partial_{a'_0}^n u\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_j := \sup_{m \leq j} \|\partial_{a_0}^m u\|.$$

We use the same convention for the C^{α} -norm and seminorm; *i.e.* we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{\alpha,j,k} &:= \sup_{m \leq j} \sup_{n \leq k} \|\partial_{a_0}^m \partial_{a'_0}^n u\|_{\alpha}, \\ \|u\|_{\alpha,j} &:= \sup_{m \leq j} \|\partial_{a_0}^m u\|_{\alpha}, \\ [u]_{\alpha,j,k} &:= \sup_{m \leq j} \sup_{n \leq k} [\partial_{a_0}^m \partial_{a'_0}^n u]_{\alpha}, \\ \text{and } [u]_{\alpha,j} &:= \sup_{m \leq j} [\partial_{a_0}^m u]_{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar notation can be introduced for the local Hölder seminorm from Definition 4.

Convolution kernel: Throughout many of our arguments we rely on regularization via convolution with a specific kernel. The convolution kernel that we use is the same as that in [17] and is most easily defined (up to a normalizing multiplicative constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$) in terms of its Fourier transform as

$$\hat{\psi}_T(k) = C \exp(-T(k_1^4 + k_2^2)). \quad (16)$$

This definition immediately implies that ψ_T is a positive Schwartz function. This kernel is chosen because it is the semigroup associated to the operator $\partial_1^4 - \partial_2^2$, which is positive and has the same relative scaling as $\partial_2 - \partial_1^2$. Usually, we will use the convention

$$(\cdot)_T = \cdot * \psi_T;$$

occasionally, we even drop the parentheses and simply use the subscript T .

We now list and prove some useful properties of ψ_T . We will use the change of coordinates

$$\hat{x} = (\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) = \left(\frac{x_1}{T^{\frac{1}{4}}}, \frac{x_2}{T^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right). \quad (17)$$

Fix $T > 0$, here is the list of properties of ψ_T :

- Using (16) and (17) we find that

$$\psi_T(x_1, x_2) = (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-3} \psi_1(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2). \quad (18)$$

Therefore, assuming that $C = \|\psi_1\|_{L^1}^{-1}$ in (16), we obtain $\|\psi_T\|_{L^1} = \|\psi_1\|_{L^1} = 1$.

- (*Bound on the moments of ψ_T*) For any $i, j \geq 0$, $\alpha \geq 0$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(x, y) |\partial_1^i \partial_2^j \psi_T(x - y)| dx \lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha - i - 2j}. \quad (19)$$

To see this we may assume that $y = 0$, after which rescaling with (17) gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(x, 0) |\partial_1^i \partial_2^j \psi_T(x)| dx = (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha - i - 2j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(\hat{x}, 0) |\partial_1^i \partial_2^j \psi_1(\hat{x})| d\hat{x}.$$

The fact that ψ_1 is a Schwartz function yields (19).

- (*Semigroup property of ψ_T*) For a distribution u and two scales $t, T > 0$ we have that $(u * \psi_t) * \psi_T = u * (\psi_t * \psi_T)$ and by (16) that $\psi_t * \psi_T = \psi_{t+T}$. Combining these two yields

$$(u_t)_T = u_{t+T}. \quad (20)$$

- For any $i, j \geq 0$ such that $i + j \geq 1$ and $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, by (19) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \partial_1^i \partial_2^j u(y) \psi_T(x - y) dy \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (u(y) - u(x)) \partial_1^i \partial_2^j \psi_T(x - y) dy \right| \\ &\leq [u]_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(x, y) |\partial_1^i \partial_2^j \psi_T(x - y)| dy \\ &\lesssim [u]_\alpha (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha - i - 2j}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Notice that we have again used that ψ_T is a Schwartz function (in the first line).

- (*Monotonicity of the L^∞ -norm in terms of the convolution scale*) For a distribution u and $T \geq t > 0$ it holds that

$$\|u * \psi_T\| \lesssim \|u * \psi_t\| \|\psi_{T-t}\|_{L^1} = \|u * \psi_t\|, \quad (22)$$

where we have used (20), Young's inequality for convolutions, and (18).

While Definition 3 gives the standard notion that we use for the $C^{\alpha-2}$ -norm, we often also need an equivalent formulation, which is developed in Lemma 1 below and relies on convolution with ψ_T at scales $T \leq 1$.

Lemma 1 (Equivalent $C^{\alpha-2}$ - norm). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then a distribution f on \mathbb{R}^2 satisfies*

$$[f]_{\alpha-2} \sim \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-\alpha} \|f_T\|. \quad (23)$$

This lemma is an analogue of Lemma A.1 in [17]. In our situation, we cannot directly use their method of proof due to the loss of periodicity in the x_2 -direction. Instead, we adapt a more general argument from a work by Ignat and Otto [12]. We use the notation

$$\|f\|_{-\beta} := \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^\beta \|f_T\|$$

for $\beta > 0$.

The alternate formulation of the $C^{\alpha-2}$ -norm is useful when working with the singular products. In particular, as already mentioned, the offline products $\{v(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a'_0)\}$ indexed by $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ should satisfy an estimate of the form (4). Using the notational conventions already introduced, such a commutator condition may be abbreviated as

$$\|[v, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v\|_{2\alpha-2,2,2} \lesssim 1. \quad (24)$$

With Lemma 1 in mind, we interpret (24) as a $C^{2\alpha-2}$ -control for the commutator. As we will see in Section 2.2, the family of offline products satisfying (24) exists almost surely for a certain class of random forcings. Inputting such a family of offline products into the proofs of the reconstruction lemmas, we end up passing to the limit (up to subsequences) in sequences of distributions that are uniformly controlled in the sense of the right-hand side of (23). Being able to pass to the limit relies on Lemma 1 through the compactness of the Hölder space on the left-hand side, which can be deduced from Definition 3.

A hierarchy of norms: There is a natural hierarchy of norms appearing. In particular, we measure:

- functions (e.g. the solution U or the initial condition U_{int} of (1)) in C^α ,
- distributions (e.g. the forcing f or the singular product $a(U) \diamond \partial_1^2 U$ in (1)) in $C^{\alpha-2}$,
- and commutators (e.g. $[a(U), (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 U$) in $C^{2\alpha-2}$.

Extensions to negative times: In order for our arguments to make sense, it will often be necessary to extend various functions defined only for positive times to negative times. We will do this in two ways:

Definition 5 (Extensions to negative times). *For a function f defined on \mathbb{R}_+^2 we use \tilde{f} to denote the even-reflection across the axis $\{x_2 = 0\}$ and f^E to denote the trivial extension by 0. So, in particular, we have that*

$$\tilde{f}(x) := f(\tilde{x}),$$

where we use the convention $\tilde{x} = (x_1, |x_2|)$ for $x = (x_1, x_2)$, and

$$f^E(x) := \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_-^2. \end{cases}$$

Notice that, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if $f \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$, then $\tilde{f} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

2.2 Usage of the Periodic Offline Products

In this contribution, as in [17], we would like to interpret f as random and taken from a certain class of stationary, space-time periodic, and centered Gaussian distributions. The regularity conditions on f are expressed in terms of \hat{C} , where we use the stationarity of f to define the covariance function via

$$\langle f(x)f(x') \rangle = C(x - x'),$$

and denote by \hat{C} the (real-valued and symmetric) discrete Fourier transform of C . Namely, we postulate that there are $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha' \in (\frac{1}{4}, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}(k) &\leq \frac{1}{(1 + |k_1|)^{\lambda_1} (\sqrt{1 + |k_2|})^{\lambda_2}}, \quad k = (k_1, k_2) \in (2\pi\mathbb{Z})^2, \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 &= -1 + 2\alpha' \quad \lambda_1, \frac{\lambda_2}{2} < 1. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We refer to Section 3 in [17] for a discussion of admissible f , but note that this class includes, e.g., the case where f is “white” in the time-like variable x_2 and has covariance operator $(1 + |\partial_1|)^{-\lambda_1}$ for $\lambda_1 > \frac{1}{3}$ in the x_1 variable.

For such f , the construction of the generalized product $v(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a'_0)$, where $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ and we use the notation from Definition 2, necessitates a renormalization procedure. More precisely, let ψ' be an arbitrary positive, L^1 -normalized Schwartz function and set $\psi'_\varepsilon(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{4}}} \psi'_1(\frac{x_1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}}, \frac{x_2}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}})$. Then, for $f_\varepsilon = f * \psi'_\varepsilon$ and $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, we let $v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a_0)$ solve $(\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a_0) = f_\varepsilon$ and construct $v(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a'_0)$ as

$$v(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a'_0) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a_0) \partial_1^2 v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a'_0) - \langle v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a_0) \partial_1^2 v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a'_0) \rangle), \tag{26}$$

the existence of this limit being part of the assertion of the proposition below. In general, the expectation $g_2(\varepsilon, a_0, a'_0) = \langle v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a_0) \partial_1^2 v_\varepsilon(\cdot, a'_0) \rangle$ diverges as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, but we mention that no renormalization procedure is needed if f is “white” in x_1 and “trace-class” in x_2 .

The results of [17], adapted to our setting, can be summarized in the following proposition. In particular, it is shown that the condition (25) corresponds to the deterministic regularity assumption (66) and that the renormalized products converge. Furthermore, we obtain a control for stochastic moments of the renormalized commutators together with their derivatives with respect to a_0, a'_0 .

Proposition. Let $\alpha' \in (\frac{1}{4}, 1)$ and let f be a centered, space-time periodic, stationary Gaussian random distribution satisfying the regularity assumption (25). Let $f_\varepsilon = f * \psi'_\varepsilon$ be as described above. We use the notation from Definition 2. Furthermore, suppose that $p < \infty$, $n, m \geq 0$ and $\alpha < \alpha'$.

Then the renormalized product (26) converges almost surely and in every stochastic L^p space uniformly in a_0, a'_0 with respect to the $C^{\alpha'-2}$ -norm. Furthermore, we find that

$$\left\langle \left(\|f\|_{\alpha-2} \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\langle \left(\|[v, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v\|_{2\alpha-2, n, m} \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim 1,$$

where the universal constants depend only on $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, p, n, m, \alpha$, the ellipticity contrast λ and the choice of the regularizing kernel ψ' .

Observe that, in contrast to [17], we do not impose the condition $\hat{C}(0) = 0$ corresponding to a mean-free condition on f . On the same token, the functions v and v_ε are solutions with respect to the operator $\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1$ instead of $\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2$, which would incur the additional subscript “OW” as indicated in the introduction. An inspection of the arguments in [17] yields the observation that these two modifications actually compensate for each other –this is because the massive term gives an additional factor of e^{-x_2} in the Green’s function. We find that, in particular, the relevant results carry over to our setting.

Remark 1. Since the noise in [17] is multiplicative, there the authors must also construct the offline products $v_{OW}(\cdot, a_0) \diamond f$. Here, however, this is not necessary since we have additive noise.

2.3 New “Offline” Products

For $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, we construct two new types of generalized products:

$$v(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 \tilde{V}(\cdot, a'_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{V}(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a'_0),$$

where $\tilde{V}(\cdot, a_0)$ is the even-reflection of the function defined in (12) and $v(\cdot, a_0)$ solves (10). Each of these families (indexed by a_0, a'_0) should satisfy a $C^{2\alpha-2}$ -commutator estimate similar to (24). These new offline products along with those from Section 2.2 and the two reconstruction lemmas (see Section 2.4) make it possible to give meaning to the nonlinear term in (1).

The new generalized products are, in fact, not really “offline,” but are classical –their construction does not require any probabilistic tools, but instead relies on the following estimates for the constant coefficient solutions from Definition 2. We start by compiling bounds for $V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$. Here, we rely on the heat kernel formulation of $V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$, i. e., using the notation

$$G(x_1, x_2, a_0) := \frac{1}{(4\pi a_0 x_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{\frac{-x_1^2}{4x_2 a_0} - x_2}, \quad (27)$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we write:

$$V(x, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} V_{int}(y, a_0) G(x_1 - y, x_2, a_0) dy. \quad (28)$$

We, in particular, obtain the following estimates:

Lemma 2 (Bounds for the heat semigroup). Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$, and $V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$ solve (11). Then the following observations hold:

i) For $1 \leq k \leq 2$ and $0 \leq j$, $\partial_{a_0}^j \partial_1^k V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$ satisfies

$$|\partial_{a_0}^j \partial_1^k V(x, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))| \lesssim [V_{int}]_{\alpha, j} x_2^{\frac{\alpha-k}{2}} \quad (29)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. In particular, $\partial_{a_0}^j \partial_1^k V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$ is a well-defined distribution if $\partial_{a_0}^m V_{int}(\cdot, a_0) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ for all $m \leq j$.

If the initial condition V_{int} does not depend on a_0 , then the relation (29) also holds in the case that $k = 0$ and $j > 0$.

ii) For $j \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have the L^∞ -estimate

$$\|V(\cdot, x_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))\|_j \lesssim \|V_{int}\|_j e^{-x_2}. \quad (30)$$

iii) For $0 \leq j \leq 3$, we have the relation

$$[\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))]_{\alpha, j} \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}\|_{\alpha, j}. \quad (31)$$

iv) For $0 \leq j \leq 1$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have that

$$|\partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(x, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(y, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))| \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}\|_{\alpha, j} (x_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + y_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) d^{2\alpha}(x, y). \quad (32)$$

v) If $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))$ solves (11) without the massive term, then the estimates (29), (31), and (32) still hold. The estimate (30) still holds in a modified form; in particular, there is no factor of e^{-x_2} on the right-hand side.

On the level of the space-time periodic constant coefficient solutions $v(\cdot, a_0)$, we often use the following estimate:

Lemma 3. Let $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$ and $v(\cdot, a_0) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ solve (10). Then the bound

$$\|v\|_{\alpha, 2} \lesssim [f]_{\alpha-2}$$

holds.

This lemma is essentially a corollary of the classical Schauder estimates and Definition 3.

To construct the first type of new reference product we use the following lemma:

Lemma 4. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Assume that $F \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and for G , a function defined on \mathbb{R}^2 , there exists a constant $C(G) \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|\partial_1^2 G(x)| \lesssim C(G) (|x_2|^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}) \quad (33)$$

for any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, then the product $F \partial_1^2 G$ is well-defined as a distribution on \mathbb{R}^2 and

$$\|[F, (\cdot)] \partial_1^2 G\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim C(G) [F]_\alpha. \quad (34)$$

We use this lemma in conjunction with Lemmas 2 and 3 to obtain the first type of new “offline” (actually classical) product:

Corollary 1. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$. Recall that $v(\cdot, a_0) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ solves (10) and $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0)$ is defined in (12); we use the notation from Definition 5. We then obtain:

i) For any $F \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the products $F \partial_1^2 \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\cdot, a_0)$ are well-defined as distributions and this family satisfies

$$\|[F, (\cdot)] \partial_1^2 \tilde{\mathbf{V}}\|_{2\alpha-2, 2} \lesssim (\|U_{int}\|_\alpha + [f]_{\alpha-2}) [F]_\alpha. \quad (35)$$

ii) For $0 \leq j, k \leq 2$, the products $\partial_{a_0}^j v(\cdot, a_0) \partial_1^2 \partial_{a'_0}^k \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\cdot, a'_0)$ are well-defined as distributions and this family satisfies

$$\|[v, (\cdot)] \partial_1^2 \tilde{\mathbf{V}}\|_{2\alpha-2, 2, 2} \lesssim (\|U_{int}\|_\alpha + [f]_{\alpha-2}) [f]_{\alpha-2}. \quad (36)$$

Since these new “offline” products are completely classical, we do not require the “ \diamond ” notation that we use for the other singular products.

To construct the second type of new reference products we use the following lemma:

Lemma 5. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

i) For $k = 1, 2$, let $G \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfy the pointwise estimates

$$|\partial_1^k G(x)| \lesssim C(G) |x_2|^{\frac{\alpha-k}{2}} \quad (37)$$

for some $C(G) \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, for $F \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, there exists a $C^{\alpha-2}$ -distribution $G \diamond \partial_1^2 F$ satisfying

$$\|[G, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 F\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim (C(G) + [G]_\alpha) [F]_\alpha. \quad (38)$$

ii) For $i = 0, 1$, let G_i and F satisfy the assumptions of part i). Furthermore, for $k = 1, 2$, assume that the pointwise estimates

$$|\partial_1^k(G_0 - G_1)(x)| \lesssim C(G_0, G_1)|x_2|^{\frac{\alpha-k}{2}} \quad (39)$$

hold for some $C(G_0, G_1) \in \mathbb{R}$ and any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Under these assumptions, the distributions defined in i) satisfy

$$\| [G_0, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 F - [G_1, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 F \|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim (C(G_0, G_1) + [G_0 - G_1]_\alpha) [F]_\alpha. \quad (40)$$

iii) For $i = 0, 1$ let G and $F_i(\cdot, a_0)$ satisfy the assumptions of part i), then for the distributions defined in i) we obtain:

$$\| [G, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 F_0 - [G, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 F_1 \|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim (C(G) + [G]_\alpha) [F_0 - F_1]_\alpha. \quad (41)$$

We remark that the last two parts of Lemma 5 address the continuity of the singular product obtained in the first part. To construct the second type of new generalized products we again use Lemmas 2 and 3, but now in conjunction with Lemma 5. We find that:

Corollary 2. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $a_0, a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$, and $i, j = 0, 1$. We use the notation from Definitions 2 and 5. Assume that each $f_i \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is periodic and they satisfy the condition **(A)**:

(A) For each pair (f_i, f_j) there is a family of $C^{\alpha-2}$ -distributions $\{v_i(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0)\}_{a_0, a'_0}$ satisfying

$$\| [v_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j \|_{2\alpha-2, 2, 2} \lesssim [f_i]_{\alpha-2} [f_j]_{\alpha-2} \quad (42)$$

$$\| [v_1, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j - [v_0, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j \|_{2\alpha-2, 1, 1} \lesssim [f_j]_{\alpha-2} [f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2}, \quad (43)$$

$$\text{and } \| [v_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1 - [v_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0 \|_{2\alpha-2, 1, 1} \lesssim [f_i]_{\alpha-2} [f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2}. \quad (44)$$

Also, assume that each $U_{int, i} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ is periodic.

Under these assumptions, for every $i, j = 0, 1$, the following observations hold:

i) There exists a family of distributions $\{\tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0)\}_{a_0, a'_0}$ such that

$$\| [\tilde{V}_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j \|_{2\alpha-2, 2, 2} \lesssim [f_j]_{\alpha-2} ([f_i]_{\alpha-2} + [U_{int, i}]_\alpha). \quad (45)$$

ii) Defining the family of distributions

$$(\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) := \tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) + v_i(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0), \quad (46)$$

we find that

$$\| [\tilde{V}_i + v_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j \|_{2\alpha-2, 2, 2} \lesssim ([U_{int, i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}) [f_j]_{\alpha-2}.$$

iii) The distributions constructed in part ii) satisfy

$$\| [\tilde{V}_0 + v_0, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j - [\tilde{V}_1 + v_1, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j \|_{2\alpha-2, 1, 1} \lesssim ([U_{int, 1} - U_{int, 0}]_\alpha + [f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2}) [f_j]_{\alpha-2} \quad (47)$$

and

$$\| [\tilde{V}_i + v_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0 - [\tilde{V}_i + v_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1 \|_{2\alpha-2, 1, 1} \lesssim ([U_{int, i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}) [f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2}. \quad (48)$$

iv) Letting

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 (\tilde{V}_j + v_j)(\cdot, a'_0) \\ & := (\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) + (\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 \tilde{V}_j(\cdot, a'_0), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the distributions defined in ii) and Corollary 1, we obtain:

$$\| [(\tilde{V}_i + v_i), (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 (\tilde{V}_j + v_j) \|_{2\alpha-2, 2, 2} \lesssim ([U_{int, 1}]_\alpha + [f_1]_{\alpha-2}) ([U_{int, 0}]_\alpha + [f_0]_{\alpha-2}).$$

As we will see in Section 6, the construction of the second new type of generalized product is not as straightforward as the first type, but still entirely classical –it proceeds via the classical Leibniz' rule.

2.4 Reconstruction Lemmas

We now state the two “Reconstruction Lemmas” (that have already been mentioned in the introduction). The first of these lemmas gives a map

$$\left\{ (v + \tilde{V})(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2(v + \tilde{V})(\cdot, a'_0) \right\} \mapsto \left\{ U \diamond \partial_1^2(v + \tilde{V})(\cdot, a'_0) \right\} \quad (49)$$

whenever U is modelled after $\tilde{V} + v$; see Lemma 6 for the full set of assumptions and result. The intended application of Lemma 6 also requires part *i*) of the following result, which shows that the modelling of U is preserved under smooth enough pointwise nonlinear transformations.

Lemma 3.2 of [17].

- i) Let $U \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be modelled after V according to a and σ , both of class $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with modelling constant M ; and the function b be twice differentiable. Then, $b(U)$ is modelled after V according to a and $\nu = b'(U)\sigma$ with modelling constant \tilde{M} and $\|b(u)\|_\alpha$ satisfying

$$\tilde{M} \lesssim \|b'\|M + \|b''\|[U]_\alpha^2 \quad (50)$$

and

$$\|b(u)\|_\alpha \lesssim \|b'\|[U]_\alpha + \|b\|.$$

- ii) For $i = 0, 1$, let U_i be modelled after $V_i(\cdot, a_0)$ according to a_i and σ_i with modelling constant M_i as in part *i*). Assume, furthermore, that $U_1 - U_0$ is modelled after (V_1, V_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(\sigma_1, -\sigma_0)$ with modelling constant δM ; and that b is three times differentiable. Then, $b(U_1) - b(U_0)$ is modelled after (V_1, V_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(\mu_1 := b'(U_1)\sigma_1, -\mu_0 := -b'(U_0)\sigma_0)$ with modelling constant $\delta \tilde{M}$ and $\|b(U_1) - b(U_0)\|_\alpha$ satisfying

$$\delta \tilde{M} \lesssim \|b'\|\delta M + \|U_1 - U_0\|_\alpha \left(\|b''\| \max_{i=0,1} [U_i]_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \|b'''\| \max_{i=0,1} [U_i]_\alpha^2 + \|b''\| \max_{i=0,1} M_i \right) \quad (51)$$

and

$$\|b(U_1) - b(U_0)\|_\alpha \lesssim \|U_1 - U_0\|_\alpha \left(\|b'\| + \|b''\| \max_{i=0,1} [U_i]_\alpha \right). \quad (52)$$

We omit the proof of this lemma, which amounts to an application of Taylor’s formula (see [7, Proposition 6]).

Here is the statement of the first reconstruction lemma:

Lemma 6 (Modified Lemma 3.3 of [17]). Let $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$ and all functions and distributions be x_1 -periodic. Let h be a distribution and $\{w(\cdot, x)\}_x$ a family of functions and $\{w(\cdot, x) \diamond h\}_x$ a family of distributions, both indexed by $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, satisfying

$$[w(\cdot, x)]_\alpha \leq N, \quad (53)$$

$$[w(\cdot, x) - w(\cdot, x')]_\alpha \leq N d^\alpha(x, x'), \quad (54)$$

$$\|h\|_{\alpha-2} \leq N_0, \quad (55)$$

$$\|[w(\cdot, x), (\cdot)] \diamond h\|_{2\alpha-2} \leq N N_0, \quad (56)$$

$$\text{and } \|[w(\cdot, x), (\cdot)] \diamond h - [w(\cdot, x'), (\cdot)] \diamond h\|_{2\alpha-2} \leq N N_0 d^\alpha(x, x') \quad (57)$$

for any points $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and some constants $N, N_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Assume that for $U \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ there is a function ν and $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|U(y) - U(x) - (w(y, x) - w(x, x)) - \nu(x)(y - x)_1| \leq M d^{2\alpha}(x, y) \quad (58)$$

for any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, there exists a unique distribution $U \diamond h \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|[U, (\cdot)_T] \diamond h - E_{diag} [w, (\cdot)_T] \diamond h - \nu [x_1, (\cdot)_T] h\| = 0,$$

where E_{diag} denotes evaluation of a function of (x, y) at (x, x) . The distribution $U \diamond h$ satisfies

$$\|[U, (\cdot)] \diamond h\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim (M + N) N_0. \quad (59)$$

The difference between Lemma 6 and Lemma 3.3 of [17] is that here we do not assume periodicity in the x_2 -direction. As the argument does not see many substantial alterations, we give this proof in an abbreviated form.

