arXiv:2006.00583v1 [math.PR] 31 May 2020

ON HYDRODYNAMIC LIMITS IN SINAI-TYPE RANDOM ENVIRONMENTS

CLAUDIO LANDIM, CARLOS G. PACHECO, SUNDER SETHURAMAN, AND JIANFEI XUE

Abstract. We investigate the hydrodynamical behavior of a system of random walks with zero-range interactions moving in a common 'Sinai-type' random environment on a one dimensional torus. The hydrodynamic equation found is a quasilinear SPDE with a 'rough' random drift term coming from a scaling of the random environment and a homogenization of the particle interaction. Part of the motivation for this work is to understand how the space-time limit of the particle mass relates to that of the known single particle Brox diffusion limit. In this respect, given the hydrodynamic limit shown, we describe formal connections through a two scale limit.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this article is to understand the 'quenched' hydrodynamical behavior of a system of random walks interacting via zero-range dynamics in a common Sinai-type random environment on $\mathbb{Z}$. Our motivation is two-fold: On the one hand, since the single particle scaling limit in a Sinai-type random environment is a Brox diffusion, it is natural to investigate the micro to macro-behaviors in an interacting system of many particles. On the other hand, although hydrodynamic limits have been studied with respect to a few interacting systems in a common random environment with traps, the limit here is different and of interest, namely a quasilinear SPDE driven in terms of a 'rough' noise emerging from the random environment.

'Sinai' random environments. A 'Sinai' random environment on $\mathbb{Z}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables $\{u_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, indexed over vertices, with the property that $c \le u_0 \le 1-c$ for some constant $0 < c < 1/2$ and $E[\log(u_0/(1-u_0))] = 0$. Define $\sigma^2 = E[(\log(u_0/(1-u_0)))^2]$. Let U_n be the position of a discrete-time random walk in this random environment (RWRE):

$$P\big(U_{n+1} = U_n + 1 | U_n, \{u_i\}\big) = 1 - P\big(U_{n+1} = U_n - 1 | U_n, \{u_i\}\big) = u_{U_n}$$

for $n \ge 1$ and $U_0 = 0$. When $\sigma^2 > 0$, Sinai [28] showed that $\sigma^2 U_n/(\log(n))^2$ converges weakly to a non-trivial random variable U_∞, whose law was identified in Kesten [19] and Golosov [11]. A functional limit theorem to a non-trivial process is problematic however as $\sigma^2 U_{\lfloor nt\rfloor}/(\log(n))^2 \Rightarrow U_\infty$, the limit process here being constant in time t.

However, a continuous analog X_t of the Sinai RWRE on $\mathbb{R}$ was introduced in Brox [3]: Formally,

$$dX_t = dB_t - \frac{1}{2}W'(X_t)dt$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60K35; 60K37; 60L50.

Key words and phrases. Sinai random environment, Brox diffusion, SPDE, interacting particle system, zero-range, hydrodynamic, quasilinear.

and $X_0 = 0$ or that the generator $\mathscr{L}_{Brox}$ takes form

$$\mathscr{L}_{Brox} = \frac{1}{2} e^{W(x)} \frac{d}{dx} (e^{-W(x)} \frac{d}{dx}).$$

Here, B is a standard Brownian motion and W is a two-sided Brownian motion on $\mathbb{R}$: $W(0) = 0$, $W(x) = \sigma W_+(x)$ for $x > 0$, and $W(x) = \sigma W_-(-x)$ for $x < 0$, where $W_\pm$ are independent standard Brownian motions. This description is only short hand, as W is not differentiable a.s. More carefully, the Brox diffusion is defined in terms of speed and scale measures:

$$X_t = A^{-1}(B_{T^{-1}(t)}) \text{ where } A(y) = \int_0^y e^{W(z)} dz \text{ and } T(t) = \int_0^t e^{-2W(A^{-1}(B_s))} ds$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$. Brox [3] showed that $X_t/(\log t)^2 \Rightarrow U_\infty$, the same limit as for the discrete Sinai RWRE convergence.

To connect the two models, Sinai-type random environments $\{u_i^N\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, in terms of a scaling parameter N, were introduced in Seignourel [27]. An example that we consider is that $\{u_i^N\}$ are i.i.d. over i and N, and $u_i^N = 1/2 + r_i/\sqrt{N}$ where $\{r_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of random variables which are mean-zero and with finite variance. Let U_n^N be the corresponding RWRE with respect to the scaled enviornment $\{u_i^N\}$. Seignourel [27] showed that $\{N^{-1}U^N_{\lfloor N^2 t\rfloor} : t \geq 0\}$ converges weakly to the Brox diffusion $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$. See also Andriopolous [2] and Pacheco [25] for extensions and variations of this convergence.

Of course, both Sinai's random walk and Brox diffusion are well studied objects with current developments. As a partial list, we refer to books/surveys [29], [30], and recent works [2], [13], [23] and references therein for more discussion.

Hydrodynamics in random environments. With respect to systems of many continuous-time random walks in a common random environment of different types, a 'quenched' hydrodynamic limit (HDL) for the bulk space time mass density of the walks has been shown in some cases. When 'averaging' is possible with respect to the random environment, deterministic HDL's have been shown in some models. For exclusion process with random conductances, see Faggionato [6], [7], Jara and Landim [14], and Nagy [24]. For independent random walks in a ballistic random environment, see Peterson [26]. For symmetric zero-range process, see Gonçalves and Jara [12].

When the random environment does not allow 'averaging', a 'quenched' HDL may involve random terms. In Jara, Landim, Teixera [17], HDL is shown for a system of symmetric independent random walks in a common scaled 'trap' environment on a torus, that one of the particles at a site i jumps at rate ξ_i^N to a nearest neighbor, where ξ_i^N is random and heavy-tailed; here the limit equation involves a heavy-tailed subordinator arising from the random environment. In Faggionato, Jara, Landim [8], HDL is shown for symmetric simple exclusion processes on a torus, with heavy-tailed random conductances on the bonds, which also involves a heavy-tailed subordinator coming from the random environment. In Jara and Peterson [18], HDL is shown for independent random walks in a random environment on $\mathbb{Z}$, where a single particle is transient but not ballistic, which incorporates a random term arising from the environment.

For a more general discussion on hydrodynamics of stochastic interacting particle systems, we refer as a partial list to books [4], [20] and references therein.

Summary of results. In these contexts, we consider a zero-range interacting particle system of random walks moving in a Sinai-type random environment $\{u_i^N = 1/2 + r_i/\sqrt{N}\}$ on a torus $\mathbb{Z}\setminus N\mathbb{Z}$. Informally, in the zero-range process, a particle at site i, with k particles,

will jump with rate $g(k)/k$ and move to a neighbor $j = i \pm 1$ with probability $p(i,j)$. We point out the case $g(k) \equiv k$ is when the random walks are all independent. When a random environment is imposed, $p(i,j) = u_i^N$ when $j = i+1$ and $= 1 - u_i^N$ when $j = i-1$. Since a Sinai random walker experiences many traps and moves slowly, one expects that the hydrodynamic limit to involve 'drift' terms reflecting the environment.

In principle, since infinitesimally the number of particles $\eta_i(t)$ at site i at time t varies according the generator action,

$$\begin{aligned} L\eta_i(t) = \frac{1}{2}\big\{g(\eta_{i+1}(t)) + g(\eta_{i-1}(t)) - 2g(\eta_i(t))\big\} \\ + \big\{g(\eta_{i-1}(t))(r_{i-1}/\sqrt{N}) - g(\eta_{i+1}(t))(r_{i+1}/\sqrt{N})\big\}dt, \end{aligned}$$

and $r_i/\sqrt{N} = [S(i) - S(i-1)]/\sqrt{N}$ where $S(\cdot)$ is the partial sum of $\{r_i\}$, one might expect the equation, scaling space and time diffusively, as

$$\partial_t \rho = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Phi(\rho) - 2\nabla\big(W'\Phi(\rho)\big). \tag{1.1}$$

Here, Φ is a homogenized version of the jump rate g. Of course, since W is not differentiable, the spatial white noise W' has to be interpreted as a distribution, and the equation is ill-posed. But, in a sense, an equation like this should represent the hydrodynamic equation, the term W' reflecting the random environment, even after some averaging in the scaling limit has been taken.

In this article, as a way to obtain formally equation (1.1), we introduce a two-scale approach: We will consider more regular random environments, those which average $\{u_i^N\}$ in small macroscopic blocks. Namely, we consider $\{\bar{u}_i^N = 1/2 + q_i^N/\sqrt{N}\}$ where $q_i^N = (2\varepsilon N+1)^{-1}\sum_{|j-i|\le \varepsilon N} r_j$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed. Then, under a fixed random environment given by $\{\bar{u}_i^N\}$, that is in a 'quenched' environment, we obtain in Theorem 3.3 the hydrodynamic equation

$$\partial_t \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(t,x) = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Phi\big(\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(t,x)\big) - 2\nabla\big(\frac{W(x+\varepsilon) - W(x-\varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon}\Phi(\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(t,x))\big). \tag{1.2}$$

We remark, in the $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ limit of (1.2), formally, one sees that some form of (1.1) should emerge. Indeed, in Funaki et. al. [10], the behavior of the limit $\rho^{(\varepsilon)}$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ is considered carefully and shown to solve (1.1) in the 'paracontrolled' sense. See [10] for a general discussion about equations (1.1) and (1.2) in connection to literature.