With Lemma 6 in-hand, we can define the mapping (49) and show that this map satisfies some continuity properties:

Corollary 3 (Modified Corollary 3.4 of [17]). *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$ and all functions and distributions be x_1 -periodic. We adopt the assumptions and notation of Corollary 2.*

For $i, j = 0, 1$, we find that the following observations hold:

- i) Let $U \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be modelled after $v_i + \tilde{V}_i$ according to a_i and σ_i on \mathbb{R}^2 with modelling constant M and, furthermore, assume that $\|a_i\|_\alpha, \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha \leq 1$. Then for every $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ there exists a unique $U \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0) \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \left\| [U, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0) - \sigma_i E_i[(v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a'_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0) - \nu_i [x_1, (\cdot)_T] \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0) \right\| = 0,$$

where E_i denotes the evaluation of a function depending on (x, a'_0, a_0) at $(x, a_i(x), a_0)$. The distributions $U \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0)$ satisfy

$$\left\| [U, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j \right\|_{2\alpha-2,2} \lesssim ([U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2} + M)[f_j]_{\alpha-2}. \quad (60)$$

and

$$\left\| [U, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1 - [U, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0 \right\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \lesssim ([U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2} + M)[f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2}. \quad (61)$$

- ii) Let $U_i \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be modelled after $v_i + \tilde{V}_i$ according to a_i and σ_i as in part i). Furthermore, assume that $U_1 - U_0$ is modelled after $(v_1 + \tilde{V}_1, v_0 + \tilde{V}_0)$ according to (a_1, a_0) and $(\sigma_1, -\sigma_0)$ with modelling constant $\delta M \in \mathbb{R}$. For the $U_i \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0)$ from part i), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| [U_1, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j - [U_0, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j \right\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \\ & \lesssim \left(\delta M + \max_{i=0,1} ([U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}) (\|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha + \|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0\|_\alpha) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + [f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2} + [U_{int,1} - U_{int,0}]_\alpha \right) [f_j]_{\alpha-2}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Now, we move on to the second reconstruction lemma: Assuming that for $F \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ there is a family of distributions $\{F \diamond \partial_1^2(v + \tilde{V})(\cdot, a_0)\}$, indexed by $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, satisfying a $C^{2\alpha-2}$ -commutator condition, this lemma gives a map

$$\left\{ F \diamond \partial_1^2(v + \tilde{V})(\cdot, a_0) \right\} \mapsto F \diamond \partial_1^2 U,$$

whenever U is modelled after $v + \tilde{V}$. Here is the statement of the second reconstruction lemma:

Lemma 7 (Modified Lemma 3.5 of [17]). *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$, $I \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda > 0$, and all functions and distributions be x_1 -periodic. Assume that for $F \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $(V_1(\cdot, a_0), \dots, V_I(\cdot, a_0))$, families of C^α -functions indexed by $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, there exist $(F \diamond \partial_1^2 V_1(\cdot, a_0), \dots, F \diamond \partial_1^2 V_I(\cdot, a_0))$, families of $C^{\alpha-2}$ -distributions indexed by $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, such that the bounds*

$$[V_i]_{\alpha,1} \leq N_i \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| [F, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i \right\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \leq N N_i \quad (63)$$

hold for some constants $N, N_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for a function $U \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that is modelled after (V_1, \dots, V_I) according to the C^α -functions a and $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_I)$, there exists a unique distribution $F \diamond \partial_1^2 U \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \left\| [F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 U - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i \right\| = 0, \quad (64)$$

where E denotes the evaluation of a function of (x, a_0) at $(x, a(x))$. Under the further assumption that $\|a\|_\alpha \leq 1$, we obtain the bound

$$\left\| [F, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 U \right\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim [F]_\alpha M + \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha N N_i. \quad (65)$$

The difference to Lemma 3.5 in [17] is again the loss of periodicity in the x_2 -direction. We give an abbreviated proof of Lemma 7 in Section 6.3.

2.5 Discussion and Statement of our Results

As already emphasized in the introduction, our main strategy is to first treat a linearized version of (1) and, on this level, enforce the right-hand side and initial condition separately. In particular, we start with showing:

Theorem 1 (Analysis of the Linear Problem). *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$ and $\lambda > 0$.*

i) (Construction of Solution Operator) Assume that we have:

(B1) a space-time periodic distribution f and $N_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|f\|_{\alpha-2} \leq N_0, \quad (66)$$

(B2) $a \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that is periodic in the x_1 -direction and satisfies $a \in [\lambda, 1]$ and $[a]_\alpha \ll 1$,

(B3) a periodic function $U_{int} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ and $N_0^{int} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|U_{int}\|_\alpha \leq N_0^{int},$$

(B4) and a family of $C^{\alpha-2}$ -distributions $\{a \diamond \partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a_0)\}$, indexed by $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, and $N \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $[a]_\alpha \leq N \leq 1$ and

$$\|[a, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v\|_{2\alpha-2,2} \lesssim NN_0. \quad (67)$$

Under these assumptions, there exists a solution $U \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ of

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)U &= f & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ U &= U_{int} & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2 \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

that may be decomposed as $U = u + \mathbf{U}$, where $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ solves

$$(\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)u = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (69)$$

and is modelled after $v(\cdot, a_0)$ solving (10) according to a on \mathbb{R}^2 and $\mathbf{U} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)\mathbf{U} &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ \mathbf{U} &= U_{int} - u & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

The solution \mathbf{U} may be further decomposed as $\mathbf{U} = \tilde{q} + w$, where \tilde{q} is the even-reflection of the function defined in Definition 6 (below) and $w \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $w \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 . The function \tilde{q} is modelled after $\tilde{V}(\cdot, a_0)$, the even-reflection of the function defined in (12), according to a on \mathbb{R}^2 . We find that the solution $U = u + q + w$ is unique in the class of functions admitting such a splitting.

We, furthermore, obtain the bounds

$$\|\tilde{q}\|_\alpha + \|w\|_\alpha + \|u\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0 + N_0^{int} \quad (71)$$

and

$$M \leq M_q + M_u + [w]_{2\alpha} \lesssim N_0 + N_0^{int}, \quad (72)$$

where M_q corresponds to the modelling of \tilde{q} after \tilde{V} and M_u corresponds to the modelling of u after v , both according to a . The constant M is associated to the modelling of $u + \tilde{q} + w$ after $\tilde{V} + v$ according to a .

ii) (Stability) Let $i, j = 0, 1$. Assume that we have:

(C1) $f_i \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying (B1) and $\delta N_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|f_1 - f_0\|_{\alpha-2} \leq \delta N_0,$$

(C2) $a_i \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying (B2) and $[a_i]_\alpha \leq N$ with $N \in \mathbb{R}$ coming from (B4),

(C3) $U_{int,i} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (B3) and $\delta N_0^{int} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|U_{int,1} - U_{int,0}\|_\alpha \leq \delta N_0^{int},$$

(C4) and $\{a_i \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0)\}$ indexed by $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ satisfying (B4) and $\delta N \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha &\leq \delta N, \\ \|[a_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0 - [a_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1\|_{2\alpha-2,1} &\leq N\delta N_0, \\ \text{and } \|[a_0, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_i - [a_1, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_i\|_{2\alpha-2,1} &\leq \delta N N_0. \end{aligned}$$

We denote the solution of (68) provided by i) that corresponds to f_i , $U_{int,i}$, and a_i as U_i , which is decomposed as $U_i = u_i + \mathbf{U}_i = u_i + q_i + w_i$. Under the above assumptions, we obtain:

$$\|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \|\tilde{q}_1 - \tilde{q}_0\|_\alpha + \|w_1 - w_0\|_\alpha \lesssim \delta N(N_0 + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}. \quad (73)$$

Furthermore, $u_1 + \tilde{q}_1 + w_1 - (u_0 + \tilde{q}_0 + w_0)$ is modelled after $(v_1 + \tilde{V}_1, v_0 + \tilde{V}_0)$ according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ such that the modelling constant δM satisfies

$$\delta M \lesssim \delta M_q + \delta M_u + [w_1 - w_0]_{2\alpha} \lesssim \delta N(N_0 + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}, \quad (74)$$

where δM_q corresponds to the modelling of $\tilde{q}_1 - \tilde{q}_0$ after $(\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_0)$ according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ and δM_u corresponds to the modelling of $u_1 - u_0$ after (v_1, v_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$.

We remark that $(v + \tilde{V})(\cdot, a_0)|_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} = V(\cdot, a_0)$, where $V(\cdot, a_0)$ solves (8), which was the predicted modelling for U solving (5).

The proof of Theorem 1, which is given in Section 4.4, is a combination of the following three propositions. First we state Proposition 1; it is a variation of Proposition 3.8 in [17] in the sense that we replace the use of the periodicity of the coefficients in the x_2 -direction with an exploitation of the massive term in the equation. Here is the statement:

Proposition 1 (Modified Proposition 3.8 of [17]). *We adopt the assumptions from Theorem 1, under which we obtain:*

i) (Construction of Solution Operator) There exists a unique $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that is modelled after v according to a such that

$$(\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)u = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (75)$$

The modelling constant M and C^α -norm of u are bounded as

$$M + \|u\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0. \quad (76)$$

ii) (Stability) Let $i = 0, 1$. Denoting the solutions given by part i) corresponding to a_i and f_i as u_i , we find that $u_1 - u_0$ is modelled after (v_1, v_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$. The modelling constant δM and $\|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha$ satisfy

$$\delta M + \|u_0 - u_1\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0 \delta N + \delta N_0. \quad (77)$$

The proof of Proposition 1 is contained in Section 4.1.

The novel contribution in this paper is the treatment of (70), which is contained in Propositions 2 and 3. The main observation that we make is that, thanks to the bounds in Lemma 2, we may treat (70) in an entirely classical manner. In particular, our strategy for solving (70) is to postulate an ansatz, which we then correct. For this we introduce the notation

$$\mathbf{V}'(\cdot, a_0) := \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U_{int} - u), \quad (78)$$

where u is the solution of (75), and notice that the most naive ansatz for the solution of (70) is $\mathbf{V}'(\cdot, a)$. However, in order for our arguments to work we need more smoothness for a , which leads us to the following definition:

Definition 6 (Ansatz for the initial boundary layer). *We define the ansatz for U solving (70), the initial boundary layer, as*

$$q := V'(\cdot, \bar{a}), \quad (79)$$

where \bar{a} solves

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - \partial_1^2)\bar{a} &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ \bar{a} &= a & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Notice that the definition of q only depends on $a|_{\{x_2=0\}}$ and that, thanks to the lack of a massive term in (80), $\bar{a} \geq \lambda$ when $a|_{\{x_2=0\}} \geq \lambda$. We would also like to mention that the “'” in (78) does not indicate a derivative, but is only meant to distinguish (78) from (12).

In the next proposition, we investigate the ansatz that we have defined above, but with a slightly more general initial condition. In particular, we find that:

Proposition 2 (Analysis of the ansatz for the initial boundary layer). *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\lambda > 0$. We use the notation from Definition 2 and the convention (12). The constants N_0^{int} , N_0 , δN_0 , and δN_0^{int} are taken from Theorem 1. We obtain that:*

- i) *Assume that $f \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies the condition (B1), $a \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies $\|a\|_\alpha \leq 1$ and $a \in [\lambda, 1]$, $U_{int} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies (B3), and $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ is modelled after v according to a on $\{x_2 = 0\}$ with modelling constant M_∂ and with respect to ν_∂ . In analogue to (78) and (79), we use the convention*

$$V'_u(\cdot, \bar{a}) := V(\cdot, \bar{a}, U_{int} - u) \quad \text{and} \quad q_u := V'_u(\cdot, \bar{a}),$$

where \bar{a} solves (80) with initial condition a . We remark that these new conventions only differentiate themselves from (78) and (79) in that now u must not be the solution of (75) from Proposition 1.

Under these assumptions, the function q_u is modelled after V according to a on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with modelling constant M and C^α -norm satisfying

$$M \lesssim M_\partial + \|\nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|u\|_\alpha + N_0 + N_0^{int} \quad (81)$$

$$\text{and } \|q_u\|_\alpha \lesssim \|u\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}. \quad (82)$$

The even-reflection \tilde{q}_u is modelled after \tilde{V} according to a on \mathbb{R}^2 and the modelling constant still satisfies (81).

- ii) *Let $i = 0, 1$. Assume that the $f_i \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfy the condition (C1), the $a_i \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfy the conditions of part i), the $U_{int,i} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy (C3), and the u_i are of the class $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. Additionally, we assume that $u_1 - u_0$ is modelled after (v_1, v_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$ with modelling constant δM_∂ and the associated $\delta \nu_\partial$.*

Under these assumptions, $q_{u_1} - q_{u_0}$ is modelled after (V_1, V_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with modelling constant δM and $\|q_{u_1} - q_{u_0}\|_\alpha$ bounded by

$$\delta M \lesssim \delta M_\partial + \|\delta \nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}) + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \delta N_0^{int} + \delta N_0 \quad (83)$$

and

$$\|q_{u_1} - q_{u_0}\|_\alpha \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}) + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \delta N_0^{int} \quad (84)$$

The even-reflection $\tilde{q}_{u_1} - \tilde{q}_{u_0}$ is modelled after $(\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_0)$ according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ on \mathbb{R}^2 and the modelling constant still satisfies (83).

The proof of Proposition 2 is contained in Section 4.2. In our proof of Theorem 1 we apply Proposition 2 with $U = U_{int}$ and u taken as the solution of (75) obtained in Proposition 1. We write Proposition 2 in a more general form than required by its use in Theorem 1 due to its application in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 2; see Section 5.

To finish up the ingredients needed for our proof of Theorem 1, we correct the ansatz defined in Definition 6 in order to solve (70). In particular, we prove the following:

Proposition 3 (Analysis of the Linear Problem with a Trivial Forcing). *We adopt the assumptions and notations from Theorem 1. We, furthermore, use the notation from Definition 6.*

i) (Construction of Solution Operator) *There exists a unique $w \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $w \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 such that $U = q + w$ solves*

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)U &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ U &= U_{int} - u & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

The C^α -norm of w and the $C^{2\alpha}$ -seminorm, which corresponds to its trivial modelling, satisfy

$$\|w\|_\alpha + [w]_{2\alpha} \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int}). \quad (86)$$

ii) (Stability) *Let $i = 0, 1$. We denote the solutions corresponding to $U_{int,i}$, a_i , and f_i from part i) as w_i . Then, the C^α -norm of $w_1 - w_0$ and the $C^{2\alpha}$ -norm, corresponding to its trivial modelling, satisfy*

$$[w_1 - w_0]_{2\alpha} + \|w_1 - w_0\|_\alpha \lesssim \delta N_0^{int} + \delta N_0 + \delta N(N_0 + N_0^{int}). \quad (87)$$

The proof of Proposition 3 is given in Section 4.3.

The main analytic tool that we use in our arguments for Propositions 1 and 3 is the following adaption of Safonov's approach to Schauder theory:

Lemma 8 (Modified Lemma 3.6 of [17]). *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $I \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lambda > 0$. Assume we have I families of periodic distributions $\{f_1(\cdot, a_0), \dots, f_I(\cdot, a_0)\}$ indexed by $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, I constants $N_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\|f_i(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha-2,1} \leq N_i, \quad (88)$$

and $a : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [\lambda, 1]$ satisfying $[a]_\alpha \ll 1$. Let $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be x_1 -periodic and modelled after (v_1, \dots, v_I) defined in terms of (10) according to a and $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_I)$ and satisfy

$$\sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|(\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)u_T - \sigma_i E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0)\| \leq K \quad (89)$$

for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, where E denotes evaluation of a function of (x, a_0) at $(x, a(x))$. Then we find that

$$M + \|u\|_\alpha \lesssim K + \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha N_i.$$

In Proposition 1, the purpose of this lemma is to pass to the limit in a family of regularized solutions. In Proposition 3, we obtain the correction w by using a trivial version of Lemma 8 (*i.e.* we set $\sigma_i = 0$).

We now come to the main result of this paper: Theorem 2, which treats the originally intended quasilinear initial value problem. The proof of this result relies on a fixed-point argument that takes Theorem 1 as input. Here is the statement of our result:

Theorem 2. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$.*

i) (Construction of Solution Operator) *Assume that $f \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies **(B1)** and the pair (f, f) satisfies condition **(A)**, $U_{int} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies **(B3)**, and $a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$ satisfies $\|a'\|, \|a''\|, \|a'''\| \leq 1$. We use the notation from Definitions 2 and 5. Let $N_0, N_0^{int} \ll 1$.*

Then there exist $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $w \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $w \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 and $U := w + q$ solves (68) with $a := a(u + w + \tilde{q})$. Here, q is defined in terms of Definition 6 with $a|_{\{x_2=0\}} := a(U_{int} - u|_{\{x_2=0\}})$. The function u solves (69) with $a := a(u + w + \tilde{q})$ and is modelled after v according to $a(u + w + \tilde{q})$. Lastly, the function $U := u + w + q$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_2 U - a(U) \diamond \partial_1^2 U + U &= f & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ U &= U_{int} & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2 \end{aligned}$$

and $u + w + \tilde{q}$ is modelled after $\tilde{V} + v$ according to $a(u + w + \tilde{q})$.

Under the additional smallness condition

$$\|u\|_\alpha + \|w\|_\alpha \ll 1, \quad (90)$$

the solution $U = u + w + q$ is unique within the class of solution admitting such a splitting. We, furthermore, have the a priori estimates

$$\|U\|_\alpha \leq \|u\|_\alpha + \|q\|_\alpha + \|w\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0 + N_0^{int} \quad \text{and} \quad M \leq M_u + M_q + [w]_{2\alpha} \lesssim N_0 + N_0^{int}, \quad (91)$$

where M is associated to the modelling of $u + \tilde{q} + w$ after $\tilde{V} + v$ and M_u to the modelling of u after v , both according to $a(u + \tilde{q} + w)$.

ii) (Stability) Let $i, j = 0, 1$. Assume that the $f_i \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfy **(C1)**, every pair (f_i, f_j) satisfies the condition **(A)**, and the $U_{int,i} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy **(C3)**. Let U_i denote the solutions constructed in part i) that decompose as $U_i = u_i + q_i + w_i$.

We find that $u_1 + \tilde{q}_1 + w_1 - (u_0 + \tilde{q}_0 + w_0)$ is modelled after $(\tilde{V}_1 + v_1, \tilde{V}_0 + v_0)$ according to $(a(u_1 + \tilde{q}_1 + w_1), a(u_0 + \tilde{q}_0 + w_0))$ and $(1, -1)$ with modelling constant δM and C^α -norm satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_1 - U_0\|_\alpha &\leq \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \|q_1 - q_0\|_\alpha + \|w_1 - w_0\|_\alpha \lesssim \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int} \\ \text{and} \quad \delta M &\leq \delta M_u + \delta M_q + [w_1 - w_0]_{2\alpha} \lesssim \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Here, δM_u corresponds to the modelling of $u_1 - u_0$ after (v_1, v_0) and δM_q to the modelling of $\tilde{q}_1 - \tilde{q}_0$ after $(\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_0)$, both according to $(a(u_1 + \tilde{q}_1 + w_1), a(u_0 + \tilde{q}_0 + w_0))$ and $(1, -1)$.

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Section 5.

Remark 2. We find in Section 2.2, in which we have summarized the probabilistic results of [17], that Theorem 2 is almost surely applicable for the class of random right-hand sides investigated in that section.

3 Main PDE Ingredient: Proof of the *Safonov* Lemma

We prove this lemma in a series of steps that are inspired by the proof of Lemma 3.6 in [17]. Here comes the argument:

Proof of Lemma 8.

Step 1: (u is Lipschitz on large scales and bound for $[u]_\alpha^{loc}$) It is a consequence of the triangle inequality that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq 2[u]_\alpha^{loc} d(x, y)$$

for any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $d(x, y) \geq 1$.

We also derive a bound for $[u]_\alpha^{loc}$ in terms of M : For this, let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $d(x, y) \leq 1$ and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{d^\alpha(x, y)} &\leq M d^\alpha(x, y) + \|\sigma_i\| \frac{|v_i(x, a(y)) - v_i(y, a(y))|}{d^\alpha(x, y)} + \frac{|\nu(y)(x - y)_1|}{d^\alpha(x, y)} \\ &\lesssim M + \|\sigma_i\| N_i, \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

where, in addition to the modelling of u , we have used the L^∞ -bound for ν in (215) and Lemma 3.

Step 2: (Equations satisfied by u_T) In this step, we show that, for any point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $T \in (0, 1]$, the function u_T solves

$$(\partial_2 - a(x_0)\partial_1^2 + 1)(u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0))) = g_{x_0}^T \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (94)$$

where, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $g_{x_0}^T(x)$ satisfies the pointwise estimate

$$|g_{x_0}^T(x)| \lesssim \tilde{N}((T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + d^\alpha(x, x_0)(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}) \quad (95)$$

with $\tilde{N} = K + [a]_\alpha [u]_\alpha^{loc} + \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha N_i$.

Additionally, we find that, for $T \in (0, 1]$, u_T solves

$$(\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)u_T = h^T \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (96)$$

where

$$\|h^T\| \lesssim K(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + \|\sigma_i\|N_i(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}. \quad (97)$$

We begin by showing the first result. Simple manipulations show the tautological observation that u_T solves

$$(\partial_2 - a(x_0)\partial_1^2 + 1)u_T = \sigma_i(x_0)f_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) + g_{x_0}^T \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_{x_0}^T := & (\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)u_T - \sigma_i E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0) \\ & + (a - a(x_0))\partial_1^2 u_T + (\sigma_i - \sigma_i(x_0))E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0) \\ & + \sigma_i(x_0)(E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0) - f_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0))). \end{aligned}$$

For a fixed point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we then bound:

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{x_0}^T(x)| & \lesssim \|(\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)u_T - \sigma_i E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0)\| + |a(x) - a(x_0)|\|\partial_1^2 u_T(x)\| \\ & \quad + |(\sigma_i(x) - \sigma_i(x_0))E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0)| + \|\sigma_i(x_0)(E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0) - f_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)))\| \\ & \leq K(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + d^\alpha(x, x_0) \left([a]_\alpha \|\partial_1^2 u_T(x)\| + [\sigma_i]_\alpha \|f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0)\| + \|\sigma_i\| [a]_\alpha \|f_{iT}\|_1 \right) \\ & \leq K(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + d^\alpha(x, x_0) \left([a]_\alpha \|\partial_1^2 u_T(x)\| + \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha N_i(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

where we have used assumptions (88), (89), and $[a]_\alpha \leq 1$.

In order to obtain (95) it remains to show the bound

$$|\partial_1^2 u_T(x)| \lesssim [u]_\alpha^{loc} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} \quad (99)$$

for any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For (99) we use the result from the first step and the moment bound (19). In particular, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_1^2 u_T(x)| & = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (u(y) - u(x)) \partial_1^2 \psi_T(x - y) dy \right| \\ & \lesssim [u]_\alpha^{loc} \left(\int_{B_1(x)} |\partial_1^2 \psi_T(x - y)| d^\alpha(x, y) dy + \int_{B_1^c(x)} |\partial_1^2 \psi_T(x - y)| d(x, y) dy \right) \\ & \lesssim [u]_\alpha^{loc} \left((T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} + (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-1} \right) \lesssim [u]_\alpha^{loc} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}, \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (99) into (98) yields the desired (95).

A different set of manipulations yields that u_T solves (96) with

$$h^T = (\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)u_T - \sigma_i E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0) + \sigma_i E f_{iT}(\cdot, a_0).$$

Using the assumptions (88) and (89), we obtain (97).

Step 3: (L^∞ -estimates on u_T) In this step we prove two L^∞ -bounds. Here is the first

$$\|u_T\| \lesssim K(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + \|\sigma_i\|N_i(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}, \quad (100)$$

which holds for $T \in (0, 1]$. This estimate follows from an application of Theorem 8.1.7 of [13] to (96) and using (97).