The proof of Theorem 3.3 broadly employs the 'entropy' method of Guo-Papanicoloau-Varadhan (GPV) (cf. Kipnis and Landim [20]), by applying an Ito's formula to the empirical measure of particle mass with respect to the zero-range evolution. However, the random environment is not homogeneous and in particular is not translation-invariant or smooth, a key feature of the 'GPV' technique to homogenize resulting nonlinear terms of the process in a replacement scheme. The main technical work is to introduce 'local' averages to piece together the 'global' average in the hydrodynamic limit.

To derive the homogenization, we make use of some averaging in time, afforded by spectral gap or mixing estimates of localized processes, to perform 'local' 1 and 2-block replacements, leading to more 'global' replacements. These 'local' replacements are not so broadly known, although related notions were used in Jara, Landim, and Sethuraman [15], [16], and Fatkullin, Sethuraman, Xue [9] to analyze tagged particle motion and Young diagram evolutions. However, differently, in our context, estimates on the random environment play a significant role in making the 'local' replacements work. We remark that in this work we do not assume the process rate g is an increasing function, as it is in [16], [9], that is that

the process is 'attractive', a technical condition which would allow use of 'basic' particle couplings.

The limiting equation (1.2) is not a standard one as the factor $W'_\varepsilon := (W(x+\varepsilon) - W(x-\varepsilon))/(2\varepsilon)$ is not smooth but in class $C^{1/2-\epsilon}$ for all $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$. To finish the proof of the hydrodynamic limit in Theorem 3.3, we need to show uniqueness of weak solutions of (1.2). We can derive a certain continuum energy estimate by considering the microscopic particle system, namely that $\partial_x \Phi(\rho(t,x))$ can be defined in a weak sense. Uniqueness of weak solutions to (1.2) in an appropriate class is then shown by a self-contained argument, which might be of separate interest.

Finally, to connect back to Brox diffusion, one might follow a tagged particle in this system. Let $x^N(t)$ be the position at time t of a tagged particle initially at the origin. Then, from Ito's formula,

$$x^N(t) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \bar{u}^N_{x^N(s)} \frac{g(\eta_s(x^N(s)))}{\eta_s(x^N(s))} ds + M^N(t).$$

One can compute that the quadratic variation of $M^N(t) = \int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s(x^N(s)))}{\eta_s(x^N(s))} ds$. Formally, given the hydrodynamic limit (1.2) and following the scheme in [15], one might expect limit points v_t of $v^N_t = x^N_{N^2 t}/N$ to satisfy the equation

$$v_t = 2 \int_0^t W'_\varepsilon(v_s) \frac{\Phi(\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(s, v_s)))}{\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(s, v_s)} ds + M(t),$$

where M is a time-changed Brownian motion. When the zero-range process consists of independent motions, that is when $g(k) \equiv k$ and so $\Phi(u) \equiv u$, one recovers a form of Brox diffusion in terms of W'_ε instead of white noise W'. We leave to a later work a rigorous study of these considerations.

2. Model description

We first introduce the random environments considered, and then the zero-range process in this random environment. Let $\{r_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^2 < \infty$.

Let $s_0 = 0$ and for $n \geq 1$, $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n r_k$. For $0 \leq u \leq 1$, let

$$X^N_u = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{N}} s_{\lfloor Nu \rfloor} + \frac{Nu - \lfloor Nu \rfloor}{\sigma\sqrt{N}} r_{\lfloor Nu \rfloor + 1}\ , \tag{2.1}$$

where $\lfloor a \rfloor$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$, stands for the integer part of a. It is standard that $\{X^N_u : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$, as a random function on $[0,1]$, converges in distribution to the Brownian motion on $[0,1]$. By Skorokhod's Representation Theorem, we may find a probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{P})$ and $\{W^N_u : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, mappings from Ω to $C[0,1]$, such that, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\{X^N_u : 0 \leq u \leq 1\} = \{W^N_u : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$$

in distribution and moreover, $\{W^N_u : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$ converges almost surely to the standard Brownian motion $\{W_u, 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$.

Quenched formulation. We will now fix throughout the paper an $\omega \in \Omega$ such that $\{W^N_u(\omega) : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$ converges (uniformly) to a Brownian path $\{W_u(\omega) : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$.

Define the discrete torus $\mathbb{T}_N := \mathbb{Z} \setminus N\mathbb{Z}$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Throughout this article, we will identify $\mathbb{T}_N$ with $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and also identify the unit torus $\mathbb{T}$ with $(0,1]$. Fix any ε such that $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

It will be convenient to extend W_t^N as well as W_t to $t \in [-1,2]$: With $\tilde{W}_u$ representing either W_u^N or W_u, we have

$$\tilde{W}_u = \begin{cases} \tilde{W}_{u+1} - \tilde{W}_1 & u \in [-1,0), \\ \tilde{W}_{u-1} + \tilde{W}_1 & u \in (1,2]. \end{cases}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a parameter, fixed throughout the paper. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$, define an ε-average of local environments:

$$q_k^N := \frac{\sqrt{N}}{2\varepsilon N + 1}\big(W^N_{\frac{k+\lfloor \varepsilon N\rfloor}{N}} - W^N_{\frac{k-\lfloor \varepsilon N\rfloor}{N}}\big) \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{(2\varepsilon N+1)\sigma} \sum_{|j-k|\le \varepsilon N} r_j. \tag{2.2}$$

In particular, when $k/N \to x \in \mathbb{T}$ as $N \uparrow \infty$, we have

$$\sqrt{N}\, q_k^N \to \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\big(W_{x+\varepsilon} - W_{x-\varepsilon}\big). \tag{2.3}$$

The following estimate, afforded by the uniform convergence of $W_\cdot^N$ to $W_\cdot$, will be useful.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists constant $C = C(\omega) < \infty$ such that*

$$\max_{1\le k\le N} \Big\{\sqrt{N}\,|q_k^N|\Big\} \le C\,. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Notice that $\sqrt{N}|q_k^N| = \dfrac{N}{2\varepsilon N+1}\big|W^N_{(k+\varepsilon N)/N} - W^N_{(k-\varepsilon N-1)/N}\big|$. The lemma follows from the uniform convergence of $W_\cdot^N \to W_\cdot$ and the continuity of $W_\cdot$. □

We now introduce the zero-range process in the random environment $\{q_k^N : k \in \mathbb{T}_N\}$. Set $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0,1,2,\ldots\}$, and let $\Sigma_N = \mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{T}_N}$ be the configuration space. Elements of Σ_N are represented by the Greek letter ξ. Thus, $\xi(k)$, $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$, stands for the number of particles at site k for the configuration ξ.

Fix a function $g : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{R}_+$. Denote by $(\xi_t : t \ge 0)$ the continuous-time Markov chain whose evolution can be informally described as follows. Take N sufficiently large for $|\,q_k^N\,|/\sqrt{N} < 1/2$ for all $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$. At rate $g(\xi(k))\,\{\,(1/2) \pm (q_k^N/\sqrt{N})\,\}$ a particle jumps from k to $k \pm 1$.

More precisely, the process $\{\xi_t : t \ge 0\}$ is the Markov process with generator L given by

$$\begin{aligned} Lf(\xi) = \sum_{k=1}^N \Big\{ & g(\xi(k))\Big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{q_k^N}{\sqrt{N}}\Big)\big(f(\xi^{k,k+1}) - f(\xi)\big) \\ & + g(\xi(k))\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{q_k^N}{\sqrt{N}}\Big)\big(f(\xi^{k,k-1}) - f(\xi)\big)\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Here, $\xi^{j,k}$ is the configuration obtained from ξ by moving a particle from j to k, that is,

$$\xi^{j,k}(\ell) \;=\; \begin{cases} \xi(j) - 1 & \ell = j\,, \\ \xi(k) + 1 & \ell = k\,, \\ \xi(\ell) & \ell \neq j\,, k\,. \end{cases}$$

To avoid degeneracies, we suppose that $g(0) = 0$ and $g(k) > 0$ for $k \ge 1$. We assume, further, that g satisfies

(1) $\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} |g(k+1) - g(k)| \le g^* < \infty$;
(2) There exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c_1 > 0$ such that $g(k) - g(j) \ge c_1$ for all $k \ge j + k_0$.

These properties guarantee that the zero-range process has good mixing properties, useful in the proof of the 'Replacement Lemma', stated in Lemma 5.1. This specification also implies that $g_* k \le g(k) \le g^* k$ for some $g_* > 0$, more than enough to satisfy the technical condition 'FEM' (cf. [20][p.69]) used for particle truncation in the 1 and 2-blocks estimates presented in Lemmas 6.3 and 7.2.

2.1. **Invariant measure.** The building blocks for the invariant measures are $\{\mathcal{P}_\phi\}$, a family of Poisson-like distributions indexed by $\phi \ge 0$ (sometimes referred as fugacity). For each ϕ, $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_\phi(n) = \frac{1}{Z(\phi)} \frac{\phi^n}{g(n)!}, \quad \text{for } n \ge 0.$$

Here, $g(0)! := 1$ and $g(n)! := \prod_{j=1}^n g(j)$ for $n \ge 1$; $Z(\cdot)$ is the partition function:

$$Z(\phi) := \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{\phi^n}{g(n)!}.$$

Since $g(k) \ge g_*\, k$, $Z(\phi) < \infty$ for all $0 \le \phi < \infty$.

Let $R(\phi) = E_{\mathcal{P}_\phi}[X]$ be the mean of the distribution $\mathcal{P}_\phi$. A direct computation yields that $R'(\phi) > 0$, $R(0) = 0$, $\lim_{\phi\to\infty} R(\phi) = \infty$. Since R is strictly increasing, it has an inverse, denoted by $\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, and we may parametrize the family of distributions $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ by its mean. For $\rho \ge 0$, let $\mathcal{Q}_\rho = \mathcal{P}_{\Phi(\rho)}$, so that $E_{\mathcal{Q}_\rho}[X] = E_{\mathcal{P}_{\Phi(\rho)}}[X] = R(\Phi(\rho)) = \rho$.

A straightforward computation yields that $E_{\mathcal{P}_\phi}[g(X)] = \phi$, $\phi \ge 0$. Thus,

$$\Phi(\rho) = E_{\mathcal{P}_{\Phi(\rho)}}[g(X)] = E_{\mathcal{Q}_\rho}[g(X)] \ , \quad \rho \ge 0\,. \tag{2.6}$$

As $g_* k \le g(k) \le g^* k$, we have that $g_*\rho \le \Phi(\rho) \le g^*\rho$. On the other hand, a simple computation yields that $\Phi'(\rho) = \Phi(\rho)/\sigma^2(\rho)$ where $\sigma^2(\rho)$ is the variance of X under $\mathcal{Q}_\rho$. Moreover, under our assumptions on g, there exist constants $0 < C_1 < C_2 < \infty$ such that $0 < C_1 \le \Phi'(\rho) \le C_2 < \infty$ for all $\rho \ge 0$ (cf. [21][equation (5.2)]). In particular, Φ is a strictly increasing function of ρ.

Fix a vector $(\phi_{k,N} : k \in \mathbb{T}_N)$ of non-negative real numbers. Denote by $\mathscr{R}_N$ the product measure on $\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{T}_N}$ whose marginals are given by

$$\mathscr{R}_N(\xi(k) = n) = \mathcal{P}_{\phi_{k,N}}(n), \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{T}_N, n \ge 0.$$

It is standard (cf. [1]) to check that $\mathscr{R}_N$ is invariant with respect to the generator L in (2.5) as long as the fugacities $\{\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$ satisfy:

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{q_{k-1}^N}{\sqrt{N}}\Big)\phi_{k-1,N} + \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{q_{k+1}^N}{\sqrt{N}}\Big)\phi_{k+1,N} = \phi_{k,N}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, N. \tag{2.7}$$

Notice that $\{c\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, is a solution of (2.7) if $\{\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$ is a solution. In particular, any solution gives rise to a one-parameter family of solutions.

Lemma 2.2. *The equation* (2.7) *admits a solution, unique up to a multiplicative constant. Moreover, the solution is either strictly positive or strictly negative or identically equal to* 0.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{r}_k = (1/2) + (q_k^N/\sqrt{N})$, $\mathfrak{l}_k = (1/2) - (q_k^N/\sqrt{N})$, $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$. With this notation, equation (2.7) becomes

$$\mathfrak{r}_{k-1}\,\phi_{k-1,N} + \mathfrak{l}_{k+1}\,\phi_{k+1,N} = \phi_{k,N}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{r}_k + \mathfrak{l}_k = 1$, we have that

$$\mathfrak{r}_{k-1}\phi_{k-1,N} - \mathfrak{l}_k\phi_{k,N} = \mathfrak{r}_k\phi_{k,N} - \mathfrak{l}_{k+1}\phi_{k+1,N}, \quad k \in \mathbb{T}_N\,.$$

Denote by γ be the common value of $\mathfrak{r}_k\phi_{k,N} - \mathfrak{l}_{k+1}\phi_{k+1,N}$, to get the recursive equation

$$\phi_{k+1,N} = \frac{\mathfrak{r}_k\phi_{k,N} - \gamma}{\mathfrak{l}_{k+1}} \,. \tag{2.8}$$

With the convention that $\mathfrak{r}_{N+1} = \mathfrak{r}_1$ and $\mathfrak{l}_{N+1} = \mathfrak{l}_1$, let

$$\mathfrak{R}_{j,k} \,=\, \prod_{i=j}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i \,, \qquad \mathfrak{L}_{j,k} \,=\, \prod_{i=j}^{k} \mathfrak{l}_i \,, \quad 1 \,\le\, j \,\le\, k \,\le\, N+1 \,.$$

We extend the definition to indices $j > k$ by setting $\mathfrak{R}_{j,k} = \mathfrak{L}_{j,k} = 1$ if $j > k$. Solving the recursive equation yields that

$$\phi_{k,N} = \frac{\mathfrak{R}_{1,k-1}}{\mathfrak{L}_{2,k}}\,\phi_{1,N} \,-\, \frac{\mathfrak{S}_k}{\mathfrak{L}_{2,k}}\,\gamma \,, \quad 2 \,\le\, k \,\le\, N+1 \,.$$

In this formula,

$$\mathfrak{S}_k \,=\, \sum_{j=2}^{k} \mathfrak{L}_{2,j-1}\,\mathfrak{R}_{j,k-1} \,,$$

with the convention, adopted above, that $\mathfrak{L}_{2,1} = \mathfrak{R}_{k,k-1} = 1$.

Since $\phi_{N+1,N} = \phi_{1,N}$, we have that

$$\gamma \,=\, \frac{\mathfrak{R}_{1,N} - \mathfrak{L}_{2,N+1}}{\mathfrak{S}_{N+1}}\,\phi_{1,N} \,. \tag{2.9}$$

Reporting this value in the equation for $\phi_{k,N}$ yields that

$$\phi_{k,N} \,=\, \Big\{\frac{\mathfrak{R}_{1,k-1}}{\mathfrak{L}_{2,k}} \,-\, \frac{\mathfrak{S}_k}{\mathfrak{S}_{N+1}}\,\frac{\mathfrak{R}_{1,N} - \mathfrak{L}_{2,N+1}}{\mathfrak{L}_{2,k}}\Big\}\,\phi_{1,N} \,, \quad 2 \,\le\, k \,\le\, N \,. \tag{2.10}$$

Therefore, for each $\phi_{1,N} \in \mathbb{R}$, the solution of the difference equation (2.7) is given by (2.10). This proves existence and uniqueness up to a multiplicative constant. Moreover, it is not difficult to check that $\mathfrak{S}_k\,\mathfrak{R}_{1,N} \le \mathfrak{S}_{N+1}\mathfrak{R}_{1,k-1}$. Therefore, as each variable $\mathfrak{r}_i$, $\mathfrak{l}_j$ is strictly positive for for sufficiently large N, the solution is strictly positive if $\phi_{1,N} > 0$. □

Let $\phi_{\max,N} = \max_{1\le k\le N}\{\phi_{k,N}\}$ and $\phi_{\min,N} = \min_{1\le k\le N}\{\phi_{k,N}\}$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\phi_{k,N}$ be a solution of* (2.7)*. Then, there exist constants $C_1 = C_1(\omega), C_2 = C_2(\omega) < \infty$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\frac{\phi_{\max,N}}{\phi_{\min,N}} \le C_1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \max_{1\le k\le N} |\phi_{k,N} - \phi_{k+1,N}| \le \frac{C_2}{N}\,\phi_{\max,N}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, there exists a finite constant C such that

$$\max_{1\le k\le N}\big\{|q_k^N|\big\} \le C/\sqrt{N}.$$

Therefore, for each j, $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$, $|\,(\mathfrak{r}_j/\mathfrak{l}_k) \,-\, 1\,|$ and $|\,(\mathfrak{l}_k/\mathfrak{r}_j) \,-\, 1\,|$ are bounded from above by

$$2\,\frac{\max_\ell |q_\ell^N|}{\sqrt{N}}\,\frac{1}{\dfrac{1}{2} - \dfrac{\max_\ell |q_\ell^N|}{\sqrt{N}}} \,\le\, \frac{8C}{N}, \text{ for } N \ge 4C. \tag{2.11}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\phi_{1,N} = \phi_{\min,N}$, $\phi_{m,N} = \phi_{\max,N}$. Hence, by (2.10) and since all terms are positive and $\mathfrak{L}_{2,N+1} = \mathfrak{L}_{2,m}\,\mathfrak{L}_{m+1,N+1}$, $\phi_{\max,N}/\phi_{\min,N}$ is bounded by

$$\frac{\mathfrak{R}_{1,m-1}}{\mathfrak{L}_{2,m}} \,+\, \frac{\mathfrak{S}_m\,\mathfrak{L}_{m+1,N+1}}{\mathfrak{S}_{N+1}} \,.$$

By (2.11), the first term is bounded by $[1 + (8C/N)]^N$. We further show that the second term is also bounded by $[1 + (8C/N)]^N$ by rewriting $\mathfrak{L}_{m+1,N+1}$ as $\mathfrak{R}_{m,N}\,[\mathfrak{L}_{m+1,N+1}/\mathfrak{R}_{m,N}]$ and using $\mathfrak{S}_m\,\mathfrak{R}_{m,N} \le \mathfrak{S}_{N+1}$. This proves the first assertion of the lemma.