The second estimate we prove is:

$$\|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0))\|_{B_L(x_0)} \lesssim \tilde{N}((T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + L^\alpha(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}), \quad (101)$$

which holds for $T \in (0, 1]$ and $L \geq 1$. To obtain (101), we use the equation (94) and, letting $G(a(x_0), x_1, x_2)$ denote the heat kernel as in (27), we write $u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0))$ as

$$u_T(x) - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(x, a(x_0)) = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_{x_0}^T(x_1 - y, x_2 - s) G(a(x_0), y, s) dy ds. \quad (102)$$

Combining (102) with the bound (95) and using the notation $x_0 = (x_{01}, x_{02})$, for $x \in B_L(x_0)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u_T(x) - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(x, a(x_0))| \\
& \lesssim \tilde{N} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} ((T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}(|x_1 - y - x_{01}|^\alpha + |x_2 - s - x_{02}|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})) |G(a(x_0), y, s)| dy ds. \\
& \lesssim \tilde{N} \left((T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + L^\alpha (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} + \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} (|y|^\alpha + s^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) |G(a(x_0), y, s)| dy ds \right) \\
& \lesssim \tilde{N} \left((T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + L^\alpha (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $B_L(x_0)$ refers to ball in terms of the parabolic distance function.

Step 4: (An excess decay) Let $0 < R \ll L$, $T \in (0, 1]$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, in this step we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\
& \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{L}\right)^{2(1-\alpha)} \frac{1}{L^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_L(x_0)} \\
& \quad + \tilde{N} \left(\frac{L^2}{R^{2\alpha}(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha}} + \frac{L^{2+\alpha}}{R^{2\alpha}(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-\alpha}} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

Alternatively, we have that

$$\inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\| \lesssim K(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + \|\sigma_i\| N_i(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}. \tag{104}$$

We first show (104). For this, set $l = 0$; we use the observation that, by Lemmas 1 and 3 in conjunction with the assumption (88), the estimate

$$\|v_{iT}\| \lesssim [f_T]_{\alpha-2} \lesssim N_i(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}$$

holds. Combining this observation with the triangle inequality and (100), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\| & \lesssim \|u_T\| + \|\sigma_i\| \|v_{iT}\| \\
& \lesssim K(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} + \|\sigma_i\| N_i(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Showing (103) is the main technical step of this argument. For this, on the ball $B_L(x_0)$ we decompose the function $u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0))$ into a “near-field” and “far-field” contribution. Letting $w_<$ be the solution of

$$(\partial_2 - a(x_0)\partial_1^2)w_< = \chi_{B_L}(g_0^T - (u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)))) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2$$

and defining $w_> = u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - w_<$, we find that $w_>$ satisfies

$$(\partial_2 - a(x_0)\partial_1^2)w_> = 0 \quad \text{in } B_L(x_0). \tag{105}$$

We may then use standard regularity theory to obtain the estimates

$$\|w_<\| \lesssim L^2(\|g_{x_0}^T\|_{B_L(x_0)} + \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0))\|_{B_L(x_0)}) \tag{106}$$

and

$$\|\{\partial_1^2, \partial_2\}w_>\|_{B_{L/2}(x_0)} \lesssim L^{-2}\|w_> - l\|_{B_L(x_0)} \tag{107}$$

for any $l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}$. To obtain (107) for $l \neq 0$ it is important that the operator in (105) does not have a massive term so that solutions are invariant under subtraction of $l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}$.

We maneuver ourselves into a position to apply the estimates (106) and (107) by using that

$$u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) = w_< + w_>$$

and using the triangle inequality to write:

$$\|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l_R\|_{B_R(x_0)} \lesssim R^2 \|\{\partial_1^2, \partial_2\}w_{>}\|_{B_R(x_0)} + \|w_{<}\|_{B_R(x_0)}$$

for $l_R = w_{>}(x_0) + \frac{\partial w_{>}}{\partial x_1}(x_0)x_1$. Then, again by the triangle inequality, now along with (106) and (107), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l_R\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{L}\right)^2 \|w_{>} - l\|_{B_L(x_0)} + \|w_{<}\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{L}\right)^2 \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_L(x_0)} + 2\|w_{<}\| \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{L}\right)^2 \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_L(x_0)} + 2L^2(\|g_{x_0}^T\|_{B_L(x_0)} + \|u_T - \sigma_i(x_0)v_{iT}(\cdot, a(x_0))\|_{B_L(x_0)}), \end{aligned}$$

for any $l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}$. To finish, we use (95) and (101).

Step 4: (*An equivalent definition of the modelling constant*) In this step we observe that $M \sim M'$, where M' is defined as

$$M' := \sup_{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sup_{R>0} R^{-2\alpha} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u - \sigma_i(x_0)v_i(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_R(x_0)}.$$

Since the argument for this observation is an easy modification of that in [17], we do not repeat it here.

Step 5: (*Use of the modelling*) In this step we remark that for $T \in (0, 1]$, $L > 0$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the estimate

$$\frac{1}{(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha}} \|u_T - u - \sigma_i(x_0)(v_{iT} - v_i)(\cdot, a(x_0))\|_{B_L(x_0)} \lesssim M + \tilde{N} \left(\frac{L}{T^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right)^\alpha \quad (108)$$

holds. Since we have access to Lemma 3 and the moment bound (19), the argument does not change from [17] and we, therefore, do not give it here.

Step 6: (*Conclusion*) We now show that $M \lesssim \tilde{N}$. To begin, for $T \in (0, 1]$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we combine (104), (108), and the triangle inequality to write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u - \sigma_i(x_0)v_i(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\ & \lesssim \frac{(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}}{R^{2\alpha}} (K + \|\sigma_i\|N_i) + \left(\frac{T^{\frac{1}{4}}}{R}\right)^{2\alpha} \left(M + \tilde{N} \left(\frac{L}{T^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right)^\alpha\right). \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

Alternatively, combining (103) with (108) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u - \sigma_i(x_0)v_i(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{L}\right)^{2(1-\alpha)} \frac{1}{L^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u - \sigma_i(x_0)v_i(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_L(x_0)} \\ & \quad + \tilde{N} \left(\frac{L^2}{R^{2\alpha}(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha}} + \frac{L^{2+\alpha}}{R^{2\alpha}(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-\alpha}}\right) + \left(\frac{T^{\frac{1}{4}}}{R}\right)^{2\alpha} \left(M + \tilde{N} \left(\frac{L}{T^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right)^\alpha\right). \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

For the case that $R \leq 1$ we make use of (110) and let $L = \epsilon^{-1}R$ and $T^{\frac{1}{4}} = \epsilon R$ for some $\epsilon \ll 1$; the restriction $R \leq 1$ guarantees that $T \leq 1$ and $\epsilon \ll 1$ ensures that $L \geq 1$. Making these identifications, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{R \leq 1} \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u - \sigma_i(x_0)v_i(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\ & \lesssim (\epsilon^{2-2\alpha} + \epsilon^{2\alpha})M + (\epsilon^{-(4-2\alpha)} + \epsilon^{-4} + 1)\tilde{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

For $R \geq 1$ we alternatively use (109) and let $T^{\frac{1}{4}} = \epsilon$ and $L = \epsilon^{-1}R$, which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{R \geq 1} \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u - \sigma_i(x_0)v_i(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{\alpha-2}(K + \|\sigma_i\|N_i) + \epsilon^{2\alpha}M + \tilde{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

Combining (111) and (112) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{R > 0} \frac{1}{R^{2\alpha}} \inf_{l \in \text{Span}\{1, x_1\}} \|u - \sigma_i(x_0)v_i(\cdot, a(x_0)) - l\|_{B_R(x_0)} \\ & \leq (\epsilon^{2-2\alpha} + \epsilon^{2\alpha})M + (\epsilon^{\alpha-2} + \epsilon^{-(4-2\alpha)} + \epsilon^{-4} + 1)\tilde{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $M \sim M'$ and choosing ϵ small enough yields $M \lesssim \tilde{N}$.

After plugging in \tilde{N} from (95) of Step 2 this gives:

$$M \lesssim K + [a]_\alpha [u]_\alpha^{loc} + \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha N_i.$$

Using (93) and $[a]_\alpha \ll 1$, we then find that

$$M + [u]_\alpha^{loc} \lesssim K + \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha N_i.$$

Step 7 : (L^∞ -bound on u) To finish, we show that

$$\|u\| \lesssim K + \|\sigma_i\|N_i + M.$$

To see this, we first notice that, by (100) with $T = 1$, we have:

$$\|u * \psi_1\| \lesssim K + \|\sigma_i\|N_i.$$

Together with the large-scale Lipschitz bound from Step 1, we can then write:

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u(x)\psi_1(y)dy \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u(x-y)\psi_1(y)dy \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (u(x-y) - u(x))\psi_1(y)dy \right| \\ &\lesssim K + \|\sigma_i\|N_i + [u]_\alpha^{loc} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|y| + |y|^\alpha)|\psi_1(y)|dy \\ &\lesssim K + \|\sigma_i\|N_i + [u]_\alpha^{loc}, \end{aligned}$$

for any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We finish with an application of (93). \square

4 Treatment of the Linear Problem

In this section we prove Propositions 1, 2, and 3 and Theorem 1; it is the core content of this paper.

4.1 Proof of Proposition 1

The main difference between the proof we present below and the proof of Proposition 3.8 in [17] is our use of the modified Lemma 8.

Proof of Proposition 1. We begin with our argument for part i), which goes down in four steps.

Step 1: (*Regularized reference products*) Throughout this step we adopt the conditions and notations of Lemma 7. For any $\tau > 0$, we use the convention that $V_{i\tau}(\cdot, a_0) = V_i(\cdot, a_0) * \psi_\tau$ and *define*

$$F \diamond \partial_1^2 V_{i\tau}(\cdot, a_0) := (F \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i(\cdot, a_0))_\tau. \quad (113)$$

These new offline products are taken as input for Lemma 7 to obtain, for $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ modelled after $V_{i\tau}$ according to a_i and σ_i , the singular product $F \diamond \partial_1^2 u \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

To apply Lemma 7 we must check that the relations listed in (63) hold. For this, we remark that (18) gives that

$$[V_{i\tau}]_{\alpha,1} \lesssim N_i$$

and (22) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \|[F, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_{i\tau}\|_{2\alpha-2,1} &= \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|[F, (\cdot)_{T+\tau}] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i\|_1 \\ &\lesssim N N_i + \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|F \partial_1^2 V_{iT+\tau} - (F \partial_1^2 V_{iT})_\tau\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

To treat the second term, we assume that $\tau \leq T$ (the general case follows from switching the roles of τ and T) and use (21), to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \|F \partial_1^2 V_{iT+\tau} - (F \partial_1^2 V_{iT})_\tau\|_1 &\lesssim [F]_\alpha \|\partial_1^2 V_{iT}\|_1 \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\psi_\tau(\cdot - y)| d^\alpha(\cdot, y) dy \right\| \\ &\lesssim [F]_\alpha [V_i]_{\alpha,1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} (\tau^{\frac{1}{4}})^\alpha \\ &\lesssim [F]_\alpha N_i (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates, we find that

$$\|[F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_{i\tau}\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \lesssim ([F]_\alpha + N) N_i. \quad (114)$$

Having verified the assumptions of Lemma 7, we then characterize the distribution $F \diamond \partial_1^2 u$ under the assumption that $\partial_1^2 u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Notice that, as already used above, by (20) and (113), we have that

$$[F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_{i\tau}(\cdot, a_0) = [F, (\cdot)_{T+\tau}] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i(\cdot, a_0).$$

This means that as $T \rightarrow 0$, $[F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_{i\tau}(\cdot, a_0) \rightarrow [F, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i(\cdot, a_0)$ uniformly in x for all $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$; whereby (63) implies that this convergence is uniform in (x, a_0) . By (64), we then find that the condition $\partial_1^2 u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ gives that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|F \partial_1^2 u - (F \diamond \partial_1^2 u)_T - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i(\cdot, a_0)\| = 0.$$

By the uniqueness in Lemma 7, we obtain:

$$F \diamond \partial_1^2 u = F \partial_1^2 u - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 V_i(\cdot, a_0).$$

Step 2: (*Analysis of the regularized problem*) Let $\tau \in (0, 1)$. We show that there exists $u^\tau \in C^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, modelled after $v_\tau(\cdot, a_0)$ according to a , that solves

$$(\partial_2 - a \partial_1^2 + 1)u^\tau = f_\tau \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (115)$$

distributionally.

Notice that by the previous step applied with $F = a$, $I = 1$, $V_1(\cdot, a_0) = v(\cdot, a_0)$, and $\sigma_1 = 1$, the formulation (115) is equivalent to

$$(\partial_2 - a \partial_1^2 + 1)u^\tau = f_\tau - E[a, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (116)$$

If $f_\tau - E[a, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then the existence of $u^\tau \in C^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ solving (116) follows from Theorem 8.7.3 of [13]. The desired modelling follows trivially due to the high regularity of u^τ .

To see that $f_\tau - E[a, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we first notice that $g_\tau \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ whenever $g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In particular, in that case, for any points $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $d(x, z) \leq 1$, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} |g_\tau(x) - g_\tau(z)| &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |g(y)| |\psi_\tau(x - y) - \psi_\tau(z - y)| dy \\ &\leq \|g\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\partial_1 \psi_\tau(x - y)(x_1 - z_1) - \partial_2 \psi_\tau(x - y)(x_2 - z_2)|^2 dy \\ &\lesssim \|g\| \left((T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-1} + (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-2} \right) d(x, z) \leq \|g\| (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-2} d^\alpha(x, z). \end{aligned}$$

Then, notice that (B1) implies $f_{\tau/2} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. For the term $E[a, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v$ —first remark that

$$\|E(a \diamond \partial_1^2 v)_\tau\|_\alpha \leq \| (a \diamond \partial_1^2 v)_\tau \|_\alpha + \| (a \diamond \partial_1^2 v)_\tau \|_1 \|a\|_\alpha < \infty,$$

where for the last bound we have used the above argument for $g = (a \diamond \partial_1^2 v)_{\tau/2}$, which is admissible by (B4), and (B2). The observation that $\|Ea\partial_1^2 v_\tau\|_\alpha < \infty$ is a trivial consequence of Lemma 3 and (B2).

Step 3: (*Passing to the limit in the regularization*) Let $\tau \in (0, 1)$. We apply Lemma 8 to u^τ from the previous step with $I = 1$, $f_1 = f_\tau$, $a = a$, and $\sigma_1 = 1$. We first check that (89) holds by convolving (115) with ψ_T :

$$(\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)u_T^\tau - f_{\tau+T} = [a, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 u^\tau \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

By (22), (65), (67), and (114) we have that

$$\|[a, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 u^\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim [a]_\alpha M_\tau + N_0([a]_\alpha + N),$$

where M_τ refers to the modelling of u^τ after $v_\tau(\cdot, a_0)$. Applying Lemma 8 and using that $N \leq 1$ we find that

$$M_\tau + \|u^\tau\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0. \quad (117)$$

By (117) we know that, up to a subsequence, $u^\tau \rightarrow u$ uniformly as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, where we define the desired solution u of (75) as this limit. We must still pass to the limit in (115) and show that we recover (75). The limits $f_\tau \rightarrow f$ and $\partial_2 u^\tau \rightarrow \partial_2 u$ are clear. It remains to check that $a \diamond \partial_1^2 u^\tau \rightarrow a \diamond \partial_1^2 u$, where the limiting modelling is a result of Definition 1 in tandem with the uniform in (x, a_0) convergence $v_\tau(\cdot, a_0) \rightarrow v(\cdot, a_0)$ and $u^\tau \rightarrow u$. This convergence can be deduced using the condition (64) from Lemma 7; the full argument, which sees no alteration in the passage to our setting, can be found in Steps 9 and 10 in the proof of Proposition 3.8 in [17].

Step 4: (*Uniqueness*) Assume that there are two solutions u and u' satisfying (75) with the desired modelling. Subtracting the two solutions we find that the difference $u - u'$ is now trivially modelled. Using (64) from Lemma 7, the triangle inequality yields

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|(a \diamond \partial_1^2 u)_T - (a \diamond \partial_1^2 u')_T - (a \diamond \partial_1^2 (u - u'))_T\| = 0,$$

which implies that

$$a \diamond \partial_1^2 u - a \diamond \partial_1^2 u' = a \diamond \partial_1^2 (u - u').$$

So, the difference $u - u'$ solves

$$(\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)(u - u')_T = [a, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 (u - u') \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Moreover, by (65) of Lemma 7 we have that

$$\|[a, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 (u - u')\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim [a]_\alpha [u - u']_{2\alpha}.$$

Therefore, Lemma 8 applied with $I = 1$, $f_1(\cdot, a_0) = 0$, $\sigma_1 = 0$, and $a = a$ gives:

$$[u - u']_{2\alpha} + \|u - u'\|_\alpha \lesssim [a]_\alpha [u - u']_{2\alpha},$$

which, since $[a]_\alpha \ll 1$, means that $[u - u']_{2\alpha} + \|u - u'\|_\alpha = 0$.

We now continue to part ii); our argument again consists of four steps.

Step 5: (*Interpolation of the data*) We linearly interpolate the a_i and f_i . In particular, for $s \in [0, 1]$ we define

$$a_s := (1 - s)a_0 + sa_1 \quad \text{and} \quad f_s := (1 - s)f_0 + sf_1. \quad (118)$$

Of course, then $v_s(\cdot, a_0)$ defined as

$$v_s(\cdot, a_0) := (1-s)v_0(\cdot, a_0) + sv_1(\cdot, a_0)$$

solves (10) with right-hand side f_s . In order keep notation lean, in this section we occasionally suppress the dependence of v_s on the parameter a_0 . To make sure that Leibniz' rule

$$\partial_s(a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s) = \partial_s a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s + a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s v_s, \quad (119)$$

holds, the offline products are interpolated bilinearly as

$$a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s := (s-1)^2 a_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0 + s(1-s)(a_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1 + a_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0) + s^2 a_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1.$$

We, furthermore, define

$$a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s v_s := (1-s)a_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1 + sa_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1 - (1-s)a_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0 - sa_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s &:= (1-s)a_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a_0) + sa_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a_0) \\ &\quad - (1-s)a_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a_0) - sa_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a_0), \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} v_s := \partial_{a_0}(a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s),$$

where we have used (67) to ensure that the right-hand side of the last definition is well-defined.

We remark that the assumptions (B4) and (C4) guarantee that

$$\|[a_s, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s v_s\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \lesssim N\delta N_0, \quad (120)$$

$$\|[\partial_s a_s, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \lesssim \delta N N_0. \quad (121)$$

$$\text{and } \|[a_s, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} v_s\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \lesssim N N_0. \quad (122)$$

We can regularize all of the new offline products as in part *i*); *e.g.* we set

$$a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 v_{s\tau} := (a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s)_\tau.$$

Step 6: (*A continuous curve of solutions u_s^τ and an equation for $\partial_s u_s^\tau$*) By part *i*), for every $\tau \in (0, 1]$, there exists a curve of $C^{\alpha+2}$ solutions u_s^τ of

$$(\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)u_s^\tau = f_{s\tau} - E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (123)$$

where E_s denotes evaluation of a function of (x, a_0) at $(x, a_s(x))$ and $f_{s\tau} = f_s * \psi_\tau$. The solution u_s^τ is modelled after $v_{s\tau}$, where $v_{s\tau} = v_s * \psi_\tau$, according to a_s , which by Step 1 of part *i*) gives

$$a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau = a_s \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau - E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s.$$

This allows us to rewrite (123) as

$$(\partial_2 - a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)u_s^\tau = f_{s\tau} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

To obtain an equation for $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ we differentiate (123); for this we use (119), which gives the relation

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_s(E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s) \\ &= E_s[\partial_s a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s + E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s v_s + \partial_s a_s E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} v_s. \end{aligned}$$

So, $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} &(\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)\partial_s u_s^\tau - \left(\partial_s f_{s\tau} + \partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau - E_s[\partial_s a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s \right. \\ &\quad \left. - E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s v_s - \partial_s a_s E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} v_s \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the term in parentheses is in $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, which can be checked using the same tools as in Step 2 of part *i*), we find that $\partial_s u_s^\tau \in C^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Due to the high regularity of $\partial_s u_s^\tau$, we know that it is modelled after $(\partial_s v_{s\tau}, \partial_{a_0} v_{s\tau})$ according to a_s and $(1, \partial_s a_s)$. Using the identities

$$\partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau - E_s[\partial_s a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_s = \partial_s a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau$$

and

$$a_s \partial_1^2 \partial_s u_s^\tau - E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s v_s - \partial_s a_s E_s[a_s, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} v_s = a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s u_s^\tau,$$

which both follow from Step 1 of part *i*), we can rewrite the equation solved by $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ as

$$(\partial_2 - a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_s u_s^\tau = \partial_s f_{s\tau} + \partial_s a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (124)$$

Step 7: (*Estimates for $\partial_s u_s^\tau$*) We now apply Lemma 8 to $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ with $I = 2$ and $f_1(\cdot, a_0) = \partial_s f_{s\tau}$, $\sigma_1 = 1$, $f_2(\cdot, a_0) = \partial_1^2 v_{s\tau}(\cdot, a_0)$, $\sigma_2 = \partial_s a_s$, and $a = a_s$. Notice that by (22) and assumption (C1) we have that

$$\|\partial_s f_{s\tau}\|_{\alpha-2} \lesssim \|f_0 - f_1\|_{\alpha-2} \lesssim \delta N_0; \quad (125)$$

using additionally (21) and Lemma 3, we obtain:

$$\|\partial_1^2 v_{s\tau}\|_{\alpha-2,1} \lesssim [f_s]_{\alpha-2} \lesssim N_0. \quad (126)$$

The relations (125) and (126) verify the assumption (88).