We turn to the second assertion. By (2.8),

$$\phi_{m+1,N} \;-\; \phi_{m,N} \;=\; \Big(\,\frac{\mathfrak{r}_m}{\mathfrak{l}_{m+1}} \;-\; 1\,\Big)\,\phi_{m,N} \;-\; \frac{\gamma}{\mathfrak{l}_{m+1}}\,\cdot$$

By (2.11), the absolute value of the first term on the right-hand side is bounded by $(8C/N)\,\max_k \phi_{k,N}$. By (2.9), and since $\mathfrak{L}_{2,N+1} = \mathfrak{L}_{1,N}$, the second one is equal to

$$\frac{\phi_{1,N}}{\mathfrak{l}_{m+1}}\,\frac{1}{\mathfrak{S}_{N+1}}\,\sum_{j=0}^{N-1}\{\,\mathfrak{L}_{1,j}\,\mathfrak{R}_{j+1,N} \;-\; \mathfrak{L}_{1,j+1}\,\mathfrak{R}_{j+2,N}\,\}\;,$$

where we used the convention that $\mathfrak{L}_{i,j} = 1$ and $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} = 1$ if $i > j$. Changing variables this expression becomes

$$\frac{\mathfrak{l}_1}{\mathfrak{l}_{m+1}}\,\frac{\phi_{1,N}}{\mathfrak{S}_{N+1}}\,\sum_{j=2}^{N+1}\mathfrak{L}_{2,j-1}\,\mathfrak{R}_{j,N}\,\Big(\,\frac{\mathfrak{r}_{j-1}}{\mathfrak{l}_{j-1}} \;-\; 1\Big)\;,$$

There is $C_0 > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{l}_1/\mathfrak{l}_{m+1} \le C_0$. Also by (2.11), the absolute value of the expression inside the parenthesis is bounded by $8C/N$, uniformly over j. The remaining sum is bounded by $\mathfrak{S}_{N+1}$. This expression is, therefore, bounded by $C_0(8C/N)\,\phi_{1,N}$. To complete the proof of the second assertion of the lemma, it remains to recollect all previous estimates. □

3. Results

We first specify the initial measures for the zero-range processes. These include the usual 'local equilibrium' measures as well as others. We then state the main result of this work.

3.1. **Initial measures.** We consider an initial macroscopic density profile $\rho_0(\cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$, and an initial microscopic measure satisfying the following condition. Denote by $\mathscr{R}_N$ the invariant measure chosen so that $\max_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}\{\phi_{k,N}\} = 1$.

Condition 3.1. *Let $\{\mu^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of probability measures on $\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{T}_N}$ such that*

(a) *$\{\mu^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is associated with profile ρ_0 in the sense that for any $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $\delta > 0$*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\mu^N\Big[\,\Big|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N G\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)\xi(k) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x)\rho_0(x)dx\Big| > \delta\,\Big] = 0\;.$$

(b) *The relative entropy of μ^N with respect to $\mathscr{R}_N$ is of order N. There exists a finite constant C_0 such that $H(\mu^N|\mathscr{R}_N) := \int f_0 \ln f_0\, d\mathscr{R}_N \le C_0 N$*

for all $N \ge 1$, where $f_0 = d\mu^N/d\mathscr{R}_N$.

A useful consequence of the relative entropy bound in part (b) of Condition 3.1 and the bounds on the fugacities of the invariant measure $\mathscr{R}_N$ in Lemma 2.3 is that the expected number of particles under μ^N is of order N. Indeed, by the entropy bound,

$$E_{\mu^N}\big[\,\sum_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}\xi(k)\big] \;\le\; \frac{1}{\gamma}H(\mu^N|\mathscr{R}_N) \;+\; \frac{1}{\gamma}\log E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\big[e^{\gamma\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}_N}\xi(k)}\big] \tag{3.1}$$

for all $\gamma > 0$. By Condition 3.1.b and by definition of $\mathscr{R}_N$, this expression is bounded by

$$\frac{C_0}{\gamma}\,N \;+\; \frac{1}{\gamma}\sum_{k=1}^N\log\frac{Z(e^\gamma\phi_{k,N})}{Z(\phi_{k,N})}\;.$$

Since $\max_k \phi_{k,N} = 1$, $\min_k \phi_{k,N} \geq c_0 > 0$ and Z is an increasing function defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$, choosing, say, $\gamma = 1$, yields that the previous expression is bounded by $C_0 N$ for some finite constant C_0.

Condition 3.1 is satisfied, for example, by 'local equilibrium' measures $\{\mu_{\mathrm{le}}^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ associated to macroscopic profiles ρ_0 in $L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let μ_{le}^N be the product measure on $\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{T}_N}$ with marginals given by

$$\mu_{\mathrm{le}}^N(\xi(k) = n) \;=\; \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\phi}_{k,N}}(n), \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{T}_N\,,\, n \geq 0\,,$$

where the parameters $\{\tilde{\phi}_{k,N} : 1 \leq k \leq N\}$ are such that $E_{\mu_{\mathrm{le}}^N}[\xi(k)] = \rho_{k,N}$ for

$$\rho_{k,N} = N \int_{(k-1)/N}^{k/N} \rho_0(x)dx.$$

To prove Condition 3.1.a, approximate the integral by a Riemann sum and apply Chebyshev and Schwarz inequality, keeping in mind that the measure μ_{le}^N is product. Next lemma asserts that condition (b) is also in force.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists $C_0 = C_0(\omega) > 0$ such that $H(\mu_{le}^N|\mathscr{R}_N) \leq C_0 N$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Write

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mu_{\mathrm{le}}^N|\mathscr{R}_N) &= \sum_{k=1}^N E_{\mu_{\mathrm{le}}^N}\left\{\ln\left(\frac{\tilde{\phi}_{k,N}}{\phi_{k,N}}\right)^{\eta(k)} + \ln\frac{Z(\phi_{k,N})}{Z(\tilde{\phi}_{k,N})}\right\} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N \rho_{k,N}\ln\frac{\tilde{\phi}_{k,N}}{\phi_{k,N}} + \sum_{k=1}^N \ln\frac{Z(\phi_{k,N})}{Z(\tilde{\phi}_{k,N})}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the lemma follows as (a) $\tilde{\phi}_{k,N} \leq g^*\rho_{k,N}$ is uniformly bounded by the fugacity bounds after (2.6) as $\|\rho_0\|_\infty < \infty$, (b) $Z(0) = 1$, and (c) $0 < c \leq \phi_{k,N} \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq k \leq N$ by Lemma 2.3. □

3.2. **Main result.** For each N, we will observe the evolution speeded up by N^2, and consider in the sequel the process $\eta_t := \xi_{N^2 t}$, generated by $N^2 L$, for times $0 \leq t \leq T$, where $T > 0$ refers to a fixed time horizon. We will access the space-time structure of the process through the scaled mass empirical measure:

$$\pi_t^N(dx) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N \eta_t(k)\delta_{k/N}(dx)\,,$$

where δ_x, $x \in \mathbb{T}$, stands for the Dirac mass at x.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the space of finite nonnegative measures on $\mathbb{T}$, and observe that $\pi_t^N \in \mathcal{M}$. We will place a metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{M}$ which realizes the dual topology of $C(\mathbb{T})$ (see [20][p. 49] for a definitive choice). Here, the trajectories $\{\pi_t^N : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ are elements of the Skorokhod space $D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$, endowed with the associated Skorohod topology.

In the following, for $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{M}$, denote $\langle G, \pi\rangle = \int_0^1 G(u)\pi(du)$. Also, for a given measure μ, we denote expectation and variance with respect to μ by E_μ and Var_μ. Also, the process measure and associated expectation governing $\eta_\cdot$ starting from μ will be denoted by $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ and $\mathbb{E}_\mu$. When the process starts from $\{\mu^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$, in the class satisfying Condition 3.1, we will denote by $\mathbb{P}_N := \mathbb{P}_{\mu^N}$ and $\mathbb{E}_N := \mathbb{E}_{\mu^N}$, the associated process measure and expectation.

We are now ready to state our main result.

Theorem 3.3. *For initial measures μ^N satisfying Condition 3.1, consider the speeded process η_t as above. Then, for any $t \geq 0$, test function $G \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, and $\delta > 0$,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_N\Big[\Big|\langle G, \pi_t^N\rangle - \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x)\rho(t,x)dx\Big| > \delta\Big] = 0,$$

where $\rho(t,x)$ is the unique weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) = \frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}\Phi(\rho(t,x)) - 2\partial_x\left(W_\varepsilon'(x)\Phi(\rho(t,x))\right), \\ \rho(0,x) = \rho_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

in the sense of Definition 10.1, where $W_\varepsilon'(x) = \dfrac{W_{x+\varepsilon} - W_{x-\varepsilon}}{2\varepsilon}$ in terms of a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.

4. Stochastic differentials and martingales

To analyze $\langle G, \pi_t^N\rangle$, we compute its stochastic differential in terms of certain martingales. Let G be a smooth function on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{T}$, and let us write $G_t(x) := G(t,x)$. Then,

$$M_t^{N,G} = \big\langle G_t, \pi_t^N\big\rangle - \big\langle G_0, \pi_0^N\big\rangle - \int_0^t \Big\{ \big\langle \partial_s G_s, \pi_s^N\big\rangle + N^2 L\big\langle G_s, \pi_s^N\big\rangle \Big\} ds$$

is a mean zero martingale. Denote the discrete Laplacian Δ_N and discrete gradient ∇_N by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_N G\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big) :=& N^2\Big(G\Big(\frac{k+1}{N}\Big) + G\Big(\frac{k-1}{N}\Big) - 2G\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)\Big), \\ \nabla_N G\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big) :=& \frac{N}{2}\Big(G\Big(\frac{k+1}{N}\Big) - G\Big(\frac{k-1}{N}\Big)\Big), \end{aligned}$$

and write

$$N^2 L\big\langle G, \pi_s^N\big\rangle = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq k\leq N}\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta_N G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)g(\eta_s(k)) + 2\nabla_N G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)g(\eta_s(k))\sqrt{N}q_k\right). \tag{4.1}$$

We will define

$$D_{N,k}^{G,s} := \frac{1}{2}\Delta_N G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big) + 2\nabla_N G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)\sqrt{N}q_k^N. \tag{4.2}$$

As $\sqrt{N}|q_k^N|$ is uniformly bounded from above by a constant C, cf. (2.4), we have

$$\Big|D_{N,k}^{G,s}\Big| \leq \|\partial_{xx}G\|_\infty + 2C\|\partial_x G\|_\infty. \tag{4.3}$$

The quadratic variation of $M_t^{N,G}$ is given by

$$\langle M^{N,G}\rangle_t = \int_0^t \Big\{ N^2 L\Big(\big\langle G_s, \pi_s^N\big\rangle^2\Big) - 2\big\langle G_s, \pi_s^N\big\rangle N^2 L\big\langle G_s, \pi_s^N\big\rangle \Big\} ds.$$

Standard calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M^{N,G}\rangle_t = \int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^N \Big\{ & g(\eta_s(k))\Big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{q_k^N}{\sqrt{N}}\Big)\Big(G_s\Big(\frac{k+1}{N}\Big) - G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)\Big)^2 \\ & + g(\eta_s(k))\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{q_k^N}{\sqrt{N}}\Big)\Big(G_s\Big(\frac{k-1}{N}\Big) - G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)\Big)^2\Big\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

This variation may be bounded as follows.

Lemma 4.1. *For smooth functions G on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{T}$, there is a constant C_G such that for large N,*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\mathbb{E}_N\langle M^{N,G}\rangle_t \le g^* C_G T N^{-1}.$$

Proof. For N large, we may assume that $1/2+|q_k^N/\sqrt{N}|\le 1$. Also since G is smooth and $g(\cdot)$ grows at most linearly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_N\langle M^{N,G}\rangle_t &\le 2g^*\|\partial_x G\|_\infty N^{-1}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\int_0^t \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N \eta_s(k)ds\Big]\\ &= 2g^*\|\partial_x G\|_\infty N^{-1} t\,\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N\eta_0(k)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

We have used that total number of particles is conserved in the last equality. By (3.1), we have that $\sup_N E_N\big[N^{-1}\sum_{k=1}^N\eta_0(k)\big]<\infty$, and the result follows. □

5. Proof outline

We now outline the proof of Theorem 3.3. Let Q^N the probability measure on the trajectory space $D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$ governing $\pi_\cdot^N$ when the process starts from μ^N. By Lemma 8.1, the family of measures $\{Q^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight with respect to the uniform topology, stronger than the Skorokhod topology.

Let now Q be any limit measure. We will show that Q is supported on a class of weak solutions to the nonlinear PDE (3.2).

Step 1. Let G be smooth on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{T}$. Recall the martingale $M_t^{N,G}$ and its quadratic variation $\langle M^{N,G}\rangle_t$ in the last section. By Lemma 4.1, we have $\mathbb{E}_N\big(M_T^{N,G}\big)^2=\mathbb{E}_N\langle M^{N,G}\rangle_T$ vanishes as $N\to\infty$. By Doob's inequality, for each $\delta>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}_N\Big[\sup_{0\le t\le T}\big|\langle G_t,\pi_t^N\rangle-\langle G_0,\pi_0^N\rangle-\int_0^t\big(\langle\partial_s G_s,\pi_s^N\rangle+N^2L\langle G_s,\pi_s^N\rangle\big)ds\big|>\delta\Big]\\ &\le\frac{4}{\delta^2}\mathbb{E}_N\big\langle M^{N,G}\big\rangle_T\ \to\ 0\ \text{ as } N\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Recall the evaluation of $N^2L\langle G_s,\pi_s^N\rangle$ in (4.1). Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_N\Big[\sup_{0\le t\le T}\Big|\langle G_t,\pi_t^N\rangle-\langle G_0,\pi_0^N\rangle-\int_0^t\Big\{\langle\partial_s G_s,\pi_s^N\rangle \qquad (5.1)\\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\le k\le N}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta_N G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)g(\eta_s(k))+2\nabla_N G_s\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)g(\eta_s(k))\sqrt{N}q_k^N\Big)\Big\}ds\Big|>\delta\Big]=0.\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. We now replace the nonlinear term $g(\eta_s(k))$ by a function of the empirical density of particles. To be precise, let $\eta^l(x)=\dfrac{1}{2l+1}\sum_{|y-x|\le l}\eta(y)$, that is the average density of particles in the box centered at x with length $2l+1$.

Recall the coefficient $D_{N,k}^{G,s}$ in (4.2). By the triangle inequality, the 1 and 2-block estimates (Lemmas 6.3 and 7.2) imply the following replacement lemma.

Lemma 5.1 (Replacement Lemma)**.** *For each $\delta>0$, we have*

$$\limsup_{\theta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_N\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\le k\le N}\int_0^T D_{N,k}^{G,t}\Big(g\left(\eta_t(k)\right)-\Phi\left(\eta_t^{\theta N}(k)\right)\Big)dt\Big|\ge\delta\Big]=0.$$

Step 3. For each $\theta > 0$, take $\iota_\theta = (2\theta)^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{[-\theta,\theta]}$. The average density $\eta_t^{\theta N}(k)$ is written as a function of the empirical measure π_t^N

$$\eta_t^{\theta N}(k) = \frac{2\theta N}{2\theta N + 1}\langle \iota_\theta(\cdot - k/N), \pi_t^N)\rangle.$$

Then, noting the form of $D_{N,k}^{G,s}$ and the quenched convergence (2.3), we may replace ∇_N, Δ_N, and $\sqrt{N}q_k^N$ by ∂_x, ∂_{xx}, and $W_\varepsilon'\Big(\frac{k}{N}\Big)$ respectively, and also the sum by an integral. Hence, we get from (5.1) in terms of the induced distribution Q^N that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{\theta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty} Q^N\Big[\Big|\left\langle G_T, \pi_T^N\right\rangle - \left\langle G_0, \pi_0^N\right\rangle - \int_0^T \Big\{\left\langle \partial_s G_s, \pi_s^N\right\rangle \\
&+ \int_{\mathbb{T}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}G_s\,(x) + 2\partial_x G_s\,(x)\,W_\varepsilon'(x)\right)\Phi\big(\langle \iota_\theta(\cdot - x), \pi_s^N\rangle\big)dx\Big\}ds\Big| > \delta\Big] = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Taking $N \to \infty$, along a subsequence, as the set of trajectories in (5.2) is open with respect to the uniform topology, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{\theta\to 0} Q\Big[\Big|\left\langle G_T, \pi_T\right\rangle - \left\langle G_0, \pi_0\right\rangle - \int_0^T \Big\{\left\langle \partial_s G_s, \pi_s\right\rangle \\
&+ \int_{\mathbb{T}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}G_s\,(x) + 2\partial_x G_s\,(x)\,W_\varepsilon'(x)\right)\Phi\big(\langle \iota_\theta(\cdot - x), \pi_s\rangle\big)dx\Big\}ds\Big| > \delta\Big] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 4. We show in Lemma 9.1 that Q is supported on trajectories $\pi_s(dx) = \rho(s,x)dx$ where $\rho \in L^1([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})$. To replace $\langle \iota_\theta(\cdot - x), \pi_s\rangle$ by $\rho(s,x)$, it is enough to show, for all $\delta > 0$, that

$$\limsup_{\theta\to 0} Q\Big[\Big|\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} D_{G,s}\left(\Phi\big(\langle \iota_\theta(\cdot - x), \pi_s\rangle\big) - \Phi(\rho(s,x))\right)dxds\Big| > \delta\Big] = 0.$$

where $D_{G,s} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}G_s\,(x) + 2\partial_x G_s\,(x)\,W_\varepsilon'(x)$. In fact, considering the Lebesgue points of ρ, almost surely with respect to Q,

$$\lim_{\theta\to 0}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} D_{G,s}\Phi\langle \iota_\theta(\cdot - x), \pi_s\rangle dxds = \int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} D_{G,s}\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds.$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q\Big[\left\langle G_T, \rho(T,x)\right\rangle - \left\langle G_0, \rho(0,x)\right\rangle - \int_0^T \Big\{\left\langle \partial_s G_s, \rho(s,x)\right\rangle \\
&+ \int_{\mathbb{T}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}G_s\,(x) + 2\partial_x G_s\,(x)\,W_\varepsilon'(x)\right)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dx\Big\}ds = 0\Big] = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 5. Hence, each $\rho(t,x)$ solves weakly the equation

$$\partial_t\rho = \frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}\Phi(\rho) - 2\partial_x\big(W_\varepsilon'(x)\Phi(\rho)\big).$$

As a consequence of the weak formulation, ρ satisfies conservation of mass (cf. Lemma 9.1): $\int_{\mathbb{T}}\rho(t,x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}}\rho_0(x)dx$. Moreover, the initial condition $\rho(0,x) = \rho_0(x)$ holds by Condition 3.1. From convergence of Q^N to Q with respect to the uniform topology, ρ is weakly continuous in time: Namely, for each test function $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$, the map $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x)\rho(t,x)dx$ is continuous. In addition, in Proposition 9.2, we show an energy estimate which defines a weak spatial derivative of $\Phi(\rho(t,x))$.