We then check that $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ is an approximate solution in the sense of (89). For this, we convolve (124) with ψ_T , which gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|(\partial_2 - a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_s u_{sT}^\tau - \partial_s (f_{s\tau})_T - \partial_s a_s E_s \partial_1^2 (v_{s\tau}(\cdot, a_0))_T\| \\ & \lesssim \| [a_s, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s u_s^\tau \|_{2\alpha-2} + \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|(\partial_s a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau)_T - \partial_s a_s E_s \partial_1^2 (v_{s\tau}(\cdot, a_0))_T\| \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

By (65) of Lemma 7 in conjunction with (120) and (122) the first term is bounded as

$$\| [a_s, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_s u_s^\tau \|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim [a_s]_\alpha \delta M_s^\tau + N \delta N_0 + N_0 \delta N, \quad (128)$$

where δM_s^τ belongs to the modelling of $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ after $(\partial_s v_{s\tau}, \partial_{a_0} v_{s\tau})$ according to a_s and $(1, \partial_s a_s)$. The second term of (127) requires another application of the triangle inequality to write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|(\partial_s a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau)_T - \partial_s a_s E_s \partial_1^2 (v_{s\tau}(\cdot, a_0))_T\| \\ & \leq \| [\partial_s a_s, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 u_s^\tau \|_{2\alpha-2} + \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \| \partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 u_{sT}^\tau - \partial_s a_s E_s \partial_1^2 (v_{s\tau}(\cdot, a_0))_T \|. \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

The first term is bounded by $\delta N M_s^\tau + N N_0$ by (65) of Lemma 7 and (121), where M_s^τ belongs to the modelling of u_s^τ after $v_{s\tau}$ according to a_s . We complete our argument by using this modelling in conjunction with ψ_1 being even in x_1 and a Schwartz function to obtain:

$$| \partial_s a_s(x) \partial_1^2 u_{sT}^\tau(x) - \partial_s a_s(x) E_s \partial_1^2 v_{s\tau+T}(x, a_0) | \leq \delta N M_s^\tau, \quad (130)$$

where we have also used $\|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha \leq \delta N$. Combining (127), (128), (129), (130), the bound $M_s^\tau \lesssim N_0$ from part *i*), and that $N \leq 1$, we find that for large enough $c \in \mathbb{R}$ we can set K in (89) as

$$K = c([a_s]_\alpha \delta M_s^\tau + N_0 \delta N + \delta N_0).$$

Together with (125) and (126), an application of Lemma 8 to the $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ gives:

$$\delta M_s^\tau + \|\partial_s u_s^\tau\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0 \delta N + \delta N_0. \quad (131)$$

Step 8: (*Integration and passing to the limit*) Since we have (131) for all $s \in [0, 1]$, we may integrate it up to obtain:

$$\|u_1^\tau - u_0^\tau\|_\alpha \lesssim \left\| \int_0^1 \partial_s u_s^\tau ds \right\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0 \delta N + \delta N_0. \quad (132)$$

To obtain a bound for δM^τ we notice that

$$\partial_s (u_s^\tau(y) - v_{s\tau}(y, a_s(x))) = \partial_s u_s^\tau(y) - \partial_s v_{s\tau}(y, a_s(x)) - \partial_s a_s(x) \partial_{a_0} v_s(y, a_s(x)),$$

which allows us to integrate up our bound on δM_s^τ to obtain that $u_1^\tau - u_0^\tau$ is modelled after $(v_{1\tau}, v_{0\tau})$ according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ with $\delta\nu^\tau = \int_0^1 \delta\nu_s^\tau ds$. Here, $\delta\nu_s^\tau$ is associated to the modelling of $\partial_s u_s^\tau$ already used in the previous step. We find that

$$\delta M^\tau \lesssim \delta N N_0 + \delta N_0.$$

Since we know from part *i*) that $u_i^\tau \rightarrow u_i$ uniformly we can pass to the limit in (132). In order to pass to the limit in the modelling we, furthermore, use that $v_{i\tau}(\cdot, a_i(\cdot)) \rightarrow v_i(\cdot, a_i(\cdot))$ and, by Step 1 of the proof of Lemma 6, also $\delta\nu^\tau \rightarrow \delta\nu$ for some $\delta\nu$; both convergences are uniform in x . \square

4.2 Analysis of the Ansatz for the Boundary Correction

This section is mainly concerned with investigating the modelling of the ansatz for \mathbf{U} solving (70), q as defined in Definition 6, and culminates in the proof of Proposition 2. We start with a technical lemma:

Lemma 9 (Post-processing of the Modelling). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We use the notation from Definition 2.*

i) Assume that $a, a' \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\|a\|_\alpha, \|a'\|_\alpha \leq 1$ and $a' = a$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$. Let $V_{int}(\cdot, a_0) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ for $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ with $\lambda > 0$. For any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ we then have the relation

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{V}(x, a(y), \mathbf{V}_{int}(a(y))) - \mathbf{V}(y, a(y), \mathbf{V}_{int}(a(y))) \\ & \quad - (\mathbf{V}(x, a'(y), \mathbf{V}_{int}(a'(y))) - \mathbf{V}(y, a'(y), \mathbf{V}_{int}(a'(y))))| \\ & \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}\|_{\alpha,1}([a]_\alpha + [a']_\alpha) d^{2\alpha}(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

It follows that if $\mathbf{U} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ is modelled after $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))$ according to a with modelling constant M , then \mathbf{U} is modelled in the same way according to a' . The new modelling constant M' satisfies

$$M' \lesssim M + \|\mathbf{V}_{int}\|_{\alpha,1}.$$

ii) Let $i = 0, 1$. Assume that $a_i, a'_i \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\|a_i\|_\alpha, \|a'_i\|_\alpha \leq 1$ and $a'_i = a_i$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$ and $V_{int,i}(\cdot, a_0) \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ for $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$ with $\lambda > 0$. We find that if $\mathbf{U} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ is modelled after $(\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int,1}(a_0)), \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int,0}(a_0)))$ according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ with modelling constant δM , then \mathbf{U} is modelled in the same way according to (a'_1, a'_0) . The new modelling constant $\delta M'$ satisfies

$$\delta M' \lesssim \delta M + \|\mathbf{V}_{int,1} - \mathbf{V}_{int,0}\|_{\alpha,1} + \max_{i=0,1} \|\mathbf{V}_{int,i}\|_{\alpha,2} (\|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha + \|a'_1 - a'_0\|_\alpha).$$

Proof. To keep notation as lean as possible, in this proof we use the convention

$$\mathbf{V}_i(\cdot, a_0) := \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int,i}(a_0))$$

and in part *i*) drop the index i ; notice that this notation is in conflict with (more general than) (12), which we use in the rest of this paper.

i) First, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{V}(x, a(y)) - \mathbf{V}(y, a(y)) - (\mathbf{V}(x, a'(y)) - \mathbf{V}(y, a'(y)))| \\ & \lesssim \sup_{a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]} |\partial_{a_0}(\mathbf{V}(x, a_0) - \mathbf{V}(y, a_0))| |a(y) - a'(y)|. \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Notice that, since $a = a'$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$, we have that

$$|a(y) - a'(y)| \lesssim ([a]_\alpha + [a']_\alpha) y_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (135)$$

Using (135), we then bound the right-hand side of (134) in two ways:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]} |\partial_{a_0}(\mathbf{V}(x, a_0) - \mathbf{V}(y, a_0))| |a(y) - a'(y)| \\ & \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}\|_{\alpha,1}([a]_\alpha + [a']_\alpha) \times \begin{cases} y_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(x_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + y_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) d^{2\alpha}(x, y) \\ y_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} d^\alpha(x, y), \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (136)$$

where we use either (31) or (32) applied to $V(\cdot, a_0)$. We now consider two cases: $y_2 \leq 2x_2$ and $2x_2 \leq y_2$. For the first case we use the top estimate of (136), which can then easily be bounded by $\|V_{int}\|_{\alpha,1}([a]_\alpha + [a']_\alpha)d^{2\alpha}(x, y)$. In the second case, we have that $\frac{y_2}{2} \leq y_2 - x_2$, which allows to bound the bottom term of (136) in the same way. (Both of these bounds are up to a multiplicative constant.)

Our modelling claim then follows from (3) and the triangle inequality. In particular, for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ the relation (133) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{U}(x) - \mathbf{U}(y) - (\mathbf{V}(x, a'(y)) - \mathbf{V}(y, a'(y))) - \nu(y)(x - y)_1| \\ & \lesssim M d^{2\alpha}(x, y) + |\mathbf{V}(x, a(y)) - \mathbf{V}(y, a(y)) - (\mathbf{V}(x, a'(y)) - \mathbf{V}(y, a'(y)))| \\ & \lesssim (M + \|V_{int}\|_{\alpha,1}) d^{2\alpha}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

ii) The triangle inequality yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{U}(x) - \mathbf{U}(y) - (-1)^{i+1}(\mathbf{V}_i(x, a'_i(y)) - \mathbf{V}_i(y, a'_i(y))) - \nu(y)(x - y)_1| \\ & \lesssim \delta M d^{2\alpha}(x, y) \\ & \quad + |\mathbf{V}_0(x, a_0(y)) - \mathbf{V}_0(y, a_0(y)) - (\mathbf{V}_0(x, a'_0(y)) - \mathbf{V}_0(y, a'_0(y))) \\ & \quad - (\mathbf{V}_1(x, a_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}_1(y, a_1(y)) - (\mathbf{V}_1(x, a'_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}_1(y, a'_1(y))))| \end{aligned}$$

for any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Letting

$$a_i^t = ta_i + (1-t)a'_i \text{ for } i = 0, 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a_s^t = sa_1^t + (1-s)a_0^t,$$

we then notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s a_s^t &= a_1^t - a_0^t, \\ \partial_t a_s^t &= s(a_1 - a'_1) + (1-s)(a_0 - a'_0), \\ \text{and } \partial_t \partial_s a_s^t &= a_1 - a_0 - (a'_1 - a'_0). \end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

This new notation allows us to write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{V}_1(x, a_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}_1(x, a'_1(y)) - (\mathbf{V}_0(x, a_0(y)) - \mathbf{V}_0(x, a'_0(y))) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (\mathbf{V}_1(y, a_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}_1(y, a'_1(y)) - (\mathbf{V}_0(y, a_0(y)) - \mathbf{V}_0(y, a'_0(y)))) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_s \partial_t (\mathbf{V}_s(x, a_s^t(y)) - \mathbf{V}_s(y, a_s^t(y))) ds dt \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_s ((\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}_s(x, a_s^t(y)) - \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}_s(y, a_s^t(y))) \partial_t a_s^t(y)) ds dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left(|\partial_{a_0}(\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_0)(x, a_s^t(y)) - \partial_{a_0}(\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_0)(y, a_s^t(y))| |\partial_t a_s^t(y)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\partial_{a_0}^2 \mathbf{V}_s(x, a_s^t(y)) - \partial_{a_0}^2 \mathbf{V}_s(y, a_s^t(y))| |\partial_t a_s^t(y)| |\partial_s a_s^t(y)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}_s(x, a_s^t(y)) - \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}_s(y, a_s^t(y))| |\partial_t \partial_s a_s^t(y)| \right) ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

To finish we bound the three terms on the right-hand side. Using the relations (137), these terms are treated in the same manner as (134) above. In particular, the first term can be bounded as

$$|\partial_{a_0}(\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_0)(x, a_s^t(y)) - \partial_{a_0}(\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_0)(y, a_s^t(y))| |\partial_t a_s^t(y)| \lesssim \|V_{int,1} - V_{int,0}\|_{\alpha,1} d^{2\alpha}(x, y),$$

where we have used (31), (32), and (135) applied to a_i and a'_i . For the second term we use the same strategy and, additionally, that $|\partial_s a_s^t(y)| \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\| + \|a'_1 - a'_0\|$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_{a_0}^2 \mathbf{V}_s(x, a_s^t(y)) - \partial_{a_0}^2 \mathbf{V}_s(y, a_s^t(y))| |\partial_t a_s^t(y)| |\partial_s a_s^t(y)| \\ & \lesssim \|V_{int,s}\|_{\alpha,2} (\|a_1 - a_0\| + \|a'_1 - a'_0\|) d^{2\alpha}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

For the last term we use that

$$|(a_1 - a_0)(y) - (a'_1 - a'_0)(y)| \lesssim ([a_1 - a_0]_\alpha + [a'_1 - a'_0]_\alpha) y_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$$

and either (31) or (32). We obtain the relation

$$|\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}_s(x, a_s^t(y)) - \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}_s(y, a_s^t(y))| |\partial_t \partial_s a_s^t(y)| \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int,s}\|_{\alpha,1} ([a_1 - a_0]_\alpha + [a'_1 - a'_0]_\alpha) d^{2\alpha}(x, y).$$

□

We now give a lemma that shows that the modelling of a function is preserved under the application of the heat semigroup. More precisely, we will prove the following:

Lemma 10 (Propagation of the Modelling). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We use the notation from Definition 2.*

i) *Assume that $\mathbf{U} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ is modelled after $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U - u)$ for $U, u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ according to $a \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\|a\|_\alpha \leq 1$ and $a \in [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$ with modelling constant M . If, furthermore, u is modelled after v according to a on $\{x_2 = 0\}$ with modelling constant M_∂ and $\nu_\partial \in C^{2\alpha-1}(\mathbb{R})$, then \mathbf{U} is modelled after $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U - v(a_0))$ according to a with modelling constant M' bounded as*

$$M' \lesssim M + M_\partial + \|\nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|U\|_\alpha + \|u\|_\alpha + \|v\|_{\alpha,1}. \quad (138)$$

ii) *Let $i = 0, 1$. Assume that $\mathbf{U} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ is modelled after $(\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U_0 - u_0), \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U_1 - u_1))$ according to (a_0, a_1) and $(1, -1)$ for $U_i, u_i \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ and $a_i \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\|a_i\|_\alpha \leq 1$ and $a_i \in [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$ with modelling constant δM . If, furthermore, $u_1 - u_0$ is modelled after (v_1, v_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$ with modelling constant δM_∂ and $\delta \nu_\partial \in C^{2\alpha-1}(\mathbb{R})$, then \mathbf{U} is modelled after $(\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U_0 - v_0(a_0)), \mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U_1 - v_1(a_0)))$ according to (a_0, a_1) and $(1, -1)$ with modelling constant $\delta M'$ bounded as*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta M' &\lesssim \delta M + \delta M_\partial + \|\delta \nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|U_1 - U_0\|_\alpha + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha \\ &\quad + \max_{i=0,1} (\|U_i\|_\alpha + \|u_i\|_\alpha) \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha + \|v_1 - v_0\|_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The main idea of this argument is to combine (3) with the heat kernel formulation given in (28). We start with part i):

Step 1: (*Modelling according to a_{tr}*) We begin with an application of part i) of Lemma 9. In particular, if we define

$$a_{tr}(x) := a(x_1, 0), \quad (139)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, then \mathbf{U} is modelled after $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U - u)$ according to a_{tr} with a modelling constant M_{tr} bounded above as $M_{tr} \lesssim M + \|U\|_\alpha + \|u\|_\alpha$.

Step 2: (*Use of the initial modelling*) The crucial step of our proof is showing that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbf{V}(x, a_{tr}(y), u - v(a_{tr}(y))) - \mathbf{V}(y, a_{tr}(y), u - v(a_{tr}(y))) - \nu^f(y)(x - y)_1 \right| \\ &\lesssim (M_\partial + \|\nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|u\|_\alpha + \|v\|_\alpha) d^{2\alpha}(x, y) \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

for any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and

$$\nu^f(y) := e^{-y_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(4\pi a_{tr}(y) y_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \nu_\partial(s, 0) e^{\frac{-|y_1 - s|^2}{4y_2 a_{tr}(y)}} ds. \quad (141)$$

Notice that here $v(a_{tr}(y))$ is used as shorthand for $v(\cdot, a_{tr}(y))$. Once we have shown (140), an easy application of the triangle inequality and Step 1 shows that \mathbf{U} is modelled after $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U - v(a_0))$ according to a_{tr} with modelling constant $M_{intermediate}$ bounded as

$$M_{intermediate} \lesssim M + M_\partial + \|\nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|U\|_\alpha + \|u\|_\alpha + \|v\|_\alpha.$$

To show (140) we first use the heat kernel representation (28) and (141) to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbf{V}(x, a_{tr}(y), u - v(a_{tr}(y))) - \mathbf{V}(y, a_{tr}(y), u - v(a_{tr}(y))) - \nu_\partial^\int(y)(x - y)_1 \right| \\
& \lesssim e^{-y_2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(u(x_1 - z(4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) - u(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) \right. \right. \\
& \quad - \left(v((x_1 - z(4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0), a(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0)) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - v((y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0), a(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0)) \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \nu_\partial(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0)(x - y)_1 \right) e^{-z^2} dz \right| \\
& + |e^{-x_2} - e^{-y_2}|(\|u\| + \|v\|).
\end{aligned} \tag{142}$$

Notice that when $d(x, y) \leq 1$, since $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we may bound the second term using that

$$|e^{-x_2} - e^{-y_2}| \lesssim |x_2 - y_2| \lesssim d^{2\alpha}(x, y). \tag{143}$$

The relation (143) is trivial when $d(x, y) \geq 1$ since then $|e^{-|x_2|} - e^{-|y_2|}| \leq 2$ and $d^{2\alpha}(x, y) \geq 1$.

For the first term of (142) we first let $d(x, y) \geq 1$. In this case, the term can be bounded by:

$$([u]_\alpha + [v]_\alpha + \|\nu_\partial\|)d^\alpha(x, y) \leq ([u]_\alpha + [v]_\alpha + \|\nu_\partial\|)d^{2\alpha}(x, y)$$

The situation that $d(x, y) \leq 1$ is more involved and requires the modelling of u . We remark that the modelling and the triangle inequality allow us to bound the first term of (142) by

$$M_\partial d^{2\alpha}(x, y) + \left| \left((4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nu_\partial(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) z e^{-z^2} dz \right|. \tag{144}$$

It remains to treat the second term of (144), which we do in four cases:

Case 1– We assume that $y_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq d(x, y)$ and $y_2 \leq x_2$. Since the square-root function is Lipschitz on $[y_2, \infty)$ with Lipschitz constant $\frac{1}{2}y_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, we may write:

$$(4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim (x_2 - y_2)y_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Additionally, using that $\nu_\partial \in C^{2\alpha-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left((4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nu_\partial(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) z e^{-z^2} dz \right| \\
& \lesssim y_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} |x_2 - y_2| \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\nu_\partial(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) - \nu_\partial(y_1, 0)) z e^{-z^2} dz \right| \\
& \lesssim y_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}} |x_2 - y_2| [\nu_\partial]_{2\alpha-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |z|^{2\alpha} e^{-z^2} dz \\
& \lesssim [\nu_\partial]_{2\alpha-1} d^{2\alpha}(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2– We assume that $x_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq d(x, y)$ and $x_2 \leq y_2$. Following the same recipe as in the previous case and adding in a couple of uses of the triangle inequality, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left((4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nu(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) z e^{-z^2} dz \right| \\
& \lesssim y_2^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}} x_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} |y_2 - x_2| [\nu_\partial]_{2\alpha-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |z|^{2\alpha} e^{-z^2} dz \\
& \lesssim \left(|y_2 - x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}} + x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}} \right) x_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} |y_2 - x_2| [\nu_\partial]_{2\alpha-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |z|^{2\alpha} e^{-z^2} dz \\
& \lesssim [\nu_\partial]_{2\alpha-1} d^{2\alpha}(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 3– We assume that $x_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq d(x, y)$. Now we use the bound

$$|(4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}| \lesssim |x_2 - y_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{145}$$

Using the same methods as in the previous cases, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left((4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nu(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) z e^{-z^2} dz \right| \\
& \lesssim \left(|y_2 - x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}} + x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}} \right) |x_2 - y_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nu]_{2\alpha-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |z|^{2\alpha} e^{-z^2} dz \\
& \lesssim [\nu]_{2\alpha-1} d^{2\alpha}(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 4- We assume that $y_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq d(x, y)$. Reusing (145), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left((4x_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nu(y_1 - z(4y_2 a_{tr}(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}, 0) z e^{-z^2} dz \right| \\
& \lesssim y_2^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}} |x_2 - y_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nu]_{2\alpha-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |z|^{2\alpha} e^{-z^2} dz \\
& \lesssim [\nu]_{2\alpha-1} d^{2\alpha}(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 3: (Conclusion) We again apply part *i*) of Lemma 9, but now to the modelling proven in the previous step to swap out a_{tr} for a . We finally obtain that \mathbf{U} is modelled after $\mathbf{V}(\cdot, a_0, U - v(\cdot, a_0))$ according to a with modelling constant bounded as specified in (138).

ii) Analogously to part *i*), we first notice that by part *ii*) of Lemma 9, \mathbf{U} is modelled after $(\mathbf{V}_1(\cdot, a_0, U_1 - u_1), \mathbf{V}_0(\cdot, a_0, U_0 - u_0))$ according to $(a_{1,tr}, a_{0,tr})$ and $(1, -1)$. Here, we use the notation from (139). The corresponding modelling constant is bounded as

$$\delta M_{tr} \lesssim \delta M + \|U_1 - U_0\|_{\alpha} + \|u_1 - u_0\|_{\alpha} + \max_{i=0,1} (\|U_i\|_{\alpha} + \|u_i\|_{\alpha}) \|a_1 - a_0\|_{\alpha}. \quad (146)$$

We then show that \mathbf{U} is modelled after $(\mathbf{V}_1(\cdot, a_0, U_1 - v_1(a_0)), \mathbf{V}_0(\cdot, a_0, U_0 - v_0(a_0)))$ according to $(a_{1,tr}, a_{0,tr})$ and $(1, -1)$, which, by the same strategy as in part *i*), reduces to showing that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (\mathbf{V}_0(x, a_{0,tr}(y), u_0 - v_0(a_0)) - \mathbf{V}_0(y, a_{0,tr}(y), u_0 - v_0(a_0))) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - (\mathbf{V}_1(x, a_{1,tr}(y), u_1 - v_1(a_1)) - \mathbf{V}_1(y, a_{1,tr}(y), u_1 - v_1(a_1))) - \delta \nu^f(y)(x - y)_1 \right| \\
& \lesssim (\delta M_{\partial} + \|\delta \nu_{\partial}\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|u_1 - u_0\|_{\alpha} + \|v_1 - v_0\|_{\alpha}) d^{2\alpha}(x, y)
\end{aligned} \quad (147)$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Of course, this is the analogue of (140) from part *i*) and $\delta \nu^f$ is defined as in (141), but in terms of $\delta \nu_{\partial}$. The argument for (147) follows the exact same line as for (140). For brevity, we do not repeat the calculation.

Combining (146) and (147) with the triangle inequality yields that the modelling constant corresponding to the intermediate modelling (according to $(a_{1,tr}, a_{0,tr})$) proven above is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta M_{intermediate} & \lesssim \delta M + \delta M_{\partial} + \|\delta \nu_{\partial}\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|U_1 - U_0\|_{\alpha} + \|u_1 - u_0\|_{\alpha} \\
& \quad + \max_{i=0,1} (\|U_i\|_{\alpha} + \|u_i\|_{\alpha}) \|a_1 - a_0\|_{\alpha} + \|v_1 - v_0\|_{\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

Again applying part *ii*) of Lemma 9 we obtain the desired modelling by replacing $(a_{1,tr}, a_{0,tr})$ by (a_1, a_0) . \square

We now complete this section by giving the proof of Proposition 2. Here is the argument:

Proof of Proposition 2. In this proof we drop the subscript u on $V'_u(\cdot, a_0)$ and q_u and for $i = 0, 1$ write $V'_i(\cdot, a_0)$ for $V'_{u_i}(\cdot, a_0)$ and q_i for q_{u_i} . Notice that this is a slight abuse of notation since we have defined the objects $V'(\cdot, a_0)$ and q already in (78) and Definition 6 respectively. As already mentioned, the notation that we use in the current proposition only differs in the sense that it allows for more general u , whereas in the rest of this paper u is always taken to be the solution of (75) in Proposition 1. Here comes the argument; we begin by proving part *i*).

Step 1: (An intermediate modelling) We first show that q is modelled after $V'(\cdot, a_0)$ according to a on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with modelling constant $M_{intermediate}$ bounded as

$$M_{intermediate} \lesssim (N_0^{int} + \|u\|_\alpha)[a]_\alpha. \quad (148)$$

To obtain this, take two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and write:

$$\begin{aligned} & |V'(x, \bar{a}(x)) - V'(y, \bar{a}(y)) - (V'(x, a(y)) - V'(y, a(y)))| \\ & \leq |V'(x, \bar{a}(x)) - V'(x, \bar{a}(y))| + |V'(x, \bar{a}(y)) - V'(y, \bar{a}(y)) - (V'(x, a(y)) - V'(y, a(y)))|. \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

Using part v) of Lemma 2 applied to \bar{a} and part i) of Lemma 9, we obtain that

$$|V'(x, \bar{a}(y)) - V'(y, \bar{a}(y)) - (V'(x, a(y)) - V'(y, a(y)))| \lesssim (\|U_{int}\|_\alpha + \|u\|_\alpha)[a]_\alpha d^{2\alpha}(x, y).$$

For the first term of (149) we use a slightly different version of part i) of Lemma 9. In particular, using Lemma 2 and (135), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |V'(x, \bar{a}(x)) - V'(x, \bar{a}(y))| & \lesssim |\partial_{a_0} V'(x, a_0)| |\bar{a}(y) - \bar{a}(x)| \\ & \lesssim (\|U_{int}\|_\alpha + \|u\|_\alpha)[a]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \times \begin{cases} (x_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + y_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) d^{2\alpha}(x, y), \\ d^\alpha(x, y). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

This we then post-process as in part i) of Lemma 9 and use (B3) to find that

$$|V'(x, \bar{a}(x)) - V'(x, \bar{a}(y))| \lesssim (\|U_{int}\|_\alpha + \|u\|_\alpha)[a]_\alpha d^{2\alpha}(x, y) \leq (N_0^{int} + \|u\|_\alpha)[a]_\alpha d^{2\alpha}(x, y).$$

Step 2: (Application of Lemma 10) Recall that we assume that u is modelled after v according to a on $\{x_2 = 0\}$ with modelling constant M_∂ and with respect to ν_∂ . By (138) of Lemma 10, Lemma 3 with (B1), and (148), we obtain that q has the claimed modelling with modelling constant bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} M & \lesssim M_{intermediate} + M_\partial + \|\nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|u\|_\alpha + N_0 + N_0^{int} \\ & \lesssim M_\partial + \|\nu_\partial\|_{2\alpha-1} + \|u\|_\alpha + N_0 + N_0^{int}. \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

For the modelling of \tilde{q} , let $\tilde{x} = (x_1, |x_2|)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, notice that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we have that $d(x, y) \geq d(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$, which implies that \tilde{q} is modelled after \tilde{V} according to \tilde{a} . We then apply part i) of Lemma 9 to see that, since $\tilde{a} = a$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$, \tilde{q} is also modelled according to a and that the bound (151) still holds.

Step 3: (Bound for the C^α -norm) For our proof of (82), we let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and write:

$$|q(x) - q(y)| \lesssim ([V']_\alpha + \|V'\|_1[a]_\alpha) d^\alpha(x, y) \lesssim (N_0^{int} + \|u\|_\alpha) d^\alpha(x, y),$$

where we have used Lemma 2 with \bar{a} and $V'(\cdot, a_0)$ and that $[a]_\alpha \leq 1$. Part ii) of Lemma 2 gives that

$$\|q\| \lesssim N_0^{int} + \|u\|.$$

We remark that we have also used (B3).

We now continue to part ii); our argument again consists of three steps.

Step 1: (An intermediate modelling)

We begin by showing that $q_1 - q_0$ is modelled after (V'_1, V'_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with modelling constant bounded by

$$\delta M_{intermediate} \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha (N_0^{int} + \|u\|_\alpha) + \delta N_0^{int} + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha.$$

To see this, for any two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we apply the triangle inequality and the definition of q_i to write:

$$\begin{aligned} & |q_1(x) - q_0(x) - (q_1(y) - q_0(y)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, a_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_1(y, a_1(y))) + (\mathbf{V}'_0(x, a_0(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(y, a_0(y)))| \\ & \lesssim |\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(x)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y)))| \\ & \quad + |\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_1(x, a_1(y)) - (\mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, a_0(y))) \\ & \quad - (\mathbf{V}'_1(y, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_1(y, a_1(y)) - (\mathbf{V}'_0(y, \bar{a}_0(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(y, a_0(y))))|. \end{aligned}$$

We treat the first term essentially as (150) and, in particular, bound it by

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(x))) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y)))| \\ & \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}'_1 - \mathbf{V}'_0\|_1 |\bar{a}_s(x) - \bar{a}_s(y)| \\ & \lesssim (\|U_{int,1} - U_{int,0}\|_\alpha + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha) [a_s]_\alpha d^{2\alpha}(x, y) \\ & \lesssim (\delta N_0^{int} + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha) d^{2\alpha}(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

where a_s is defined in (118). The second term is more involved, but was already treated in part *ii*) of Lemma 9 and was shown to be (up to a multiplicative constant) bounded by

$$(\|U_{int,1} - U_{int,0}\|_\alpha + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \max_i (\|U_{int,i}\|_\alpha + \|u_i\|_\alpha) \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha) d^{2\alpha}(x, y).$$

Step 2: (*Application of Lemma 10*) Recall that we assume that $u_1 - u_0$ is modelled after (v_1, v_0) according to (a_1, a_0) and $(1, -1)$ with modelling constant δM_∂ and associated $\delta \nu_\partial$. The argument for the modelling of $\tilde{q}_1 - \tilde{q}_0$ is completed as in part *i*), but instead using the second parts of Lemmas 9 and 10.

Step 3: (*Bound for the C^α -norm*) We first use Lemma 2 and (C3) to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_1 - q_0\| & \lesssim \|(\mathbf{V}'_1 - \mathbf{V}'_0)(\cdot, a_0)\| + \|\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_0(\cdot, a_0)\| \|\overline{a_1 - a_0}\| \\ & \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha (N_0^{int} + \|u_0\|) + \|u_1 - u_0\| + \delta N_0^{int}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{a_1 - a_0}$ solves (80) with initial condition $a_1 - a_0$ and $(\mathbf{V}'_1 - \mathbf{V}'_0)(\cdot, a_0)$ solves (11) with initial condition $U_{int,1} - u_1 - (U_{int,0} - u_0)$. Then, for two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |(q_1 - q_0)(x) - (q_1 - q_0)(y)| & \leq |\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(x)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y)))| \\ & \quad + |\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(y, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(y, \bar{a}_0(y)))|. \end{aligned} \quad (152)$$

For the first term we let \bar{a}_s be defined as a_s in (118) and denote

$$V'_s := sV'_1(\cdot, a_0) + (1-s)V'_0(\cdot, a_0).$$

We then notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(x)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y))) \\ & = \int_0^1 \partial_s (\mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(y))) ds \\ & = \int_0^1 \left(\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_s(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_s(y))) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(y))) \overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(y)) (\overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) - \overline{a_1 - a_0}(y)) \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds from Lemma 2 and (C3) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_s(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_s(y)))| \lesssim (\|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \delta N_0^{int}) d^\alpha(x, y), \\ & |(\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(y))) \overline{a_1 - a_0}(x)| \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\| (\|u_s\| + N_0^{int}) d^\alpha(x, y), \\ & \text{and } |\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(y)) (\overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) - \overline{a_1 - a_0}(y))| \lesssim [a_1 - a_0]_\alpha (\|u_s\| + N_0^{int}) d^\alpha(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates gives

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(x)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(x)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y)))| \\ & \lesssim (\|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \delta N_0^{int} + \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha (\|u_s\|_\alpha + N_0^{int})) d^\alpha(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (153)$$

A similar strategy can be used to bound the second term on the right-hand side of (152). In particular, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{V}'_1(x, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(x, \bar{a}_0(y)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1(y, \bar{a}_1(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_0(y, \bar{a}_0(y)))| \\ & = \left| \int_0^1 \partial_s (\mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(y)) - \mathbf{V}'_s(y, \bar{a}_s(y))) \, ds \right| \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \left(|(\mathbf{V}'_1 - \mathbf{V}'_0)(x, \bar{a}_s(y)) - (\mathbf{V}'_1 - \mathbf{V}'_0)(y, \bar{a}_s(y))| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + |\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(y)) - \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'_s(y, \bar{a}_s(y))| |\overline{a_1 - a_0}(y)| \right) \, ds \\ & \lesssim (\delta N_0^{int} + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha (\|u_s\|_\alpha + N_0^{int})) d^\alpha(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

Together (152), (153), and (154) show that

$$[q_1 - q_0]_\alpha \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}) + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \delta N_0^{int}.$$

□

4.3 Proof of Proposition 3

We first prove two technical lemmas:

Lemma 11. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. If a distribution f on \mathbb{R}^2 satisfies the relation*

$$|f(x)| \leq C |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \quad (155)$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and some $C \in \mathbb{R}$, then for $T > 0$ and $j, l \geq 0$ we have that

$$\|\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_T\| \lesssim C (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2-j-2l} \quad (156)$$

and

$$[f_T]_\alpha \lesssim C (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}. \quad (157)$$

If, additionally, we know that $f \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 , then we have that

$$\|\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_T\|_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \lesssim C L^{-\delta} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2-j-2l+2\delta} \quad (158)$$

and

$$[f_T]_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}_+^2} \lesssim C L^{-\delta} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2+2\delta}, \quad (159)$$

for any $\delta, L > 0$. Notice that the implicit constants depend additionally on δ .

Proof of Lemma 11. We start by showing (156). For this we fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and use the growth condition (155) and the standard rescaling (17) to write:

$$|\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_T(x)| \leq C (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+2\alpha-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\hat{x}_2 - \hat{y}_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}} |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l \psi_1(\hat{y})| \, d\hat{y} \lesssim C (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+2\alpha-2}. \quad (160)$$

For the last inequality we have relied on ψ_1 being a Schwartz function and that $-1 < \frac{2\alpha-2}{2} < 0$.

For (157), we use (156) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |f_T(x) - f_T(y)| & \leq \|\partial_1 f_T\| d(y, x) + \|\partial_2 f_T\| d^2(y, x) \\ & \lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-3} d(y, x) + (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-4} d^2(y, x) \\ & \lesssim \begin{cases} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} d^\alpha(y, x), & \text{if } d(y, x) \leq T^{\frac{1}{4}}, \\ (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-4} d^2(y, x), & \text{if } d(y, x) > T^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The estimate for $d(y, x) \leq T^{\frac{1}{4}}$ is already in the desired form. The estimate for $d(y, x) > T^{\frac{1}{4}}$ can be interpolated with

$$|f_T(x) - f_T(y)| \leq 2\|f_T\| \lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2},$$

by writing:

$$|f_T(x) - f_T(y)| = |f_T(x) - f_T(y)|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} |f_T(x) - f_T(y)|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} d^\alpha(y, x),$$

which is again in the desired form. This proves (157).

If f is additionally only supported for positive times, we may write, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_L^2$, that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_T(x)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f(x-y)| |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l \psi_T(y)| dy \\ &\leq L^{-\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f(x-y)| |y_2|^\delta |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l \psi_T(y)| dy \\ &\leq CL^{-\delta} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+2\alpha-2+2\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\hat{x}_2 - \hat{y}_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}} |\hat{y}_2|^\delta |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l \psi_1(\hat{y})| d\hat{y} \\ &\lesssim CL^{-\delta} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+2\alpha-2+2\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

which is (158). Here, as above, we have relied on $-1 < \frac{2\alpha-2}{2} < 0$. Now (159) follows from (158) in the same way as (157) follows from (156). \square

We also need a lemma that combines the methods of Section 4.2 with those of Lemma 2. In particular, we show the following bound:

Lemma 12. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$. Assume that $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is modelled after v according to $a \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$, satisfying $\|a\|_\alpha \leq 1$ and $a \in [\lambda, 1]$ for $\lambda > 0$, with modelling constant M_∂ . Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we find that*

$$|E\partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}(x, a_0, u - v(a_0))| \lesssim M_\partial |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}},$$

where E denotes evaluation of the parameter a_0 at $a_{tr}(x)$, which we have defined in (139).

Proof. This proof is essentially a corollary of the argument for part *i*) of Lemma 2. In particular, we use the heat kernel representation (28), the modelling of u , that the heat kernel $G(x_1, x_2, a_0)$ given in (27) is even in x_1 , and the identity (206) to write:

$$\begin{aligned} &|E\partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}(x, a_0, u - v(a_0))| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u(y, 0) - v(y, 0, a_{tr}(x))) \partial_1^2 G(x_1 - y, x_2, a_{tr}(x)) dy \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u(y, 0) - u(x_1, 0) - (v(y, 0, a_{tr}(x)) - v(x_1, 0, a_{tr}(x))) - \nu(x_1)(y - x_1)) \partial_1^2 G(x_1 - y, x_2, a_{tr}(x)) dy \right| \\ &\lesssim M_\partial \int_{\mathbb{R}} |y - x_1|^{2\alpha} |\partial_1^2 G(x_1 - y, x_2, a_{tr}(x))| dy \\ &\lesssim M_\partial |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Using these technical tools, we now give the main argument of this section:

Proof of Proposition 3. The idea is to correct the ansatz q defined in Definition 6. We start with part *i*), which has four steps.

Step 1: (*Regularity for the forcing of the equation solved by w*) In this step we show that, for any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the bound

$$|(\partial_2 q - a\partial_1^2 q + q)^E(x)| \lesssim N(N_0^{int} + N_0) |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}} \quad (161)$$

holds, where we use Definition 5 to denote the trivial extension. By the bounds in Lemma 11 and the equivalence in Lemma 1, we interpret this as information on the $C^{2\alpha-2}$ -norm. To obtain (161), we first notice that on \mathbb{R}_+^2 the expression $\partial_2 q - a\partial_1^2 q + q$ is classical since q is smooth for positive times. Applying Leibniz' rule we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\partial_2 q - a\partial_1^2 q + q)(x) \\ &= \partial_2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) + \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) \partial_2 \bar{a}(x) - a\partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) - 2a\partial_1 \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}(x) \\ & \quad - a\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}(x) - a\partial_{a_0}^2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}(x))^2 + \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we have $\partial_2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) = \bar{a}(x) \partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) - \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x))$ due to (11) and $\partial_2 \bar{a} = \partial_1^2 \bar{a}$ from (80). Plugging in these identities, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 q - a\partial_1^2 q + q)(x) &= (\bar{a} - a)(x) \partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) + \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) (1 - a(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}(x) \\ & \quad - 2a(x) \partial_1 \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}(x) - a(x) \partial_{a_0}^2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}(x))^2. \end{aligned}$$

To complete this step we first apply Lemma 2 to \bar{a} to find that

$$\|\bar{a}\| \lesssim \|a\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad [\bar{a}]_\alpha \lesssim [a]_\alpha,$$

the second of which then gives:

$$|a(x) - \bar{a}(x)| \lesssim [a]_\alpha |x_2|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (162)$$

Combining the above bounds with further applications of Lemma 2 to either \bar{a} or $\mathbf{V}'(\cdot, a_0)$, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} |(a - \bar{a})(x) \partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x))| &\lesssim [a]_\alpha ([U_{int}]_\alpha + [u]_\alpha) |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\ |\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) (1 - a(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}(x)| &\lesssim [a]_\alpha ([U_{int}]_\alpha + [u]_\alpha) |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\ |a(x) \partial_{a_0} \partial_1 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}(x)| &\lesssim [a]_\alpha ([U_{int}]_\alpha + [u]_\alpha) |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\ \text{and } |a(x) \partial_{a_0}^2 \mathbf{V}'(x, \bar{a}(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}(x))^2| &\lesssim [a]_\alpha (\|U_{int}\| + \|u\|) |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that in the second estimate above it was important that the initial condition of $\mathbf{V}'(\cdot, a_0)$ does not depend on a_0 . These estimates, (76), and the assumptions (B2), (B3), and $[a]_\alpha \leq N$ give (161).

Step 2: (Construction of the correction w) We now show that there exists $w \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ solving

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)w &= -(\partial_2 q - a\partial_1^2 q + q) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ w &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned} \quad (163)$$

In fact, we construct the solution w of (163) as a $C^{2\alpha}$ -solution of

$$(\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)w = -(\partial_2 q - a\partial_1^2 q + q)^E \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (164)$$

and then show that $w|_{\mathbb{R}_-^2} = 0$. The construction of the correction w follows a similar procedure as part i) of Proposition 1.

Step 2.1: (A specific form of the singular product) Let $u \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and satisfy $\partial_1^2 u \in C^\alpha(\Omega)$ for $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$. Using a trivial version of the argument from Step 1 of Proposition 1, we find that the singular product $a \diamond \partial_1^2 u$ obtained using the trivial modelling of u via Lemma 7 coincides with the classical product on Ω . In particular, this follows from the uniqueness in Lemma 7.

Step 2.2: (Hölder bounds for the right-hand side of (164)) Let $g = -(\partial_2 q - a\partial_1^2 q + q)^E$. We now estimate $\|g_\tau\|_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}_L^2}$ and $\|g_\tau\|_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}^2}$ for any $L \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau > 0$.

We first bound $[g_\tau]_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}_L^2}$ for which we use (159) of Lemma 11 with $\delta = \frac{\alpha+2}{2}$ and (161) to obtain:

$$[g_\tau]_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}_L^2} \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int})(\tau^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha} L^{-\frac{\alpha+2}{2}}.$$

To bound the corresponding L^∞ -norm, we use (158) (again with $\delta = \frac{\alpha+2}{2}$), which gives that

$$\|g_\tau\|_{\mathbb{R}_L^2} \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int})(\tau^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha} L^{-\frac{\alpha+2}{2}}.$$

For our estimate on $[g_\tau]_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}^2}$, we again use (161), but now in combination with (157); we find that

$$[g_\tau]_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}^2} \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int})(\tau^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2}.$$

For the L^∞ -norm $\|g_\tau\|$, we use (156) to give that

$$\|g_\tau\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int})(\tau^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2}.$$

Step 2.3: (Analysis of the regularized problem) Let $\tau \in (0, 1)$. From the last step we know that $g_\tau \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, which means that there exists $w^\tau \in C^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ solving

$$(\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)w^\tau = g_\tau \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (165)$$

Similar to Proposition 1, we would now like to pass to the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ with an application of Lemma 8. For this application we set $I = 1$, $f_1(\cdot, a_0) = 0$, $\sigma_1 = 0$, and $a = a$. We first check the condition (89). Convolving (165) with ψ_T , we obtain that w^τ solves

$$(\partial_2 - a\partial_1^2 + 1)w_T^\tau = g_{\tau+T} + (a\partial_1^2 w^\tau)_T - a\partial_1^2 w_T^\tau \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (166)$$

A calculation similar to (160), taking (161) as input, yields that

$$\|g_\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int}). \quad (167)$$

Furthermore, since $w^\tau \in C^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we may apply Step 2.1, which is then combined with (65) of Lemma 7 to give that

$$\sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|(a\partial_1^2 w^\tau)_T - a\partial_1^2 w_T^\tau\| = \|[a, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 w^\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim [a]_\alpha [w^\tau]_{2\alpha}. \quad (168)$$

Together (166), (167), and (168) yield that (89) is satisfied with $K = C([w^\tau]_{2\alpha}[a]_\alpha + N(N_0 + N_0^{int}))$ for some large enough constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$.

Applying Lemma 8 we find that

$$[w^\tau]_{2\alpha} + \|w^\tau\|_\alpha \lesssim [a]_\alpha [w^\tau]_{2\alpha} + N(N_0 + N_0^{int}),$$

which, after we use that $[a]_\alpha \ll 1$, gives:

$$[w^\tau]_{2\alpha} + \|w^\tau\|_\alpha \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int}). \quad (169)$$

Step 2.4: (Passing to the limit in the regularization) We now pass to the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ in the sequence of approximate solutions w^τ . Using the convention (14), in which we define the $C^{2\alpha}$ -seminorm, we see that (169) allows us to apply the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem in $C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, which implies that up to a subsequence $w^\tau \rightarrow w$ uniformly. In order to pass to the limit in (165), just like in Step 3 of Proposition 1, we first notice that $g_\tau \rightarrow g$ and $\partial_2 w_\tau \rightarrow \partial_2 w$ distributionally. It is still necessary to show that $a\partial_1^2 w^\tau \rightarrow a \diamond \partial_1^2 w$, which follows from (64) of Lemma 7. To avoid repetition we again reference Steps 9 and 10 in the proof of Proposition 3.8 in [17]. Notice lastly that since the bound (169) is preserved under taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$, we obtain (86).

In order to see that w satisfies the initial condition of (163) we use the estimates from Step 2.2. In particular, the classical Schauder estimate for (165) (see *e.g.* [13, Theorem 8.10.1]) yields:

$$\|w_\tau\|_{\alpha+2; \mathbb{R}_L^2} \lesssim \|g_\tau\|_{\alpha; \mathbb{R}_L^2} \lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int})L^{-\frac{\alpha+2}{2}}(\tau^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha},$$

and passing to the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ implies that $w \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_L^2 for every $L > 0$.

Step 3: (Uniqueness) In this step we show that the correction w solving (163) such that $w \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 is unique. To see this, we assume that we have two such solutions w and w' and subtract them. We then use the same argument as in Step 4 of the proof of Proposition 1, to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)(w - w') &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2 \\ w - w' &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Step 3.1 we have that $a \diamond \partial_1^2(w - w') = a\partial_1^2(w - w') \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 . In particular, we find that $w - w'$ solves

$$(\partial_2 - a \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)(w - w') = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

which we can then take as input into Lemma 8. The proof of our claim then proceeds exactly as in Step 4 of Proposition 1 by showing that $\|w - w'\|_\alpha = 0$.

Step 4: (Conclusion) To conclude, we check that $\mathbf{U} = q + w$ solves (85). In this step it is important to keep in mind the notations from Definition 2 and Definition 6 and, additionally, the shorthand given in (12) and (78). Notice that because $q = U_{int} - u$ and $w = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^2$, the desired boundary condition holds. Furthermore, by (164) we have that

$$\partial_1^2(\tilde{q} + w) - a \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q} - a \diamond \partial_1^2w + (\tilde{q} + w) = (\partial_1^2\tilde{q} - a \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q} + \tilde{q}) - (\partial_1^2q - a\partial_1^2q + q)^E \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

To finish we show that

$$a \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q} + a \diamond \partial_1^2w = a \diamond \partial_1^2(\tilde{q} + w) \quad (170)$$

and

$$(\partial_1^2\tilde{q} - a \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q} + \tilde{q}) - (\partial_1^2q - a\partial_1^2q + q)^E \equiv 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+^2. \quad (171)$$

For (170) we first notice that, since $w \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, it follows from Proposition 2 that $\tilde{q} + w$ is modelled after $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\cdot, a_0)$ according to a . So, the product on the right-hand side of (170) is defined via Lemma 7 with this modelling. The first product on the left-hand side is defined using the same modelling and the second product on the left-hand side is defined via the trivial modelling. Just like in Step 4 of Proposition 1, we find that the triangle inequality and (64) of Lemma 7 may be combined to give

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|(a \diamond \partial_1^2(\tilde{q} + w))_T - (a \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q})_T - (a \diamond \partial_1^2w)_T\| = 0,$$

which implies (170).

To show (171), we prove that $a \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q}$ is the classical product on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . We first notice that $\partial_1^2\tilde{q}$ satisfies (33), which implies that the product $a\partial_1^2\tilde{q}$ is well-defined in a distributional sense. For this calculation fix a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$; then, we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1^2\tilde{q}(x) &= \partial_1^2\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x)) + 2\partial_1\partial_{a_0}\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x))\partial_1\tilde{a}(x) \\ &\quad + \partial_{a_0}^2\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x))(\partial_1\tilde{a}(x))^2 + \partial_{a_0}\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x))\partial_1^2\tilde{a}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2 and using (76) along with the assumptions (B2), (B3), and $[a]_\alpha \leq N \leq 1$ yields that

$$|\partial_1^2\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x))| \lesssim (N_0 + N_0^{int})|x_2|^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &|\partial_1\partial_{a_0}\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x))\partial_1\tilde{a}(x)| + |\partial_{a_0}^2\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x))(\partial_1\tilde{a}(x))^2| + |\partial_{a_0}\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x, \tilde{a}(x))\partial_1^2\tilde{a}(x)| \\ &\lesssim N(N_0 + N_0^{int})|x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (172)$$

So, indeed $\partial_1^2\tilde{q}$ satisfies (33).

As now $a\partial_1^2\tilde{q}$ has a well-defined classical meaning, it makes sense to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|(a \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q})_T - (a\partial_1^2\tilde{q})_T\| &\lesssim \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|[a, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2\tilde{q} - E[a, (\cdot)_T]\partial_1^2\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\cdot, a_0)\| \\ &\quad + \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|[a, (\cdot)_T]\partial_1^2\tilde{q} - E[a, (\cdot)_T]\partial_1^2\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\cdot, a_0)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

where E denotes evaluation of a function of (x, a_0) at $(x, a(x))$. Notice that by Lemma 7, the first term on the right-hand side of (173) vanishes. We will now show that the second term also vanishes, which finishes our argument for (171). To this end, notice that by (172) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |a(x) - a(x - y)| \left(|\partial_1\partial_{a_0}\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x - y, \tilde{a}(x - y))\partial_1\tilde{a}(x - y)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\partial_{a_0}^2\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x - y, \tilde{a}(x - y))(\partial_1\tilde{a}(x - y))^2| + |\partial_{a_0}\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'(x - y, \tilde{a}(x - y))\partial_1^2\tilde{a}(x - y)| \right) |\psi_T(y)| \, dy \\ &\lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. To finish, we use that $[a]_\alpha \leq 1$ and the triangle inequality to write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |a(x) - a(x-y)| |\partial_1^2 \tilde{V}'(x-y, \tilde{a}(x-y)) - E \partial_1^2 \tilde{V}(x-y, a_0)| |\psi_T(y)| dy \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(0, y) |\partial_1^2 \tilde{V}(x-y, a(x)) - \partial_1^2 \tilde{V}(x-y, a(x-y))| |\psi_T(y)| dy \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(0, y) |\partial_1^2 \tilde{V}(x-y, a(x-y)) - \partial_1^2 \tilde{V}(x-y, a_{tr}(x-y))| |\psi_T(y)| dy \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(0, y) |\partial_1^2 \tilde{V}'(x-y, \tilde{a}(x-y)) - \partial_1^2 \tilde{V}'(x-y, a(x-y))| dy \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(0, y) |\partial_1^2 \tilde{V}'(x-y, a(x-y)) - \partial_1^2 \tilde{V}'(x-y, a_{tr}(x-y))| dy \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^\alpha(0, y) |\partial_1^2 \tilde{V}(x-y, a_{tr}(x-y), u - v(a_{tr}(x-y)))| |\psi_T(y)| dy
\end{aligned} \tag{174}$$

Notice that by Lemma 2 and (135), the first four terms of (174) are uniformly bounded (in x) by $(N_0 + N_0^{int})(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}$. For the last term we use Lemma 12, which gives a uniform bound of $M(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}$, where M is associated to the modelling of u after v according to a that follows from Proposition 1. Combining all of these observations we find that the second term of (173) also vanishes as $T \rightarrow 0$.