We show in Subsection 10 that there is at most one weak solution ρ to (3.2), subject to these constraints (cf. Definition 10.1). We conclude then that the sequence of Q^N converges weakly to the Dirac measure on $\rho(\cdot, x)dx$. Finally, as Q^N converges to Q with respect to the uniform topology, we have for each $0 \le t \le T$ that $\langle G, \pi_t^N \rangle$ weakly converges to the constant $\int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x)\rho(t,x)dx$, and therefore convergence in probability as stated in Theorem 3.3. □

6. 1-block estimate

Following the scheme of [15] and [9], the '1-block' estimate is obtained by using a Rayleigh-type estimation of a variational expression derived from a Feynman-Kac bound. A spectral gap bound plays an important role in this step. Since there are differences here in the context of the random environment, all details are given.

Recall the generator L, cf. (2.5), and the invariant measure $\mathscr{R}_N$, cf. Section 3. As $\mathscr{R}_N$ is not reversible with respect to L, we will work with S, the symmetric part of L:

$$Sf(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\Big\{g(\eta(k))\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^N\big(f(\eta^{k,k+1}) - f(\eta)\big) + g(\eta(k))\mathfrak{p}_{k,-}^N\big(f(\eta^{k,k-1}) - f(\eta)\big)\Big\}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^N := \big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{q_k^N}{\sqrt{N}}\big) + \frac{\phi_{k+1,N}}{\phi_{k,N}}\big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{q_{k+1}^N}{\sqrt{N}}\big), \quad \mathfrak{p}_{k,-}^N := \big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{q_k^N}{\sqrt{N}}\big) + \frac{\phi_{k-1,N}}{\phi_{k,N}}\big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{q_{k-1}^N}{\sqrt{N}}\big). \quad (6.1)$$

Then, $\mathscr{R}_N$ is reversible under the generator S. The Dirichlet form is

$$E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[f(-Sf)\right] = E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[f(-Lf)\right] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[g(\eta(k))\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^N\big(f(\eta^{k,k+1}) - f(\eta)\big)^2\Big].$$

6.1. **Spectral gap bound for 1-block estimate.** For $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$ and $l \ge 1$, define the set $\Lambda_{k,l} = \{k-l, k-l+1, \dots, k+l\} \subset \mathbb{T}_N$. Consider the process restricted to $\Lambda_{k,l}$ generated by $S_{k,l}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k,l}f(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \Big\{ & g(\eta(x))\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^N\big(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta)\big) \\ & + g(\eta(x+1))\mathfrak{p}_{x+1,-}^N\big(f(\eta^{x+1,x}) - f(\eta)\big)\Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Let $\Omega_{k,l} = \mathbb{N}_0^{\Lambda_{k,l}}$ be the state space of configurations restricted on sites $\Lambda_{k,l}$. For each $\eta \in \Omega_{k,l}$, define $\kappa_{k,l}(\eta) = \prod_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \mathcal{P}_{\phi_{x,N}}(\eta(x))$, that is, $\kappa_{k,l}$ is the product measure $\kappa := \mathscr{R}_N$ restricted to $\Omega_{k,l}$. Define the state space of configurations with exactly j particle on the sites $\Lambda_{k,l}$:

$$\Omega_{k,l,j} = \{\eta \in \Omega_{k,l} : \sum_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \eta(x) = j\}.$$

Let $\kappa_{k,l,j}$ be the associated reversible canonical measure obtained by conditioning $\kappa_{k,l}$ on $\Omega_{k,l}$. The corresponding Dirichlet form is

$$E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[f(-S_{k,l}f)\right] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,l}} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\Big[g(\eta(x))\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^N\big(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta)\big)^2\Big]. \quad (6.3)$$

We will obtain the spectral gap estimate corresponding to the localized inhomogeneous process by comparison with the spectral gap for the standard translation-invariant localized

process. Consider the generator L_l on $\Omega_{k,l}$ given by

$$L_l f(\eta) = \sum_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \frac{1}{2}\left\{g(\eta(x))\left[f\left(\eta^{x,x+1}\right) - f(\eta)\right] + g(\eta(x+1))\left[f\left(\eta^{x+1,x}\right) - f(\eta)\right]\right\}.$$

For any $\rho > 0$, let ν_ρ be the product measure on Ω with common marginal $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ on each site $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with mean ρ, and let ν_l^ρ be its restriction to $\Omega_{k,l}$.

Consider $\nu_{l,j}$, the associated canonical measure on $\Omega_{k,l,j}$, with respect to j particles in $\Lambda_{k,l}$. Notice that $\nu_{l,j}$ does not depend on ρ. It is well-known that both ν_l^ρ and $\nu_{l,j}$ are invariant measures with respect to the localized generator L_l (cf. [1]). The corresponding Dirichlet form is given by

$$E_{\nu_{l,j}}\left[f(-L_l f)\right] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,l}} E_{\nu_{l,j}}\left[g(\eta(x))\left(f\left(\eta^{x,x+1}\right) - f(\eta)\right)^2\right]. \tag{6.4}$$

We are now ready to state the lemma for the spectral gap bounds. Recall $\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^N$ from (6.1). Let $r_{k,l,N}^{-1} := \min_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}}\left\{\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^N\right\}$.

Lemma 6.1. *We have the following estimates:*

(1) *Uniform bound: For all $\eta \in \Omega_{k,l,j}$, we have*

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,l}}{\phi_{\max,k,l}}\right)^j \le \frac{\kappa_{k,l,j}(\eta)}{\nu_{l,j}(\eta)} \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^j \tag{6.5}$$

where $\phi_{\min,k,l} = \min_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \phi_{x,N}$ and $\phi_{\max,k,l} = \max_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \phi_{x,N}$.

(2) *Poincaré inequality: We have*

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}(f) \le C_{k,l,j} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[f(-S_{k,l}f)\right]$$

where $C_{k,l,j} := C(2l+1)^2 r_{k,l,N}\left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{2j}$ bounds the inverse of the spectral gap of $-S_{k,l}$ on $\Omega_{k,l,j}$ and C is a universal constant.

(3) *For each l fixed, we have*

$$\lim_{N\uparrow\infty} \sup_{1\le k\le N} \frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}} = 1, \quad \lim_{N\uparrow\infty} \sup_{1\le k\le N} r_{k,l,N} = 1$$

and hence, for fixed l and j, $\sup_{N\ge 1}\sup_{1\le k\le N} C_{k,l,j} < \infty$.

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $\rho > 0$. By the definitions of conditioned measures $\kappa_{k,l,j}$ and $\nu_{l,j}$, we have, for $\eta \in \Omega_{k,l,j}$,

$$\frac{\kappa_{k,l,j}(\eta)}{\nu_{l,j}(\eta)} = \frac{\kappa_{k,l}(\eta)}{\nu_l^\rho(\eta)} \frac{\nu_l^\rho(\Omega_{k,l,j})}{\kappa_{k,l}(\Omega_{k,l,j})}. \tag{6.6}$$

The product structure of $\kappa_{k,l}$ and ν_l^ρ allows a direct computation

$$\frac{\kappa_{k,l}(\eta)}{\nu_l^\rho(\eta)} = \frac{\prod_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}}\left\{\left(\phi_{x,N}\right)^{\eta(x)}/Z(\phi_{x,N})\right\}}{\prod_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}}\left\{(\phi_0)^{\eta(x)}/Z(\phi_0)\right\}}, \tag{6.7}$$

where ϕ_0 is the common fugacity for (the marginals of) ν_ρ. Recalling that $\phi_{\min,k,l} = \min_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}}\phi_{x,N}$ and $\phi_{\max,k,l} = \max_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}}\phi_{x,N}$, for $\eta \in \Omega_{k,l,j}$, we can estimate $\kappa_{k,l}(\eta)/\nu_l^\rho(\eta)$ by

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,l}}{\phi_0}\right)^j \prod_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \frac{Z(\phi_{x,N})}{Z(\phi_0)} \le \frac{\kappa_{k,l}(\eta)}{\nu_l^\rho(\eta)} \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_0}\right)^j \prod_{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}} \frac{Z(\phi_{x,N})}{Z(\phi_0)}. \tag{6.8}$$

Note that $\kappa_{k,l}(\Omega_{k,l,j}) = \sum_{\eta\in\Omega_{k,l,j}} \big[\kappa_{k,l}(\eta)/\nu_l^\rho(\eta)\big]\nu_l^\rho(\eta)$. Then, $\kappa_{k,l}(\Omega_{k,l,j})/\nu_l^\rho(\Omega_{k,l,j})$ is estimated by the same bounds as in (6.8). Then, rearranging these estimates, (6.5) follows from (6.6).

Turning now to the Poincaré inequality, the proof relies on the well known spectral gap for one dimensional localized symmetric zero range process (cf. [21]): For all j, with respect to a universal constant C,

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\nu_{l,j}}(f) \le C(2l+1)^2 E_{\nu_{l,j}}[f(-L_l f)]. \tag{6.9}$$

To get an estimate with respect to $-S_{k,l}$, from (6.4) and (6.3), using (6.5), we have

$$E_{\nu_{l,j}}\left[f(-L_l f)\right] \le r_{k,l,N}\left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^j E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[f(-S_{k,l}f)\right]. \tag{6.10}$$

Now, since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}(f) &= \inf_a E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[(f-a)^2\right]\\ &\le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^j \inf_a E_{\nu_{l,j}}\left[(f-a)^2\right] = \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^j \mathrm{Var}_{\nu_{l,j}}(f),\end{aligned}$$

the desired Poincaré inequality follows from (6.9) and (6.10).