We now continue on to part ii); it again has four steps.

Step 5: (*Interpolation of the data*) We linearly interpolate the data as in Proposition 1. Notice that a_s and f_s have already been defined in Step 5 of Proposition 1 and that $v_s(\cdot, a_0)$ and u_s corresponding to f_s and a_s have also been introduced. We now additionally let

$$U_{int,s} := sU_{int,1} + (1-s)U_{int,0}$$

for $s \in [0, 1]$. By Definition 6, these conventions induce the notation

$$q_s := V'_s(\cdot, \bar{a}_s(\cdot)),$$

where $V'_s(\cdot, a_0) = V(\cdot, a_0, U_{int,s} - u_s)$ and \bar{a}_s solves (80) with initial condition a_s .

Step 6: (*A continuous curve of corrections w_s^τ and an equation for $\partial_s w_s^\tau$*) In analogue to (161), the bounds from Lemma 2 yield:

$$|(\partial_2 q_s - a_s \partial_1^2 q_s + q_s)^E(x)| \lesssim N(N_0^{int} + N_0) |x_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}} \tag{175}$$

for any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Feeding (175) into the machinery that we have developed in part i), we find that there exists $w_s \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ solving (163) with right-hand side $-(\partial_2 q_s - a_s \partial_1^2 q_s + q_s)$ and coefficient a_s and that w_s actually solves

$$(\partial_2 - a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)w_s = g_s \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $g_s := -(\partial_2 q_s - a_s \partial_1^2 q_s + q_s)^E$. This solution w_s is obtained by taking the limit in $C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of the sequence of regularized solutions w_s^τ of

$$(\partial_2 - a_s \diamond \partial_1^2 + 1)w_s^\tau = g_{s\tau} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{176}$$

By the same arguments as in Step 4, we find that $U_s = q_s + w_s$ solves (85) with coefficients a_s and initial condition $U_{int,s} - u_s$.

Since Step 2.1 implies that when $\tau > 0$ the singular product in (176) is the classical product, we may differentiate (176) with respect to s and find that $\partial_s w_s^\tau$ solves

$$(\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)\partial_s w_s^\tau = (\partial_s g_s)_\tau + \partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 w_s^\tau \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{177}$$

By similar arguments as in Step 2 part i), the right-hand side of (177) is of class C^α , which implies that $\partial_s w_s^\tau \in C^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In particular, $\partial_s w_s^\tau$ is trivially modelled.

Step 7: (*Estimates for $\partial_s w_s^\tau$*) Let $\tau \in (0, 1)$. We apply Lemma 8 to $\partial_s w_s^\tau$ with the inputs $I = 2$, $f_1(\cdot, a_0) = \partial_s g_s$, $f_2(\cdot, a_0) = \partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 w_s^\tau(\cdot, a_0)$, and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 0$. First, we check that $\partial_s w_s^\tau$ is an approximate solution in the sense of (89). To begin, we convolve (177) with ψ_T , which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_s w_{sT}^\tau \\ &= \partial_s (g_{sT})_T + (\partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 w_s^\tau)_T - [a_s, (\cdot)_T] \partial_1^2 \partial_s w_s^\tau \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The crux of the proof of part *ii*) of Proposition 3 is showing that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|\partial_s (g_{sT})_T + (\partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 w_s^\tau)_T - [a_s, (\cdot)_T] \partial_1^2 \partial_s w_s^\tau\| \\ & \lesssim [a_s]_\alpha [\partial_s w_s^\tau]_{2\alpha} + \delta N (N_0 + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}, \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

which we split into three steps. The eventual application of Lemma 8 then comes in Step 7.4.

Step 7.1: We start by showing that

$$\|\partial_s g_{sT}\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim \delta N (N_0 + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}. \quad (179)$$

In particular, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s g_s(x) &= -((\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)(V'_1(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - V'_0(x, \bar{a}_s(x))))^E \\ &\quad - ((\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)(\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)))^E \\ &\quad + ((a_1 - a_0) \partial_1^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)))^E \end{aligned} \quad (180)$$

holds. The first term may be treated like (160) and (166), using the linearity of the equations (11) and (80) along with the assumption (C3) and (77). In conjunction with (22) and $N \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\|((\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)(V'_1(\cdot, \bar{a}_s(\cdot)) - V'_0(\cdot, \bar{a}_s(\cdot))))^E_\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim N_0 \delta N + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}. \quad (181)$$

Treating the second and third terms of (180) is more involved. Applying Leibniz' rule for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)(\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - (a_1 - a_0) \partial_1^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \\ &= \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_2 (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) + (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \partial_2 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \\ &\quad + (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_2 \bar{a}_s - a_s \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1^2 (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \\ &\quad - 2a_s \partial_1 (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) (\partial_1 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) + \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s) \\ &\quad - a_s (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \left(\partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) + 2\partial_1 \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s(x) \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + \partial_{a_0}^3 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}_s)^2 + \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s \right) \\ &\quad + (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \\ &\quad - (a_1 - a_0) \left(-\partial_1^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) + 2\partial_1 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}_s)^2 + \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s \right). \end{aligned}$$

We rework this identity by using the following relations:

$$\partial_2 (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) = \partial_1^2 (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) - (\overline{a_1 - a_0}),$$

$$\partial_2 \bar{a}_s = \partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s - \bar{a}_s,$$

$$\text{and } \partial_2 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) = \bar{a}_s(x) \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) + \partial_1^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)),$$

which are plugged-in to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\partial_2 - a_s \partial_1^2 + 1)(\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) - (a_1 - a_0) \partial_1^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \\
& = (1 - a_s) \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1^2 (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) + (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) (\bar{a}_s(x) - a_s(x)) \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \\
& \quad + (a_1 - a_0 - \overline{a_1 - a_0}) (\partial_1^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) + (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) (\partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s - \bar{a}_s)) \\
& \quad - 2a_s \partial_1 (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) (\partial_1 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) + \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s) \\
& \quad - a_s (\overline{a_1 - a_0}) (2 \partial_1 \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, a_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s(x) + \partial_{a_0}^3 V'_s(x, a_s(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}_s)^2 + \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, a_s(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s) \\
& \quad - (a_1 - a_0) \left(2 \partial_1 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s + \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}_s)^2 + \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Each term on the right-hand side of the above expression is now treated separately. In particular, using the bounds from Lemma 2, that the initial condition of $V'_s(\cdot, a_0)$ does not depend on a_0 , the relation (162), and the linearity of the equations (11) and (80), we obtain the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(1 - a_s(x)) \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1^2 (\overline{a_1 - a_0})(x)| \lesssim (1 + \|a_s\|) [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha [a_1 - a_0]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |(\overline{a_1 - a_0})(x) (\bar{a}_s - a_s)(x) \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x))| \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\| [a_s]_\alpha [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |(\overline{a_1 - a_0} - (a_1 - a_0))(x) \partial_1^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x))| \lesssim [a_1 - a_0]_\alpha [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |\overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) (\partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s - \bar{a}_s)(x)| \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\| [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} ([a_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + \|a_s\|), \\
& |a_s(x) \partial_1 \overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) \partial_1 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x))| \lesssim \|a_s\| [a_1 - a_0]_\alpha [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |\partial_1 \overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s(x)| \lesssim [a_s]_\alpha [a_1 - a_0]_\alpha \|U_{int,s} - u_s\| x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |a_s(x) \overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) \partial_1 \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, a_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s(x)| \lesssim \|a_s\| [a_s]_\alpha \|a_1 - a_0\| [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |a_s(x) \overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) \partial_{a_0}^3 V'_s(x, a_s(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}_s(x))^2| \lesssim \|a_s\| \|a_1 - a_0\| \|U_{int,s} - u_s\| [a_s]_\alpha^2 x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |a_s(x) \overline{a_1 - a_0}(x) \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, a_s(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s(x)| \lesssim \|a_s\| \|a_1 - a_0\| [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha [a_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |(a_1 - a_0)(x) \partial_1 \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1 \bar{a}_s(x)| \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\| [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha [a_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& |(a_1 - a_0)(x) \partial_{a_0}^2 V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) (\partial_1 \bar{a}_s(x))^2| \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\| [a_s]_\alpha^2 \|U_{int,s} - u_s\| x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}, \\
& \text{and } |(a_1 - a_0)(x) \partial_{a_0} V'_s(x, \bar{a}_s(x)) \partial_1^2 \bar{a}_s(x)| \lesssim \|a_1 - a_0\| [U_{int,s} - u_s]_\alpha [a_s]_\alpha x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates with the assumptions (C2), (C3), and (C4) along with the previous estimate (76), we find that the second and third terms of (180) are bounded as $\delta N(N_0 + N_0^{int}) (x_2^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}} + x_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})$. Applying Lemma 11 and using (181), we then obtain (179). In our application of Lemma 11, we remark that the term $|x_2|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is not disturbing as $(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} \leq (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^\alpha$ when $T \in (0, 1)$.

Step 7.2: To continue checking (178) we use the triangle inequality to write:

$$\|\partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 w_s^\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} \leq \|[\partial_s a_s, (\cdot)] \partial_1^2 w_s^\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} + \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-2\alpha} \|\partial_s a_s \partial_1^2 (w_s^\tau)_T\|. \quad (182)$$

The first term is treated with (65) of Lemma 7, the analogue of (169) for w_s^τ , and assumption (C2), which yield that

$$\|[\partial_s a_s, (\cdot)] \partial_1^2 w_s^\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim \delta N [w_s^\tau]_{2\alpha} \lesssim \delta N (N_0 + N_0^{int}).$$

The second term of (182) is also handled using (169). In particular, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we can use (19), that ψ_T is an even Schwartz function, that $N \leq 1$, and assumption (C4) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial_s a_s (\partial_1^2 w_s^\tau)_T(x)| & \lesssim \|a_0 - a_1\| \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (w_s^\tau(y) - w_s^\tau(x) - \partial_1 w_s^\tau(x)(y - x)_1) \partial_1^2 \psi_T(y - x) dy \right| \\
& \lesssim \|a_0 - a_1\| [w_s^\tau]_{2\alpha} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} \\
& \lesssim \delta N (N_0 + N_0^{int}) (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 7.3: To finish checking (178), we again use (65) of Lemma 7 for:

$$\|[a_s, (\cdot)]\partial_1^2 \partial_s w_s^\tau\|_{2\alpha-2} \lesssim [a_s]_\alpha [\partial_s w_s^\tau]_{2\alpha}.$$

This completes the argument for (178).

Step 7.4: Having shown (178) and using $[a_s]_\alpha \ll 1$, we can then apply Lemma 8 to find that

$$\|\partial_s w_s^\tau\|_\alpha + [\partial_s w_s^\tau]_{2\alpha} \lesssim \delta N(N_0 + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}. \quad (183)$$

Step 8: (Conclusion) Just as in Step 8 of Proposition 1, the bound (183) may be integrated-up to give:

$$\|w_0^\tau - w_1^\tau\|_\alpha + [w_0^\tau - w_1^\tau]_{2\alpha} \lesssim \delta N(N_0 + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}. \quad (184)$$

Passing to the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$, we find that the bound (184) holds also for $w_0 - w_1$. \square

4.4 Proof of Theorem 1

As already advertised, the proof of Theorem 1 consists of combining Propositions 1, 2, and 3. Here is the argument:

Proof of Theorem 1.

i) From Proposition 1 we have a unique solution $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of (69) that is modelled after v according to a . In Proposition 2 we take u to be this solution of (69). By (76), (81), (82), and (215) from the proof of Lemma 6 –where M_∂ and ν_∂ correspond to the modelling of u – we find that

$$M_q + \|q\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0 + N_0^{int}.$$

An application of Proposition 3 then gives a unique $w \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $w \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 and $U = q + w$ solves (70). The desired solution $U \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ of (68) is then given by $U = u + U$.

To check that $u + U$ in fact satisfies (68), we show that

$$a \diamond \partial_1^2 U = a \diamond \partial_1^2 u + a \diamond \partial_1^2 U. \quad (185)$$

Recall that the singular products in (185) are defined as follows:

- $a \diamond \partial_1^2 u := a \diamond \partial_1^2 u|_{\mathbb{R}_+^2}$ is obtained via Lemma 7 using the modelling of u after v according to a ,
- $a \diamond \partial_1^2 U := a \diamond \partial_1^2 (\tilde{q} + w)|_{\mathbb{R}_+^2}$ is obtained via Lemma 7 using the modelling of $\tilde{q} + w$ after \tilde{V} according to a ,
- and $a \diamond \partial_1^2 U := a \diamond \partial_1^2 (u + \tilde{q} + w)|_{\mathbb{R}_+^2}$ is obtained via Lemma 7 using the modelling of $u + \tilde{q} + w$ after $v + \tilde{V}$ according to a .

The argument for (185) has already been used in Step 1 of Proposition 1 and Step 2.1 of Proposition 3. In particular, by using Lemma 7 and the triangle inequality we find that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \|(a \diamond \partial_1^2 U)_T - (a \diamond \partial_1^2 u)_T + (a \diamond \partial_1^2 U)_T\| = 0.$$

The relations (71) and (72) are a consequence of (76), (81), and (86).

ii) We now use the results of part *ii)* of Propositions 1, 2, and 3. In particular, for u_0 and u_1 in part *ii)* of Proposition 2 we take the solutions from part *ii)* of Proposition 1. Using (77), (83), (84), and (215) –where δM_∂ and $\delta \nu_\partial$ correspond to the modelling of $u_1 - u_0$ – we find that

$$M_{q_1 - q_0} + \|q_1 - q_0\|_\alpha \lesssim \delta N(N_0 + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}.$$

Then relations (73) and (74) are immediate from the above bound, (77), and (87). \square

5 Proof of Theorem 2

Here is the:

Proof of Theorem 2. We work under the assumptions of part *ii*). The main idea of the proof is to do a contraction mapping argument for

$$(u_i^*, w_i^*, a_i^*) \mapsto (q_i^*, a_i := a(u_i^* + w_i^* + \tilde{q}_i^*), \{a_i \diamond \partial_1^2 v_i(\cdot, a_0)\}) \xrightarrow{Thm. 1} (u_i, w_i, a_i), \quad (186)$$

where $u_i^* \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is modelled after v_i according to $a_i^* \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $w_i^* \in C^{2\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $w_i^* \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}_-^2 . We make the additional assumption that $a_i^* = a(U_{int,i})$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$ and a_i^*, u_i^* , and w_i^* are x_1 -periodic. We, furthermore, use the convention

$$q_i^* := V(\cdot, \bar{a}_i, U_{int,i} - u_i^*), \quad (187)$$

where we have made use of Definition 2 and \bar{a}_i solves (80) with the initial condition $a(U_{int,i})$. We also use the notation given in (12) and that in Definition 5 to denote even-reflection.

Step 1: (*Application of Lemma 3.2 of [17]; see Section 2.4*) Let $i = 0, 1$. We introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} M^* &:= \max_{i=0,1} (M_{u_i^*} + [w_i^*]_{2\alpha} + \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + \|w_i^*\|_\alpha) + N_0 + N_0^{int} \\ \text{and } \delta M^* &:= M_{u_1^* - u_0^*} + [w_1^* - w_0^*]_{2\alpha} + \|u_1^* - u_0^*\|_\alpha + \|w_1^* - w_0^*\|_\alpha \\ &\quad + (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0 + N_0^{int}) \|a_1^* - a_0^*\|_\alpha + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}, \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{u_i^*}$ corresponds to the modelling of u_i^* after v_i according to a_i^* and $M_{u_1^* - u_0^*}$ is associated to the modelling of $u_1^* - u_0^*$ after (v_1, v_0) according to (a_1^*, a_0^*) and $(1, -1)$.

We also define:

$$\begin{aligned} U_i^* &:= u_i^* + w_i^* + \tilde{q}_i^*, \\ \tilde{M} &:= \max_{i=0,1} (M_{a_i} + [a_i]_\alpha) + N_0 + N_0^{int}, \quad \text{and} \\ \delta \tilde{M} &:= M_{a_1 - a_0} + \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha + (N_0 + N_0^{int}) (\|a'(U_1^*) - a'(U_0^*)\|_\alpha + \|a_1^* - a_0^*\|_\alpha) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}, \end{aligned} \quad (188)$$

where M_{a_i} corresponds to the modelling of a_i after $\tilde{V}_i + v_i$ according to a_i^* and $\nu_i = a'(U_i^*)$ and $M_{a_1 - a_0}$ is associated to the modelling of $a_1 - a_0$ after $(\tilde{V}_1 + v_1, \tilde{V}_0 + v_0)$ according to (a_1^*, a_0^*) and $(\nu_1, -\nu_0)$.

Using the bounds from Lemma 3.2 of [17] and the assumptions on the nonlinearity a , we then find that

$$a_i \in [\lambda, 1] \text{ and } [a_i]_\alpha \ll 1 \quad \text{if} \quad \max_{i=0,1} (\|u_i^*\|_\alpha + \|w_i^*\|_\alpha) \ll 1 \text{ and } N_0, N_0^{int} \ll 1, \quad (190)$$

$$\tilde{M} \lesssim M^* \quad \text{if} \quad \max_{i=0,1} (\|u_i^*\|_\alpha + \|w_i^*\|_\alpha) \ll 1 \text{ and } N_0, N_0^{int} \ll 1, \quad (191)$$

$$\text{and } \delta \tilde{M} \lesssim \delta M^* \quad \text{if} \quad M^* \leq 1. \quad (192)$$

For (190) we notice that

$$[a_i]_\alpha \lesssim \|a'\| ([u_i^*]_\alpha + [w_i^*]_\alpha + [\tilde{q}_i^*]_\alpha) \quad (193)$$

and $\|a'\| \leq 1$. So, since $a_i \in [\lambda, 1]$ is clear as $a \in [\lambda, 1]$, (190) holds if $[u_i^*]_\alpha + [w_i^*]_\alpha + [\tilde{q}_i^*]_\alpha \ll 1$. By (82) and the notation (187) we know that $[\tilde{q}_i^*]_\alpha \ll 1$ if $N_0^{int} + \|u_i^*\|_\alpha \ll 1$.

For (191) and (192) we first observe that U_i^* is modelled after $\tilde{V}_i + v_i$ according to a_i^* . This follows from the assumed modelling of u_i^* and noticing that q_i^* is modelled after \tilde{V}_i according to a_i^* with modelling constant $M_{q_i^*}$ bounded as

$$M_{q_i^*} \lesssim M_{u_i^*} + \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0 + N_0^{int}. \quad (194)$$

The modelling of q_i^* and the bound (194) follow from taking $a = a_i$ in part *i*) of Proposition 2– this yields that q_i^* is modelled after \tilde{V}_i according to a_i with modelling constant bounded as

$$M_{intermediate} \lesssim M_{u_i^*} + \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0 + N_0^{int}.$$

Using Lemma 9, since $a(U_{int,i}) = a_i^*$ on $\{x_2 = 0\}$, we obtain (194). From (82) we also obtain that

$$\|q_i^*\|_\alpha \lesssim \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}. \quad (195)$$

We can then combine (194) and (195) with the bound (50); $\|a'\|, \|a''\| \leq 1$; and the assumptions of (191) to write:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{a_i} &\lesssim \|a'\| M_{U_i^*} + \|a''\| [U_i^*]^2 \\ &\lesssim \|a'\| (M_{u_i^*} + [w_i^*]_{2\alpha} + M_{q_i^*}) + \|a''\| ([u_i^*]_\alpha + [w_i^*]_\alpha + [q_i^*]_\alpha)^2 \\ &\lesssim M_{u_i^*} + [w_i^*]_{2\alpha} + \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + [w_i^*]_\alpha + N_0 + N_0^{int}. \end{aligned}$$

Another application of (193) and (195) yields (191).

The bound (192) requires the use of both (51) and (52). First, however, we collect the bounds stemming from (83) and (84). In particular, we first notice that by (83) we have that

$$M_{q_1^* - q_0^*} \lesssim M_{u_1^* - u_0^*} + \|u_1^* - u_0^*\|_\alpha + \|a_1^* - a_0^*\|_\alpha (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0^{int} + \delta N_0, \quad (196)$$

where this corresponds to the modelling of $q_1^* - q_0^*$ after $(\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_0)$ according to (a_1^*, a_0^*) and $(1, -1)$. Applying (84), we obtain:

$$\|q_1^* - q_0^*\|_\alpha \lesssim \|u_1^* - u_0^*\|_\alpha + \|a_1^* - a_0^*\|_\alpha (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}) + \delta N_0^{int}. \quad (197)$$

Combining (194), (195), (196), (197), (51), the assumption $M^* \leq 1$, and $\|a'\|, \|a''\|, \|a'''\| \leq 1$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{a_1 - a_0} &\lesssim \|a'\| M_{U_1^* - U_0^*} + \|U_1^* - U_0^*\|_\alpha (\|a''\| \max_{i=0,1} [U_i^*]_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \|a'''\| \max_{i=0,1} [U_i^*]_\alpha^2 + \|a''\| \max_{i=0,1} M_{U_i^*}) \\ &\lesssim M_{u_1^* - u_0^*} + [w_1^* - w_0^*]_{2\alpha} + \|u_1^* - u_0^*\|_\alpha + \|w_1^* - w_0^*\|_\alpha + \delta N_0^{int} + \delta N_0 \\ &\quad + \|a_1^* - a_0^*\|_\alpha (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}). \end{aligned}$$

Using (52), (197), and $M^* \leq 1$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha + \|a'(U_1^*) - a'(U_0^*)\|_\alpha \\ &\lesssim (\|a'\| + \|a''\| + (\|a'''\| + \|a'''\|)) \max_{i=0,1} [U_i^*]_\alpha \|U_1^* - U_0^*\|_\alpha \\ &\lesssim \|u_1^* - u_0^*\|_\alpha + \|w_1^* - w_0^*\|_\alpha + \delta N_0^{int} + \|a_1^* - a_0^*\|_\alpha (\max_{i=0,1} \|u_i^*\|_\alpha + N_0^{int}). \end{aligned} \quad (198)$$

Combining the last two computations, we obtain (192).

Step 2: (*Application of Corollary 3*) In this step we apply Corollary 3. For $i, j = 0, 1$, we obtain families of distributions $\{a_i \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0)\}$, indexed by $a_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, satisfying

$$\|[a_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0)\|_{2\alpha-2,2} \lesssim N_0(N_0^{int} + N_0 + M_{a_i}) \lesssim N_0 \tilde{M}, \quad (199)$$

$$\|[a_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a_0) - [a_i, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a_0)\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \lesssim \delta N_0(N_0 + N_0^{int} + M_{a_i}) \lesssim \delta N_0 \tilde{M}, \quad (200)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{and } \|[a_1, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_i(\cdot, a_0) - [a_0, (\cdot)] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_i(\cdot, a_0)\|_{2\alpha-2,1} \\ &\lesssim N_0(M_{a_1 - a_0} + (N_0 + N_0^{int})(\|a'(U_1^*) - a'(U_0^*)\|_\alpha + \|a_1^* - a_0^*\|_\alpha) + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}) \lesssim N_0 \delta \tilde{M} \end{aligned} \quad (201)$$

Notice that (199) follows from (60), (200) follows from (61), and (201) follows from (62) via the additional ingredient of either the definition (188) or (189).

Step 3: (*Application of Theorem 1*) As indicated in (186), for $i = 0, 1$, we now apply Theorem 1 with $a_i := a(U_i^*)$, initial condition $U_{int,i}$, and forcing f_i . We use the convention that $U_i = u_i + q_i + w_i$ and the notation

$$\begin{aligned} M &:= \max_{i=0,1} (M_{u_i} + [w_i]_{2\alpha} + \|u_i\|_\alpha + \|w_i\|_\alpha) + N_0 + N_0^{int} \\ \delta M &:= M_{u_1 - u_0} + [w_1 - w_0]_{2\alpha} + \|u_1 - u_0\|_\alpha + \|w_1 - w_0\|_\alpha \\ &\quad + (N_0 + N_0^{int}) \|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int}. \end{aligned}$$

To apply the first part of Theorem 1 we work under the assumption that $M^* \ll 1$: Assumptions (B1) and (B3) are verified as they are adopted into the assumptions on the inputs f_i and $U_{int,i}$; the assumption (B2) is verified by a_i using (190) and the assumption $M^* \ll 1$; and the existence of the appropriate offline products in (B4) is guaranteed by (199) of the previous step with $N = \tilde{M}$, which via (191) satisfies $\tilde{M} \lesssim M^* \ll 1$ and, therefore, $\tilde{M} \leq 1$. The relations (71) and (72) then give that

$$M \lesssim N_0 + N_0^{int} \quad \text{if } M^* \ll 1. \quad (202)$$

To apply the second part of Theorem 1 we again work under the assumption that $M^* \ll 1$. The conditions (C1) and (C3) are again automatically verified since they have been adopted into the assumptions of Theorem 2. For the assumptions (C2) and (C4) we set $\delta N = \delta \tilde{M}$, which is a valid choice for (C4) by (201), and notice that by (198) we have that

$$\|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha \lesssim \delta \tilde{M}.$$

By (73) and (74) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta M &\lesssim (N_0 + N_0^{int})\delta \tilde{M} + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int} \\ &\lesssim (N_0 + N_0^{int})\delta M^* + \delta N_0 + \delta N_0^{int} \quad \text{if } M^* \ll 1, \end{aligned} \quad (203)$$

where we have additionally used (192).

Step 4: (Fixed-point argument) We now let $U_{int,1} = U_{int,0}$ and $f_0 = f_1$, which implies that $\delta N_0 = \delta N_0^{int} = 0$. We will perform a fixed-point argument for the map given in (186) in the space of triples (u_i^*, w_i^*, a_i^*) as described following (186) and, furthermore, satisfying

$$M^* \leq \epsilon \quad (204)$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. By (202) we see that the set defined through (204) is mapped to itself under (186) for $\epsilon \ll 1$. Using the same argument as in [17], we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &d((u_1, w_1, a_1), (u_0, w_0, a_0)) \\ &:= M_{u_1^* - u_0^*} + [w_1 - w_0]_{2\alpha} + \|u_1^* - u_0^*\|_\alpha + \|w_1 - w_0\|_\alpha + (N_0 + N_0^{int})\|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha \end{aligned}$$

defines a distance function under which the set defined by (204) is complete and closed. By (203) with $\delta N_0 = \delta N_0^{int} = 0$, we obtain that $\delta M \lesssim (N_0 + N_0^{int})\delta M^*$, which translates into:

$$d((u_1, w_1, a_1), (u_0, w_0, a_0)) \lesssim (N_0 + N_0^{int})d((u_1^*, w_1^*, a_1^*), (u_0^*, w_0^*, a_0^*)).$$

In other words, the map given by (186) is a contraction on the space defined by (204).

Step 5: (Conclusion) We first conclude part *i*). Notice that the fixed point (u, w, a) of the map (186) found in the previous step satisfies the claim in part *i*) of this theorem. For the uniqueness part of our claim, assume that the triplet (u, w, a) satisfies part *i*) of Theorem 2 and notice that then it is clearly a fixed-point of (186). To finish we must check that this triplet is in the set defined by (204). Notice that thanks to (90), we know that (190) and (191) hold, and we may use (75) and (86) of Propositions 1 and 3 respectively to obtain that

$$M_u + [w]_{2\alpha} + \|u\|_\alpha + \|w\|_\alpha \lesssim N_0 + N_0^{int}. \quad (205)$$

So, since $N_0, N_0^{int} \ll 1$ and $M = M^*$ for a fixed point, we find that indeed (u, w, a) satisfies (204). Furthermore, the a priori bounds contained in (91) follows from (202).

Moving on part *ii*), assume that we have two triplets (u_i, w_i, a_i) corresponding to two solutions in part *i*). Each (u_i, w_i, a_i) is a fixed point of its own map (186) corresponding to f_i and $U_{int,i}$. Since we are dealing with fixed points we have that $M^* = M$ and $\delta M^* = \delta M$. By (205) we know that $M^* \ll 1$ when $N_0, N_0^{int} \ll 1$, which means that we may apply (203) to obtain (92). \square

6 Construction of the New “Offline” Products and Reconstruction Lemmas

6.1 Proof of Lemmas 2 and 3: Bounds for Functions from Definition 2

The bounds in Lemma 2 all follow from the heat kernel representation of $V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$ given in (28). Here is the argument:

Proof of Lemma 2. We will use the change of variables $z = \frac{x_1 - y}{(4x_2 a_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ for which

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial y} = \frac{-1}{(4x_2 a_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial z}{\partial a_0} = -\frac{1}{2} z a_0^{-1}.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we use the convention that P_k represents a generic degree k polynomial; additionally, $P_k(\cdot, a_0^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ indicates a polynomial of order k with coefficients that are polynomials in $a_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

i) Fix $1 \leq k \leq 2$ and $j \geq 0$ and let $0 \leq m \leq j$. Using the above change of variables, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{a_0}^m \partial_1^k G(a_0, x_1 - y, x_2) \\ &= \partial_{a_0}^m \partial_1^k \left(\frac{e^{-x_2}}{(4\pi a_0 x_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{-z^2} \right) \\ &= e^{-x_2} \partial_{a_0}^m \left((a_0 x_2)^{-\frac{1+k}{2}} P_k(z) e^{-z^2} \right) \\ &= e^{-x_2} P_{k+2m}(z, a_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-z^2} x_2^{-\frac{1+k}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{206}$$

We then notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{a_0}^j \int_{\mathbb{R}} V_{int}(y, a_0) \partial_1^k G(a_0, x_1 - y, x_2) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{m=0}^j (\partial_{a_0}^m V_{int}(y, a_0) - \partial_{a_0}^m V_{int}(x_1, a_0)) \partial_{a_0}^{j-m} \partial_1^k G(a_0, x_1 - y, x_2) dy, \end{aligned} \tag{207}$$

where we have used that $k \geq 1$. To finish showing (29), we use (206) to calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{m=0}^j (\partial_{a_0}^m V_{int}(y, a_0) - \partial_{a_0}^m V_{int}(x_1, a_0)) \partial_{a_0}^{j-m} \partial_1^k G(a_0, x_1 - y, x_2) dy \right| \\ & \lesssim [V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha, j} x_2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |z|^\alpha \sum_{m=0}^j |\partial_{a_0}^{j-m} \partial_1^k G(a_0, x_1 - y, x_2)| dy \\ & \lesssim [V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha, j} e^{-x_2} x_2^{\frac{\alpha-k}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |z|^\alpha \sum_{m=0}^j P_{k+2m}(z, a_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-z^2} dz \\ & \lesssim_{\lambda, \alpha, j, k} [V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha, j} e^{-x_2} x_2^{\frac{\alpha-k}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

When the initial condition does not depend on a_0 , then we also obtain (29) for $k = 0$. This is clear once we make the observation that, since

$$\partial_{a_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x_1 - y, x_2, a_0) dy = 0,$$

the relation (207) still holds.

ii) Fix $j \geq 0$. The relation (30) then easily follows from (28) and (206). In particular, for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we can write:

$$|\partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, x_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))| \lesssim e^{-x_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{m=0}^j |\partial_{a_0}^m V_{int}(y, a_0)| x_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} |P_{2(j-m)}(z, a_0^{-\frac{1}{2}})| e^{-z^2} dy \lesssim e^{-x_2} \|V_{int}\|_j.$$

iii) We derive equations for $\partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$, $\partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$, and $\partial_{a_0}^3 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$. The equation for $\partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$ is derived by differentiating (11) in terms of a_0 , which yields that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) &= \partial_1^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ \partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) &= \partial_{a_0} V_{int}(\cdot, a_0) && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned} \quad (208)$$

Taking one more derivative in a_0 , we find that $\partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(\cdot, a_0))$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) &= 2 \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ \partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) &= \partial_{a_0}^2 V_{int}(\cdot, a_0) && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2 \end{aligned}$$

and differentiating a third time gives that $\partial_{a_0}^3 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_{a_0}^3 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) &= 3 \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ \partial_{a_0}^3 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) &= \partial_{a_0}^3 V_{int}(\cdot, a_0) && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned}$$

From these equations we can read-off (31) by using the Schauder estimate $[u]_\alpha \lesssim [f]_{\alpha-2} + \|g\|_\alpha$ for $u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ solving

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)u &= f && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ u &= g && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned}$$

This estimate follows from decomposing $f = \partial_2 f^2 + \partial_1^2 f^1 + f^3$ for a triplet (f^1, f^2, f^3) of C^α -functions that is near optimal in the sense of Definition 3 and applying the classical Schauder estimate [13, Lemma 9.2.1] to the solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)u_i &= \partial_i^{i-3} f_i && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ u_i &= 0 && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)u_\partial &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2, \\ u_\partial &= g && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^2. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we can then use the linearity of the equation and the uniqueness of the solution u to obtain the desired Schauder estimate.

Using the Schauder estimate we find that

$$\begin{aligned} [\partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_\alpha &\lesssim [\partial_1^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_{\alpha-2} + \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,1} \lesssim \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,1}, \\ [\partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_\alpha &\lesssim [\partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_{\alpha-2} + \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,2} \\ &\lesssim [\partial_{a_0} V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_\alpha + \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,2} \lesssim \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,2}, \\ \text{and } [\partial_{a_0}^3 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_\alpha &\lesssim [\partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_{\alpha-2} + \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,3} \\ &\lesssim [\partial_{a_0}^2 V(\cdot, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_\alpha + \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,3} \lesssim \|V_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,3}. \end{aligned}$$

iv) Fix two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $0 \leq j \leq 1$. We first apply the triangle inequality, which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, x_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j V(y_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))| \\ &\leq |\partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, x_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))| \\ &\quad + |\partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j V(y_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))| \end{aligned} \quad (209)$$

and then treat the two terms on the right-hand side separately. For the second term we use (29) and (31) to write:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j V(y_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))| \\ &\leq |\partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j V(y_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))|^{\frac{2-2\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \\ &\quad \times |\partial_{a_0}^j V(x_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j V(y_1, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))|^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \\ &\lesssim ([V(\cdot, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))]_{\alpha,j} |x_1 - y_1|^\alpha)^{\frac{2-2\alpha}{2-\alpha}} (|x_1 - y_1|^2 \|\partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0}^j V(\cdot, y_2, a_0, V_{int}(a_0))\|)^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \\ &\lesssim \|V_{int}\|_{\alpha,j} y_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} d^{2\alpha}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

The first term of (209) is treated using the equations (11) and (208). In particular, after applying (29) and (30) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_2 \mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))\| &\leq \|\partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))\| + \|\mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))\| \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_\alpha (x_2^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + e^{-x_2}) \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_\alpha x_2^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (210)$$

and, similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_2 \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))\| \\ &\leq \|\partial_1^2 \mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))\| + \|\partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))\| + \|\partial_{a_0} \mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))\| \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,1} (x_2^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + e^{-x_2}) \lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,1} x_2^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (211)$$

Using (210) (when $j = 0$) or (211) (when $j = 1$), we then obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(x_1, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(x_1, y_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))| \\ &\leq |\partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(x_1, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(x_1, y_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))|^{\frac{2-2\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \\ &\quad \times |\partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(x_1, x_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)) - \partial_{a_0}^j \mathbf{V}(x_1, y_2, a_0, \mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0))|^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \\ &\leq (|x_2 - y_2|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} [\mathbf{V}_{int}(a_0)]_{\alpha,j})^{\frac{2-2\alpha}{2-\alpha}} (|x_2 - y_2| \|\partial_2 \mathbf{V}(\cdot, x_2, a_0)\|_j)^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{V}_{int}(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha,1} x_2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} d^{2\alpha}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

v) Our claim immediately follows from the above arguments using (28), but with an extra factor of e^{-x_2} in the definition of the heat kernel (27). \square

The argument for Lemma 3 depends on classical Schauder theory and Definition 3. Here comes the argument:

Proof of Lemma 3. Let $f = \partial_1^2 f^1 + \partial_2 f^2 + f_3$ be a near optimal decomposition of f in the sense of Definition 3. Furthermore, let $v^i(\cdot, a_0)$ be the C^α -solution of

$$(\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1)v^i(\cdot, a_0) = f^i \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Notice that, for $i = 1, 2$, we may assume that f^i has vanishing average. By classical Schauder theory we have that $\|v^i(\cdot, a_0)\|_{\alpha+2} \lesssim \|f^i\|_\alpha$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. Using this and the convention (14) we obtain that

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 ([\partial_1^2 v^i(\cdot, a_0)]_\alpha + [\partial_2 v^i(\cdot, a_0)]_\alpha + \|v^i(\cdot, a_0)\|) \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^3 \|f^i\|_\alpha \lesssim [f]_{\alpha-2},$$

where the last bound follows from the vanishing average condition for f^i when $i = 1, 2$. To conclude our argument, we notice that by the uniqueness of C^α -solutions to (10) we know that $v(\cdot, a_0) = \partial_1^2 v^1(\cdot, a_0) + \partial_2 v^2(\cdot, a_0) + v^3(\cdot, a_0)$.

For the bounds on the higher order parameter derivatives, we emulate the argument from part *iii)* of Lemma 2. In particular, differentiating (10) in terms of a_0 gives that

$$(\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_{a_0} v(\cdot, a_0) = \partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a_0) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

which by the above gives that $\|\partial_{a_0} v(\cdot, a_0)\|_\alpha \lesssim [\partial_1^2 v(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha-2} \lesssim [f]_{\alpha-2}$. Differentiating in terms of a_0 again we find that $\partial_{a_0}^2 v(\cdot, a_0)$ solves

$$(\partial_2 - a_0 \partial_1^2 + 1) \partial_{a_0}^2 v(\cdot, a_0) = 2 \partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} v(\cdot, a_0) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

which again yields that $\|\partial_{a_0}^2 v(\cdot, a_0)\|_\alpha \lesssim [\partial_1^2 \partial_{a_0} v(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha-2} \lesssim [\partial_{a_0} v(\cdot, a_0)]_\alpha \lesssim [f]_{\alpha-2}$. \square

6.2 Proofs for the Construction of the New “Offline” Products

We begin by proving Lemma 4 and Corollary 1. Here is the:

Proof of Lemma 4. The bound (33) ensures that for $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the product

$$F \diamond \partial_1^2 G := F \partial_1^2 G$$

is classically defined as a distribution. In order to obtain (34), we fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and use (33) to write:

$$\begin{aligned} & |[F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 G(x)| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (F(x) - F(y)) \psi_T(x - y) \partial_1^2 G(y) dy \right| \\ &\lesssim C(G) [F]_\alpha \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_T(x - y)| d^\alpha(x, y) (|y_2|^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + |y_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}) dy \right) \\ &\lesssim C(G) [F]_\alpha (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2} \times \\ &\quad \left(\int_{-1}^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_1(\hat{x} - \hat{y})| d^\alpha(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) (|\hat{y}_2|^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + |\hat{y}_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}) d\hat{y}_1 d\hat{y}_2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\psi_1(\hat{x} - \hat{y})| d^\alpha(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) d\hat{y} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (212)$$

Notice that here we have used the change of variables (17) and that $T \leq 1$. To handle the first term on the right-hand side of (212) we use that

$$p(\cdot) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_1(x_1, \cdot)| (|x_1|^\alpha + |\cdot|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) dx_1 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}),$$

which follows from ψ_1 being a Schwartz function. Using this, we then have that

$$\int_{-1}^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_1(x - y)| d^\alpha(x, y) (|y_2|^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + |y_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}) dy_1 dy_2 \lesssim \|p\| \int_{-1}^1 (|y_2|^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} + |y_2|^{\frac{2\alpha-2}{2}}) dy_2 < \infty.$$

Another application of the Schwartz-ness of ψ_1 , now used for the second term on the right-hand side of (212), we obtain the desired (34). \square

Without much ado, we now apply Lemma 4 to obtain the first type of new reference products. Here is the application of the lemma:

Proof of Corollary 1. Both parts of this corollary are straightforward applications of Lemma 4.

i) For $i = 0, 1, 2$, we let $G_i = \partial_{a_0}^i \tilde{V}(\cdot, a_0)$ in Lemma 4; By Lemma 2, we know that each $C(G_i)$ is bounded by $[U_{int} - v(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha, 2}$. Applying (34) and Lemma 3, then yields (35).

ii) For $i = 0, 1, 2$, we let $F = \partial_{a_0}^i v(\cdot, a_0)$ in part *i*). The result of Lemma 3 then yields (36). \square

We now move on to the construction of the second type of new offline product, which we do as an application of Lemma 5. Here comes the:

Proof of Lemma 5.

i) To begin we symbolically apply Leibniz’ rule with the goal of moving the derivatives from F onto G :

$$\begin{aligned} G \partial_1^2 F &= \partial_1^2 (FG) - 2\partial_1 F \partial_1 G - F \partial_1^2 G \\ &= \partial_1^2 (FG) - 2\partial_1 (F \partial_1 G) + \partial_1^2 (FG) - F \partial_1^2 G \\ &= \partial_1^2 (FG) - 2\partial_1 (F \partial_1 G) + F \partial_1^2 G. \end{aligned}$$

This heuristic calculation motivates the definition

$$G \diamond \partial_1^2 F := \partial_1^2 (FG) - 2\partial_1 (F \partial_1 G) + F \partial_1^2 G. \quad (213)$$

Notice that, thanks to (37), $F \partial_1^2 G$ and $F \partial_1 G$ are well-defined as distributions and $FG \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

We must check that the commutator estimate (38) holds. So, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and use definition (213) to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |[G, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 F(x)| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (G(x) \partial_1^2 F(y) - G(y) \diamond \partial_1^2 F(y)) \psi_T(x-y) dy \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (G(x) - G(y)) F(y) \partial_1^2 \psi_T(x-y) dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F(y) \partial_1 G(y) \partial_1 \psi_T(x-y) dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F(y) \partial_1^2 G(y) \psi_T(x-y) dy \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (G(x) - G(y)) (F(y) - F(x)) \partial_1^2 \psi_T(x-y) dy \right. \\
&\quad - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (F(y) - F(x)) \partial_1 G(y) \partial_1 \psi_T(x-y) dy \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (F(y) - F(x)) \partial_1^2 G(y) \psi_T(x-y) dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (G(x) - G(y)) F(x) \partial_1^2 \psi_T(x-y) dy \\
&\quad - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F(x) \partial_1 G(y) \partial_1 \psi_T(x-y) dy \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F(x) \partial_1^2 G(y) \psi_T(x-y) dy \right|. \tag{214}
\end{aligned}$$

The terms on the right-hand side of (214) are then treated separately. The first term is easily handled using (19):

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (G(x) - G(y)) (F(y) - F(x)) \partial_1^2 \psi_T(x-y) dy \right| &\leq [G]_\alpha [F]_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\partial_1^2 \psi_T(x-y)| d^{2\alpha}(x, y) dy \\
&\lesssim [G]_\alpha [F]_\alpha (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we additionally use (37) to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (F(y) - F(x)) \partial_1 G(y) \partial_1 \psi_T(x-y) dy \right| &\lesssim C(G) [F]_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x_2|^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} d^\alpha(x, y) |\partial_1 \psi_T(x-y)| dy \\
&\lesssim C(G) [F]_\alpha (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The third term is treated as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (F(y) - F(x)) \partial_1^2 G(y) \psi_T(x-y) dy \right| &\lesssim C(G) [F]_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x_2|^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} d^\alpha(x, y) |\psi_T(x-y)| dy \\
&\lesssim C(G) [F]_\alpha (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

To finish our analysis of the right-hand side of (214), we notice that the last three terms cancel each other.

ii) First notice that by definition (213), we have that $G_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 F - G_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 F = (G_0 - G_1) \diamond \partial_1^2 F$, which by the linearity of the convolution implies:

$$[G_0, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 F - [G_1, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 F = [G_0 - G_1, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 F.$$

By (39) on top of the assumptions that we carry over from part *i)*, we may then apply the result of *i)* for $G = G_0 - G_1$ to obtain the desired bound (40).

iii) Again, notice that by (213) we have that $G \diamond \partial_1^2 F_0 - G \diamond \partial_1^2 F_1 = G \diamond \partial_1^2 (F_0 - F_1)$, which, when combined with the linearity of the convolution, gives:

$$[G, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 F_0 - [G, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 F_1 = [G, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 (F_0 - F_1).$$

Applying part *i)* with $F = F_0 - F_1$ gives the desired (41). \square

We now apply Lemma 5 in combination with Lemmas 2 and 3 to obtain the second family of new reference products. Here is the:

Proof of Corollary 2.

i) In part *i)* of Lemma 5 we set $G_l = \partial_{a_0}^l \tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0)$ and $F = \partial_{a'_0}^k v_j(\cdot, a'_0)$ for $l, k = 0, 1, 2$. Notice that, for $l = 0, 1, 2$, we may apply Lemma 2 to obtain that (37) is satisfied and each of the corresponding $C(G_l)$ is bounded by $[U_{int,i} - v_i(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha,2}$. Combining (38) and Lemma 3, we obtain the desired (45). Of course, here we have also used the relation

$$\partial_{a'_0}^k \partial_{a_0}^l (\tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0)) = \partial_{a_0}^l \tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a'_0}^k v_j(\cdot, a'_0),$$

which follows from the definition (213).

ii) This an immediate consequences of the triangle inequality, part *i)*, and the assumption (42).

iii) Let $k, l = 0, 1$ and $i, j = 0, 1$. We start by showing (47). Notice that by the definitions (46) and (213), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{a_0}^l \partial_{a'_0}^k ([(\tilde{V}_0 + v_0)(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) - [(\tilde{V}_1 + v_1)(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0)) \\ &= [\partial_{a_0}^l (\tilde{V}_0 - \tilde{V}_1)(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a'_0}^k v_j(\cdot, a'_0) \\ & \quad + \partial_{a_0}^l \partial_{a'_0}^k ([v_0(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) - [v_1(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0)). \end{aligned}$$

The relation (47) then follows from the triangle inequality, the assumption (43), and part *ii)* of Lemma 5. In particular, we let $G_i = \tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0)$, for which Lemma 2 gives that $C(\tilde{V}_0(\cdot, a_0), \tilde{V}_1(\cdot, a_0)) \lesssim [U_{int,0} - U_{int,1} + v_0(\cdot, a_0) - v_1(\cdot, a_0)]_{\alpha,1}$, and $F(\cdot, a_0) = v_j(\cdot, a_0)$, to which we apply Lemma 3.

Obtaining (48) is done in essentially the same way. Again, by (46) and (213) we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{a_0}^l \partial_{a'_0}^k ([(\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a'_0) - [(\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a'_0)) \\ &= [\partial_{a_0}^l \tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 \partial_{a'_0}^k (v_1 - v_0)(\cdot, a'_0) \\ & \quad + \partial_{a_0}^l \partial_{a'_0}^k ([v_i(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a'_0) - [v_i(\cdot, a_0), (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a'_0)). \end{aligned}$$

The relation (48) is then obtained via the triangle inequality, the assumption (44), and part *iii)* of Lemma 5. In particular, we apply part *ii)* of Lemma 5 with $G = \tilde{V}_i(\cdot, a_0)$ and $F_j(\cdot, a_0) = v_j(\cdot, a_0)$. Again, to verify the assumptions of Lemma 5, we must use Lemmas 2 and 3.

iv) Let $i, j = 0, 1$. Then, this follows from the triangle inequality, Lemma 2, and part *i)* of Corollary 1 with $F = \partial_{a_0}^l (\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_0)$ for $l = 0, 1, 2$. \square

6.3 Proof of the Reconstruction Lemmas

As indicated in the introduction, we only give abbreviated proofs for Lemmas 6 and 7. In particular, many of the arguments used by Otto and Weber for the corresponding results in [17] see no change on their passage to our setting –we will only address issues that see variations. For more details, we ask that the reader consult the proofs of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5 in [17]. We start with the:

Proof of Lemma 6.

Step 1: (*Bound for ν*) One begins by obtaining the bound:

$$\|\nu\|_{2\alpha-1} \lesssim M + N. \quad (215)$$

Using the same strategy as for (5.108) in [17], yields the necessary bound on the seminorm of ν ; here, one uses the assumptions (53), (54), and (58).

The modelling assumption also yields the L^∞ -bound for ν . In particular, using the triangle inequality we obtain:

$$|\nu(x)(y - x)_1| \leq M d^{2\alpha}(x, y) + |U(y) - U(x) - (w(y, x) - w(x, x))|,$$

which, after exploiting the periodicity of U and $w(\cdot, x)$ in the x_1 -direction, gives that $\|\nu\| \leq M$.