As the last claim follows from the second assertion of Lemma 2.3, the proof to the lemma is complete. □

6.2. **Relative entropy.** For $t>0$, let μ_t^N be the distribution of η_t. As the entropy production is negative, cf. p. 340, [20], we have $H(\mu_t^N|\mathscr{R}_N) \le H(\mu^N|\mathscr{R}_N) \le C_0 N$. Furthermore, the relative entropy of μ_t^N with respect to the homogeneous invariant measures ν_ρ is also of order $O(N)$ which will be useful in the sequel.

Lemma 6.2. *For any fixed $\rho>0$, there is a constant $C=C(\omega)$ such that $H(\mu_t^N|\nu_\rho)\le CN$.*

Proof. Write

$$H(\mu_t^N|\nu_\rho) = \int \ln\left(\frac{d\mu_t^N}{d\nu_\rho}\right) d\mu_t^N = \int \ln\left(\frac{d\mu_t^N}{d\mathscr{R}_N}\right) d\mu_t^N + \int \ln\left(\frac{d\mathscr{R}_N}{d\nu_\rho}\right) d\mu_t^N.$$

The first term on the right-hand side is exactly $H(\mu_t^N|\mathscr{R}_N) = O(N)$ by part (2) of Condition 3.1. The integrand in the second term equals,

$$\ln\frac{d\mathscr{R}_N}{d\nu_\rho}(\eta) = \ln\frac{\mathscr{R}_N(\eta)}{\nu_\rho(\eta)} = \sum_{k=1}^N \eta(k)\ln\frac{\phi_{k,N}}{\phi_0} + \sum_{k=1}^N \ln\frac{Z(\phi_0)}{Z(\phi_{k,N})}.$$

The desired estimate now follows the observations: $0<c\le\phi_{k,N}\le 1$ by Lemma 2.3, and the mean expected number of particles, $\int\sum_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}\eta(k)d\mu_t^N = O(N)$ by (3.1). □

6.3. **1-block estimate.** We prove the 1-block estimate:

Lemma 6.3 (1-block estimate)**.** *For every $T>0$,*

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\le k\le N}\Big|\int_0^T V_{k,l}(s,\eta_s)ds\Big|\Big] = 0$$

where $V_{k,l}(s,\eta) := D_{N,k}^{G,s}\left(g(\eta(k)) - \Phi(\eta^l(k))\right)$ and $D_{N,k}^{G,s}$ is as in (4.2).

Proof. We first introduce a cutoff of large densities. Fix $A > 0$, and let

$$\tilde{V}_{k,l,A}(s,\eta) := V_{k,l}(s,\eta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^l(k)\le A\}}.$$

Notice that $g(\cdot)$ considered here satisfies the 'FEM' assumption in [20]. By Lemma 6.2, the cutoff follows exactly from Lemma 4.2 in p.90, [20].

It now remains to prove that for every $A > 0$, $T > 0$,

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\sup_{1\le k\le N}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\Big|\int_0^T \tilde{V}_{k,l,A}(s,\eta_s)ds\Big|\Big] = 0.$$

Define $\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta)$ be the number of particles in $\Lambda_{k,l}$, that is $\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta) := (2l+1)\eta^l(k)$. As in [9], we will replace $\tilde{V}_{k,l,A}(s,\eta)$ by its 'centering':

$$V_{k,l,A}(s,\eta) := D^{G,s}_{N,k}\Big\{\, g(\eta(k)) - E_{\kappa_{k,l,\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta)}}[g(\eta(k))]\,\Big\}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^l(k)\le A\}}.$$

Note that $E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}V_{k,l,A} = 0$ for all k,l,j which will be used in the Rayleigh-type estimation. The error introduced by such a replacement is less than or equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{0<\eta^l_s(k)\le A\}}\Big|E_{\kappa_{k,l,\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta_s)}}[g(\eta(k))] - \Phi(\eta^l_s(k))\Big|ds\Big]. \tag{6.11}$$

Note that $\Phi(\eta^l_s(k)) = E_{\nu_{\eta^l_s(k)}}[g]$. By triangle inequality, (6.11) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{0<\eta^l_s(k)\le A\}}\Big|E_{\kappa_{k,l,\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta_s)}}[g(\eta(k))] - E_{\nu_{k,l,\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta_s)}}[g(\eta(k))]\Big|ds\Big]\\ &+\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{0<\eta^l_s(k)\le A\}}\Big|E_{\nu_{k,l,\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta_s)}}[g(\eta(k))] - E_{\nu_{\eta^l_s(k)}}[g]\Big|ds\Big] =: I_1 + I_2.\end{aligned}$$

Using (6.5) and then $g(k) \le g^*k$, the term I_1 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{0<\eta^l_s(k)\le A\}}E_{\nu_{k,l,\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta_s)}}[g(\eta(k))]\Big[\Big(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\Big)^{\Lambda_{k,l}(\eta_s)} - 1\Big]ds\Big]\\ &\le Tg^*(2l+1)A\Big[\Big(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\Big)^{(2l+1)A} - 1\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\sup_{1\le k\le N}\dfrac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}} \to 1$ by Lemma 6.1. Then, for each fixed l and A, the term $\sup_{1\le k\le N} I_1$ vanishes as $N\uparrow\infty$.

Now, we turn to estimate the term I_2. By equivalence of ensembles (cf. p.355, [20]), the absolute value in I_2 vanishes as $l\uparrow\infty$, uniformly in k. Therefore, the term I_2 vanishes as soon as we take $N\uparrow\infty$, $l\uparrow\infty$ in order.

To prove the lemma, it now remains to show

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\sup_{0\le k\le N}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\Big|\int_0^T V_{k,l,A}(s,\eta_s)ds\Big|\Big] = 0.$$

By the entropy inequality (cf. p.338 [20]) and the assumption $H(\mu^N|\mathscr{R}_N) \le C_0N$, we have, for any $\gamma > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\Big|\int_0^T V_{k,l,A}(s,\eta_s)ds\Big|\Big] \le \frac{C_0}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma N}\ln\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\exp\Big\{\gamma N\Big|\int_0^T V_{k,l,A}(s,\eta_s)ds\Big|\Big\}\Big]. \tag{6.12}$$

By Feynman-Kac formula (cf. p.336, [20]), (6.12) is bounded further by

$$\frac{C_0}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma N}\int_0^T \lambda_{N,l}(s)ds$$

where $\lambda_{N,l}(s)$ is the largest eigenvalue of $N^2 S + \gamma N V_{k,l,A}(s,\eta)$.

Now, fix $s \in [0,T]$ and omit the argument s to simplify notation. To estimate the eigenvalue $\lambda_{N,l}(s)$, we make use of the variational formula:

$$(\gamma N)^{-1}\lambda_{N,l} = \sup_f \left\{ E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[V_{k,l,A} f\right] - \gamma^{-1} N E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\right]\right\}$$

where the supremum is over all f which are densities with respect to $\mathscr{R}_N$.

For any density f, we consider its restriction with respect to configurations sites $\Lambda_{k,l}$, i.e. we define $f_{k,l} = E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[f|\Omega_{k,l}\right]$. Recall that $\kappa_{k,l}$ is the restriction of $\mathscr{R}_N$ to $\Lambda_{k,l}$, and that $S_{k,l}$ is the localized generator. Notice that $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S_{k,l}\sqrt{f})\right] \le E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\right]$. By convexity of the Dirichlet form, we have

$$(\gamma N)^{-1}\lambda_{N,l} \le \sup_{f_{k,l}} \left\{ E_{\kappa_{k,l}}\left[V_{k,l,A} f_{k,l}\right] - \gamma^{-1} N E_{\kappa_{k,l}}\left[\sqrt{f_{k,l}}(-S_{k,l}\sqrt{f_{k,l}})\right]\right\}.$$

We now write $f_{k,l}d\kappa_{k,l}$ with respect to sets $\Omega_{k,l,j}$ of configurations with total particle number j on $\Lambda_{k,l}$:

$$E_{\kappa_{k,l}}\left[V_{k,l,A} f_{k,l}\right] = \sum_{j\ge 0} c_{k,l,j}(f) \int V_{k,l,A} f_{k,l,j} d\kappa_{k,l,j}, \tag{6.13}$$

where $c_{k,l,j}(f) = \int_{\Omega_{k,l,j}} f_{k,l} d\kappa_{k,l}$, and $f_{k,l,j} = c_{k,l,j}(f)^{-1}\kappa_{k,l}\left(\Omega_{k,l,j}\right) f_{k,l}$. Here, $\sum_{j\ge 0} c_{k,l,j} = 1$ and $f_{k,l,j}$ is a density with respect to $\kappa_{k,l,j}$.

Then, on $\Omega_{k,l,j}$, we have $\dfrac{S_{k,l}\sqrt{f_{k,l}}}{\sqrt{f_{k,l}}} = \dfrac{S_{k,l}\sqrt{f_{k,l,j}}}{\sqrt{f_{k,l,j}}}$. By (6.13), we write

$$E_{\kappa_{k,l}}\left[\sqrt{f_{k,l}}(-S_{k,l}\sqrt{f_{k,l}})\right] = \sum_{j\ge 0} c_{k,l,j}(f) E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[\sqrt{f_{k,l,j}}(-S_{k,l}\sqrt{f_{k,l,j}})\right].$$

Then, we have

$$(\gamma N)^{-1}\lambda_{N,l} \le \sup_{0\le j\le A(2l+1)} \sup_f \left\{ E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[V_{k,l,A} f\right] - \gamma^{-1} N E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S_{k,l}\sqrt{f})\right]\right\},$$

where the inside supremum is on densities f with respect to $\kappa_{k,l,j}$.