Step 2: (Dyadic decomposition) For $T \geq \tau > 0$ such that $T = 2^n \tau$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & (Uh_T - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_T] \diamond h - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_T] h) - (Uh_\tau - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond h - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_\tau] h)_{T-\tau} \\ &= \sum_{t=\tau 2^i \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq n} \left(([U, (\cdot)_t] - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_t] - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_t]) h_t \right. \\ & \quad \left. - [\nu, (\cdot)_t][x_1, (\cdot)_t] h - [E_{diag}, (\cdot)_t][w, (\cdot)_t] \diamond h \right)_{T-2t}. \end{aligned} \quad (216)$$

This dyadic decomposition follows from the semigroup property (20).

Step 3: (Use of the modelling) Using the dyadic decomposition from the previous step, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Uh_T - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_T] \diamond h - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_T] h - (Uh_\tau - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond h - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_\tau] h)_{T-\tau}\| \\ & \lesssim (M + N)N_0(T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2} \end{aligned} \quad (217)$$

for $\tau < T \leq 1$ such that T is a dyadic multiple of τ . In particular, (217) is obtained from (216) after using (22) and the three estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|([U, (\cdot)_t] - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_t] - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_t])h_t\| \lesssim MN_0(t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}, \\ & \|[\nu, (\cdot)_t][x_1, (\cdot)_t]h\| \lesssim (M + N)N_0(t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}, \\ & \text{and } \|[E_{diag}, (\cdot)_t][w, (\cdot)_t] \diamond h\| \lesssim NN_0(t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that in this step, in order to make the geometric series on the right-hand side of (216) converge, it is necessary that $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$. The three estimates are proven using the assumptions (53) - (57). We remark that the proof of the first estimate requires the use of Lemma A.2 of [17], which says that

$$\|[x_1, (\cdot)]h\|_{\alpha-2} \lesssim \|h\|_{\alpha-2}$$

and the bounds on ν from Step 1.

Step 4: (Conclusion) To conclude, we now introduce the notation $\mathcal{F}^\tau = Uh_\tau - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond h - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_\tau] h$. Now, (217) becomes

$$\sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-3\alpha} \|\mathcal{F}^T - (\mathcal{F}^\tau)_{T-\tau}\| \lesssim (M + N)N_0, \quad (218)$$

where the supremum is still taken over T that are dyadic multiples of τ . By the assumptions (55) and (56), the bound (215), and Lemma A.2 of [17] we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-\alpha} \|\mathcal{F}^T\| &= \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-\alpha} \|Uh_T - E_{diag}[w, (\cdot)_T] \diamond h - \nu[x_1, (\cdot)_T] h\| \\ &\lesssim (\|U\| + \|\nu\|)\|h_T\|_{\alpha-2} + NN_0 \\ &\lesssim (\|U\| + M + N)N_0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (22) and (218), the triangle inequality yields that

$$\|\mathcal{F}^\tau\|_{\alpha-2} \lesssim (\|U\| + M + N)N_0.$$

By Lemma 1, we may (up to a subsequence) pass to the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ using the statement of Arzelà-Ascoli. In particular, we define $u \diamond h$ such that $\mathcal{F}^\tau \rightarrow u \diamond h$. The bound (59) follows from taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ in (217) and using the lower semicontinuity of the L^∞ -norm with respect to weak-* convergence. \square

As we have seen, in order to apply Lemma 6 in the proof of Theorem 2, we use Corollary 3. The proof of Corollary 3 is essentially the same as that for Corollary 3.4 in [17], but relies on modelling information in terms of $\tilde{V} + v$ as opposed to v_{OW} , where the subscript is included because of the massive term in (10). The different modelling information, however, does not change the character of the calculations as the equation solved by $V(\cdot, a_0)$ is linear and we have access to Lemma 2 and Corollary 2. While the proof is straightforward, various choices for the distribution h and the family $\{w(\cdot, x)\}_x$ in Lemma 6 are made, it is computationally intensive. To avoid excessive repetition we, therefore, only give an abbreviated proof below. Here is the:

Proof of Corollary 6. This is a corollary of Lemma 6 and comes down to choosing appropriate families $\{w(\cdot, x)\}$, indexed by $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and distributions h to which to apply the lemma. Here, we will use the full barrage of Lemmas 1, 2, and 3 and Corollary 2 without further notice.

i) First, for $a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} w(\cdot, x) &= \sigma_i(x)(\tilde{V}_i + v_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)), \\ h &= \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0), \\ \text{and } w(\cdot, x) \diamond h &= \sigma_i(x)(v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0). \end{aligned}$$

Using similar calculations to those in [17], one finds that the assumptions (53)-(57) hold for $N = [U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}$ and $N_0 = [f_j]_{\alpha-2}$. We may then apply Lemma 6, which yields a distribution $U \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying (60), but without the parameter derivatives included in the norm.

In order to obtain the full bound (60), we must also control the indicated parameter derivatives. (In this case, we must consider two parameter derivatives.) To do this, for any $a_0^-, a_0^+ \in [\lambda, 1]$, we first set

$$\begin{aligned} w(\cdot, x) &= \sigma_i(x)(v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)), \\ h &= \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^+) - \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^-), \\ \text{and } w(\cdot, x) \diamond h &= \sigma_i(x) \left((v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^+) - (v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^-) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again, the assumptions of Lemma 6 are checked— of course, the family of $w(\cdot, x)$ has not changed from the previous scenario. We find that (53)-(57) hold for $N_0 = [f_j]_{\alpha-2}|a_0^+ - a_0^-|$ and $N = [U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}$. Lemma 6 then yields a distribution $U \diamond (\partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^+) - \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^-)) \in C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying

$$\| [U, (\cdot)_T] \diamond (\partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^+) - \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^-)) \| \lesssim |a_0^+ - a_0^-| (N_0 + N_0^{int}) N_0^{int}. \quad (219)$$

To finish showing that (60) holds for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{2\alpha-2,1}$, we notice that, due to the built-in linearity of the definition for $w(\cdot, x) \diamond h(\cdot)$ and the uniqueness in Lemma 6, the identity

$$U \diamond (\partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^+) - \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^-)) = U \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^+) - U \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^-)$$

holds. Plugging this into (219), we may deduce (60) for one parameter derivative.

To obtain (60) for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{2\alpha-2,2}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} w(\cdot, x) &= \sigma_i(x)(v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)), \\ h &= (\partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{++}) - \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{+-})) - (\partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{-+}) - \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{--})), \\ \text{and } w(\cdot, x) \diamond h &= \sigma_i(x) \left((v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{++}) - (v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{+-}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - ((v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{-+}) - (v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a_0^{--})) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $a_0^{++}, a_0^{+-}, a_0^{-+}, a_0^{--} \in [\lambda, 1]$ such that $|a_0^{++} - a_0^{+-}| = |a_0^{-+} - a_0^{--}|$. To finish, we again check the assumptions of Lemma 6; we conclude that (53)-(57) are satisfied for $N_0 = [f_j]_{\alpha-2}|a_0^{++} - a_0^{+-}| |a_0^{-+} - a_0^{--}|$ and $N = [U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}$. One then completes the argument as for one parameter derivative above.

To obtain (61), one first sets

$$\begin{aligned} w(\cdot, x) &= \sigma_i(x)(v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)), \\ h &= (\partial_1^2 v_1 - \partial_1^2 v_0)(\cdot, a'_0), \\ \text{and } w(\cdot, x) \diamond h &= \sigma_i(x)((v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a'_0) - (v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a'_0)), \end{aligned}$$

for $a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$. We notice that (53)-(57) hold for $N_0 = [f_1 - f_0]_\alpha$ and $N = [U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}$, which yields the relation (61), but without the control of the indicated parameter derivatives. Notice that we have used the uniqueness claim of Lemma 6 in order to make the identification

$$U \diamond (\partial_1^2 v_1 - \partial_1^2 v_0)(\cdot, a'_0) = U \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a'_0) - U \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a'_0).$$

Following the recipe that we have already introduced above, in order to upgrade our previous result to the full (61), we, for $a_0^+, a_0^- \in [\lambda, 1]$, set

$$w(\cdot, x) = \sigma_i(x)(v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
h &= (\partial_1^2 v_1 - \partial_1^2 v_0)(\cdot, a_0^+) - (\partial_1^2 v_1 - \partial_1^2 v_0)(\cdot, a_0^-), \\
\text{and } w(\cdot, x) \diamond h &= \sigma_i(x) \left((v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a_0^+) - (v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a_0^+) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - ((v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_1(\cdot, a_0^-) - (v_i + \tilde{V}_i)(\cdot, a_i(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_0(\cdot, a_0^-)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that (53)-(57) hold for $N_0 = [f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2} |a_0^+ - a_0^-|$ and $N = [U_{int,i}]_\alpha + [f_i]_{\alpha-2}$, one finishes the argument as already indicated above.

ii) For $a'_0 \in [\lambda, 1]$, we now set

$$\begin{aligned}
w(\cdot, x) &= \sigma_1(x)(v_1 + \tilde{V}_1)(\cdot, a_1(x)) - \sigma_0(x)(v_0 + \tilde{V}_0)(\cdot, a_0(x)), \\
h &= \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0), \\
\text{and } w(\cdot, x) \diamond h &= \sigma_1(x)(v_1 + \tilde{V}_1)(\cdot, a_0(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) - \sigma_0(x)(v_0 + \tilde{V}_0)(\cdot, a_0(x)) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Again, one checks (53)-(57), which are seen to hold for $N_0 = [f_j]_{\alpha-2}$ and $N = (\|a_1 - a_0\|_\alpha + \|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0\|_\alpha)(\max_{i=0,1} [f_i]_{\alpha-2} + \max_{i=0,1} [U_{int,i}]_\alpha) + [f_1 - f_0]_{\alpha-2} + [U_{int,1} - U_{int,0}]_\alpha$ -applying Lemma 6 and additionally using the uniqueness to make the identification

$$(U_1 - U_0) \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) = U_1 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0) - U_0 \diamond \partial_1^2 v_j(\cdot, a'_0),$$

yields (62) without a parameter derivative. To obtain the statement for the parameter derivative, one takes $h = \partial_1^2 v_i(\cdot, a_0^+) - \partial_1^2 v_i(\cdot, a_0^-)$ and proceeds as in the previous part. \square

To finish this section we give the argument for the second reconstruction lemma, which we only summarize and for more details point the reader to the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [17].

Proof of Lemma 7.

Step 1: (Dyadic decomposition) Just as in Step 2 of the proof of Lemma 6, we have the dyadic decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
(F\partial_1^2 U_T - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i) - (F\partial_1^2 U_\tau - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i)_{T-\tau} = \\
\sum_{t=\tau 2^i \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq n} \left([F, (\cdot)_t] \partial_1^2 U_t - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_t] \partial_1^2 w_{it} \right. \\
\left. - \sigma_i [E, (\cdot)_t] [F, (\cdot)_t] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i - [\sigma_i, (\cdot)_t] E[F, (\cdot)_t] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i \right)_{T-2t},
\end{aligned}$$

for $T, \tau > 0$ such that $T = 2^n \tau$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Again, the proof of this identity only relies on the semigroup property (20).

Step 2: (Use of the modelling) We upgrade Step 1 to the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|F\partial_1^2 U_T - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_T] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i - (F\partial_1^2 U_\tau - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i)_{T-\tau}\| \\
&\lesssim ([F]_\alpha M + \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha (1 + [a]_\alpha) N N_i) (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2},
\end{aligned} \tag{220}$$

which holds for $T = 2^n \tau$ for $\tau > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The argument for (220) relies on the following three relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|[F, (\cdot)_t] \partial_1^2 U_t - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_t] \partial_1^2 w_{it}\| \lesssim [F]_\alpha M (t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}, \\
&\|\sigma_i [E, (\cdot)_t] [F, (\cdot)_t] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i\| \lesssim \|\sigma_i\| [a]_\alpha N N_i (t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2}, \\
&\text{and } \|[\sigma_i, (\cdot)_t] E[F, (\cdot)_t] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i\| \lesssim [\sigma_i]_\alpha N N_i (t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{3\alpha-2},
\end{aligned}$$

which hold for any $t > 0$, and that $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$.

Step 3: (Conclusion) To conclude we use the notation $\mathcal{F}^\tau = F\partial_1^2 U_\tau - \sigma_i E[F, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i$. Notice that

$$\|\mathcal{F}^T\| \leq \|F\| \|\partial_1^2 U_T\| + \|\sigma_i\| \| [F, (\cdot)_\tau] \diamond \partial_1^2 w_i \| \lesssim (\|F\| [U]_\alpha^{loc} + \|\sigma_i\| N N_i) (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2},$$

where we have bounded $\|\partial_1^2 U_T\|$ as in (99) of Lemma 8 and have used the assumption (63). Combining this with (220) and Step 1 of Lemma 8 we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{F}^\tau\|_{\alpha-2} \lesssim \|F\|_\alpha (M + \|\sigma_i\| N_i) + N N_i (1 + [a]_\alpha) \|\sigma_i\|_\alpha.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 7, we can then use compactness in $C^{\alpha-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ along with Lemma 1 in order to define $F \diamond \partial_1^2 U$ as the weak limit (along a subsequence) of the $\{\mathcal{F}^\tau\}_\tau$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. \square

7 Proof of Lemma 1

In this section we give an argument for Lemma 1 that is motivated by the proof of a similar result (Lemma 5) in [12].

Proof of Lemma 1. Observe that it suffices to show

$$[f]_{\alpha-2} \lesssim \|f\|_{\alpha-2}. \quad (221)$$

Indeed, for the converse inequality, we decompose $f = \partial_1^2 f^1 + \partial_2 f^2 + f^3$ in a way that is near optimal in the sense of Definition 3. For such a triple (f^1, f^2, f^3) the use of (21) then yields for $T \leq 1$

$$\|f_T\| = \|(\partial_1^2 f^1 + \partial_2 f^2 + f^3)_T\| \lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} ([f^1]_\alpha + [f^2]_\alpha + \|f^3\|) \lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} [f]_{\alpha-2},$$

as desired. Hence, we may concentrate on (221).

As a technical tool, we make use of the convolution kernel $e^{-T}\psi_T$ that is associated to the semigroup of the operator $\mathcal{A} := \partial_1^4 - \partial_2^2 + 1$. We use the notational convention that $f * e^{-T}\psi_T = f_T^m$ and, as always, $f * \psi_T = f_T$.

Step 1: (*Bound for the C^α -seminorm*) We first show that, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, it holds that

$$[f]_\alpha \lesssim \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-\alpha} \|T \mathcal{A} f_T\|. \quad (222)$$

For this, we first notice that due to homogeneity, we may assume that

$$\sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-\alpha} \|T \mathcal{A} f_T\| = 1.$$

Notice that, due to the semigroup property and (22), the above normalization ensures that

$$\|T \mathcal{A} f_T^m\| = T e^{-T} \|(\mathcal{A} f_1)_{T-1}\| \lesssim T e^{-T} \|\mathcal{A} f_1\| \lesssim 1,$$

for $T > 1$. Combining the two estimates, we find that

$$\sup_{T > 0} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-\alpha} \|T \mathcal{A} f_T^m\| \lesssim 1.$$

Together with the semigroup property of $e^{-T}\psi_T$ and the moment bound (19), this yields, for $j, l \geq 0$ and $T > 0$, that

$$\|\partial_1^j \partial_2^l \mathcal{A} f_T^m\| = e^{-\frac{T}{2}} \|\partial_1^j \partial_2^l \mathcal{A} (f_{\frac{T}{2}}^m)_{\frac{T}{2}}\| \lesssim e^{-\frac{T}{2}} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l} \|\mathcal{A} f_{\frac{T}{2}}^m\| \lesssim e^{-\frac{T}{2}} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+\alpha-4}. \quad (223)$$

By definition $e^{-T}\psi_T$ is a smooth solution of $(\partial_T + \mathcal{A})e^{-T}\psi_T = 0$ and the moment bounds for ψ_T , furthermore, imply that f_T^m is a smooth solution of $(\partial_T + \mathcal{A})f_T^m = 0$. Fixing $j, l \geq 0$ and using (223) allows us to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_1^j \partial_2^l (f_t^m - f_T^m)\| &= \left\| \int_t^T \partial_1^j \partial_2^l \mathcal{A} f_s^m \, ds \right\| \lesssim \int_t^T e^{-\frac{s}{2}} (s^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+\alpha-4} \, ds \\ &\lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+\alpha} + (t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

for all $0 < t < T$. In the case that $j = l = 0$ this yields that

$$\|f_t^m - f_T^m\| \lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^\alpha, \quad (224)$$

which implies that (224) holds also for $t = 0$.

Fixing a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $0 < t < T$ and $j, l \geq 0$ such that $j + l \geq 1$, we then use the triangle inequality to write

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_t^m(x)| &\leq |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l (f_t^m - f_T^m)(x)| + |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_T^m(x)| \\ &\lesssim ((t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+\alpha} + (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+\alpha}) + e^{-T} |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_T(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

which after letting $T \rightarrow \infty$ gives

$$\|\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_t^m\| \lesssim (t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l+\alpha}. \quad (225)$$

To finish the argument for (222), we fix $T > 0$ and two distinct points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We then write

$$|f_T^m(y) - f_T^m(x)| \leq \|\partial_1 f_T^m\| d(y, x) + \|\partial_2 f_T^m\| d^2(y, x),$$

which we combine with (224) for $t = 0$ and (225) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |f(y) - f(x)| &\lesssim \|f - f_T^m\| + \|\partial_1 f_T^m\| d(y, x) + \|\partial_2 f_T^m\| d^2(y, x) \\ &\lesssim (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^\alpha + (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-1} d(y, x) + (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} d^2(y, x). \end{aligned}$$

This we may further process by setting $T^{\frac{1}{4}} = d(y, x)$, which yields $|f(y) - f(x)| \lesssim d^\alpha(y, x)$.

Step 2: (*A specific decomposition of f*) Assume that $\|f\|_{\alpha-2} = 1$. Using this and the properties (20) and (22), we obtain the relation

$$\|f_T^m\| = e^{-T} \|(f_1)_{T-1}\| \lesssim e^{-T} \|f_1\| \lesssim e^{-T} \quad (226)$$

for $T > 1$. In this step we find that these observations are enough to show that

$$u = \int_0^\infty f_T^m dT \quad (227)$$

is a distributional solution of

$$\mathcal{A}(u) = f \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

We first show that, for any $t \in (0, 1)$, the function

$$u^t := \int_0^\infty f_{t+T}^m dT$$

satisfies $\mathcal{A}u^t = f_t^m$. To see this, we recall from Step 1 that f_{t+T}^m solves $(\partial_T + \mathcal{A})f_{t+T}^m = 0$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , which allows us to write

$$\int_0^\infty \partial_T f_{t+T}^m dT = - \int_0^\infty \mathcal{A} f_{t+T}^m dT. \quad (228)$$

Using that $t > 0$, we process the left-hand side of (228) as

$$\int_0^\infty \partial_T f_{t+T}^m dT = -f_t^m,$$

where we have used that $\|f_T^m\| \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ by (226). For the term on the right-hand side of (228), we use that $\|f\|_{\alpha-2} = 1$ and (226) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |\partial_1^j \partial_2^l f_{t+T}^m| dT &\lesssim (t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l} \int_0^\infty \|f_T^m\| dT \\ &\lesssim (t^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-j-2l} \int_0^1 (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\alpha-2} dT + \int_1^\infty e^{-T} dT < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (229)$$

which means that

$$\int_0^\infty \mathcal{A} f_{t+T}^m dT = \mathcal{A} \left(\int_0^\infty f_{t+T}^m dT \right). \quad (230)$$

In particular, combining (228) and (230) we end up with

$$\mathcal{A}\left(\int_0^\infty f_{t+T}^m dT\right) = f_t^m.$$

To show that $u^t \rightarrow u$ uniformly as $t \rightarrow 0$, we can directly estimate the difference as

$$\|u^t - u\| = \left\| \int_0^t f_T^m dT \right\| \lesssim t^{\frac{\alpha+2}{4}},$$

where we have again used that $\|f\|_{\alpha-2} = 1$.

Step 3: (*Argument for (221)*) By homogeneity, we may assume that $\|f\|_{\alpha-2} = 1$. Using the decomposition

$$f = \mathcal{A}(u) = \partial_1^2(\partial_1^2 u) + \partial_2(-\partial_2 u) + u$$

with u given as (227), we can apply Definition 3 to find that

$$[f]_{\alpha-2} \leq [\partial_1^2 u]_\alpha + [\partial_2 u]_\alpha + [u]_\alpha + \|u\|. \quad (231)$$

Noticing that since $\|f\|_{\alpha-2} = 1$ we have that

$$\sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-\alpha} \|(\mathcal{A}u)_T\| = \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{2-\alpha} \|f_T\| \leq 1,$$

which we process with (19) to, for $j, l \geq 0$, obtain

$$\sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{j+2l+(2-\alpha)-4} \|T(\mathcal{A}\partial_1^j \partial_2^l u)_T^m\| \lesssim 1. \quad (232)$$

We estimate the first three terms on the right-hand side of (231) by first applying (222) from Step 1 and then using (232). We find that

$$[\partial_1^2 u]_\alpha + [\partial_2 u]_\alpha + [u]_\alpha \lesssim \sup_{T \leq 1} (T^{\frac{1}{4}})^{-\alpha} (\|T(\mathcal{A}\partial_1^2 u)_T\| + \|T(\mathcal{A}\partial_2 u)_T\| + \|T(\mathcal{A}u)_T\|) \lesssim 1.$$

The bound $\|u\| \lesssim 1$ follows from (229) with $j, l = 0$.

□

8 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to warmly thank Felix Otto for many helpful discussions and input. Also, we would like to thank Scott Smith for many useful comments along the way.

References

- [1] I. Bailleul, A. Debussche, and M. Hofmanová. Quasilinear Generalized Parabolic Anderson Model Equation. *Stoch. PDE: Anal. Comp.*, 7(1):40–63, 2019.
- [2] P. Friz and M. Hairer. *A Course on Rough Paths: With an Introduction to Regularity Structures*. Springer, 2014.
- [3] M. Furlan and M. Gubinelli. Paracontrolled Quasilinear SPDEs. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(2):1096–1135, 2019.
- [4] M. Gerencsér. Nondivergence Form Quasilinear Heat Equations Driven by Space-time White Noise. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1902.07635, 2019.
- [5] M. Gerencsér and M. Hairer. Singular SPDEs in Domains with Boundaries. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173(3-4):697–758, 2019.

- [6] M. Gerencsér and M. Hairer. A Solution Theory for Quasilinear Singular SPDEs. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(9):1983–2005, 2019.
- [7] M. Gubinelli. Controlling Rough Paths. *J. Func. Anal.*, 216(1):86–140, 2004.
- [8] M. Gubinelli, P. Imkeller, and N. Perkowski. Paracontrolled Distributions and Singular PDEs. *Forum Math. Pi.*, 3:e6, 75, 2015.
- [9] M. Hairer. Rough Stochastic PDEs. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 64(11):1547–1585, 2011.
- [10] M. Hairer. Solving the KPZ Equation. *Ann. of Math.*, 178(2):559–664, 2013.
- [11] M. Hairer. A Theory of Regularity Structures. *Invent. Math.*, 198(2):269–504, 2014.
- [12] R. Ignat and F. Otto. The Magnetization Ripple: a Nonlocal Stochastic PDE Perspective. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 130(167-199), 2019.
- [13] N. V. Krylov. *Lectures on Elliptic and Parabolic Equations in Hölder Spaces*, volume 12 of *Graduate studies in mathematics*. AMS, 1996.
- [14] T. Lyons. Differential Equations Driven by Rough Signals. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 12(2):215–310, 1998.
- [15] F. Otto, J. Sauer, S. Smith, and H. Weber. Quasilinear Parabolic Equations with Singular Forcing. *In preparation*.
- [16] F. Otto, J. Sauer, S. Smith, and H. Weber. Parabolic Equations with Rough Coefficients and Singular Forcing. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1803.07884, 2018.
- [17] F. Otto and H. Weber. Quasilinear SPDEs via Rough Paths. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 232(2):873–950, 2019.