By Lemma 6.1, we have $C_{k,l,j}$ as the inverse spectral gap estimate of $S_{k,l}$. Note also $\|V_{k,l,A}\|_\infty \le C(A,G)$. Using the Rayleigh estimation (cf. p. 377, [20]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[V_{k,l,A} f\right] - \gamma^{-1} N E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S_{k,l}\sqrt{f})\right] \\ \le &\frac{\gamma N^{-1}}{1 - 2C(A,G)C_{k,l,j}\,\gamma N^{-1}} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[V_{k,l,A}(-S_{k,l})^{-1} V_{k,l,A}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

As remarked in the beginning of the proof, $E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}} V_{k,l,A} = 0$. Observe that the spectral gap estimate of $S_{k,l}$ in Lemma 6.1 also implies that $\|S_{k,l}^{-1}\|_2$, the $L^2(\kappa_{k,l,j})$ norm of the operator $S_{k,l}^{-1}$ on mean zero functions, is less than or equal to $C_{k,l,j}$. Thus, by Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[V_{k,l,A}(-S_{k,l})^{-1} V_{k,l,A}\right] \le C_{k,l,j} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[V_{k,l,A}^2\right].$$

Retracing the steps, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\Big|\int_0^T V_{k,l,A}(\eta_s)ds\Big|\Big] \le \frac{C_0}{\gamma} + \sup_{0\le j\le A(2l+1)} \frac{T\gamma N^{-1}C_{k,l,j}}{1-2C(A,G)C_{k,l,j}\,\gamma N^{-1}} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}}\left[V_{k,l,A}^2\right]$$

where the last expression vanishes uniformly as $N\to\infty$ for $1\le k\le N$ and $j\le A(2l+1)$. The lemma now is proved by letting $\gamma\to\infty$. □

7. 2-block estimate

In this section we discuss 2-block estimate which is needed for the replacement lemma. For brevity, we present the main elements, but omit some proofs, as they are similar to those for the 1-block estimate.

As for the 1-block estimate, a spectral gap bound will be needed in the comparison of two 'blocks'. Recall the notation $\Lambda_{k,l}$ from the 1-block estimate. For $l\ge 1$ and $|k-k'|>2l$, let $\Lambda_{k,k',l}=\Lambda_{k,l}\cup\Lambda_{k',l}$. We introduce the following localized generator $S_{k,k',l}$ governing the coordinates $\Omega_{k,k',l}=\mathbb{N}_0^{\Lambda_{k,k',l}}$. Inside each block, the process moves as before, but we add an extra bond interaction between sites $k+l$ and $k'-l$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k,k',l}f(\eta) = S_{k,l}f(\eta)+S_{k',l}f(\eta) &+ \frac{1}{2}\,g(\eta(k+l))\mathfrak{p}^N_{k+l,k'-l}\big(f(\eta^{k+l,k'-l})-f(\eta)\big)\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\,g(\eta(k'-l))\,\mathfrak{p}^N_{k'-l,k+l}\big(f(\eta^{k'-l,k+l})-f(\eta)\big)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{p}^N_{k+l,k'-l}=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{q^N_{k+l}}{\sqrt{N}}+\frac{\phi_{k'-l,N}}{\phi_{k+l,N}}\big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{q^N_{k'-l}}{\sqrt{N}}\big),\quad \mathfrak{p}^N_{k'-l,k+l}=\frac{1}{2}-\frac{q^N_{k'-l}}{\sqrt{N}}+\frac{\phi_{k+l,N}}{\phi_{k'-l,N}}\big(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{q^N_{k+l}}{\sqrt{N}}\big).$$

As before, the localized measure $\kappa_{k,k',l}$ defined by $\kappa=\mathscr{R}_N$ limited to sites in $\Lambda_{k,k',l}$, as well as the canonical measure $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}$ on $\Omega_{k,k',l,j}:=\{\eta\in\Omega_{k,k',l}:\sum_{x\in\Lambda_{k,k',l}}\eta(x)=j\}$, that is $\kappa_{k,k',l}$ is conditioned so that there are exactly j particles counted in $\Omega_{k,k',l}$, are both invariant and reversible for the dynamics.

The corresponding Dirichlet form, with measure $\tilde\kappa$ given by $\kappa_{k,k',l}$ or $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\tilde\kappa}\left[f(-S_{k,k',l}f)\right] =& \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,k',l}} E_{\tilde\kappa}\Big[g(\eta(k))\,\mathfrak{p}^N_{k,+}\big(f(\eta^{x,x+1})-f(\eta)\big)^2\Big]\\ &+\frac{1}{2}E_{\tilde\kappa}\Big[g(\eta(k+l))\mathfrak{p}^N_{k+l,k'-l}\big(f(\eta^{k+l,k'-l})-f(\eta)\big)^2\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Recall also the generator of symmetric zero-range L_l with respect to $\Lambda_{k,l}$ (cf. below (6.3)). Let L'_l be the same generator with respect to $\Lambda_{k',l}$. Define the generator $L_{l,l}$ with respect to $\Lambda_{l,l}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} L_{l,l}f(\eta) = L_lf(\eta)+L'_lf(\eta) &+ \frac{1}{2}\Big[f\big(\eta^{k+l,k'-l}\big)-f(\eta)\Big]\,g(\eta(k+l))\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\Big[f\big(\eta^{k'-l,k+l}\big)-f(\eta)\Big]\,g(\eta(k'-l)).\end{aligned}$$

When $|k-k'|$ is large, the process governed by $L_{l,l}$ in effect treats the blocks as adjacent, with a connecting bond.

Corresponding to the set-up of the gap bound Lemma 6.1, let $\nu^\rho_{l,l}$ be the product of $4l+2$ distributions with common marginal ρ. One may inspect that $\nu^\rho_{l,l}$ is invariant to the dynamics generated by $L_{l,l}$. Let now $\nu_{l,l,j}$ be $\nu^\rho_{l,l}$ conditioned on that the total number of

particles in the $4l+2$ sites is j. Note that $\nu_{l,l,j}$ is independent of ρ. This canonical measure $\nu_{l,l,j}$ is also invariant to the dynamics. The corresponding Dirichlet form is given by

$$E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\left[f(-L_{l,l}f)\right] = \sum_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,k',l}} E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\Big[\frac{1}{2}g(\eta(x))[f\left(\eta^{x,x+1}\right)-f(\eta)]^2\Big] + E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\Big[\frac{1}{2}g(\eta(k'-l))\left[f\left(\eta^{k'-l,k+l}\right)-f(\eta)\right]^2\Big].$$

Let $r^{-1}_{k,k',l,N} := \min\left\{\mathfrak{p}^N_{k+l,k'-l}, \min_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,k',l}}\left\{\mathfrak{p}^N_{x,+}\right\}\right\}$.

Lemma 7.1. *We have the following estimates:*

(1) *Uniform bound: For all $\eta\in\Omega_{k,k',l,j}$, we have*

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,k',l}}{\phi_{\max,k,k',l}}\right)^j \le \frac{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}(\eta)}{\nu_{l,l,j}(\eta)} \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,k',l}}{\phi_{\min,k,k',l}}\right)^j$$

where $\phi_{\min,k,k',l} = \min_{x\in\Lambda_{k,k',l}}\phi_{x,N}$ and $\phi_{\max,k,k',l} = \max_{x\in\Lambda_{k,k',l}}\phi_{x,N}$.

(2) *Poincaré inequality: For fixed $j\ge 0$ and k,k' such that $|k-k'|>2l+1$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}}(f) \le C_{k,k',l,j}E_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}}\left[f(-L_{k,k',l}f)\right]$$

where $C_{k,k',l,j} = C(4l+2)^2 r_{k,k',l,N}\left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,k',l}}{\phi_{\min,k,k',l}}\right)^{2j}$ for a universal constant C.

(3) *There exists constant C_0 such that*

$$\sup_{k,k',l,N}\frac{\phi_{\max,k,k',l}}{\phi_{\min,k,k',l}} \le C_0. \quad \limsup_{N\uparrow\infty}\sup_{k',k,l} r_{k,k',l,N} \le C_0.$$

Hence, for fixed j and l, we have $\limsup_{\theta\downarrow 0}\limsup_{N\uparrow\infty}\sup_{2l+1\le|k'-k|\le\theta N} C_{k,k',l,j}<\infty$.

We may repeat proof of Lemma 6.1, step by step, to show Lemma 7.1; to be brief, we omit the details.

We now state a 2-blocks estimate.

Lemma 7.2 (2-block estimate)**.** *We have*

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{\theta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\le k\le N}\int_0^T\left|\Phi\left(\eta^l_s(k)\right)-\Phi\left(\eta^{\theta N}_s(k)\right)\right|ds\Big]=0. \tag{7.1}$$

Proof. As $\Phi(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz, it suffices to show (7.1) with the absolute value replaced by $\left|\eta^{\theta N}_s(k)-\eta^l_s(k)\right|$. We will further approximate $\eta^{\theta N}_s(k)$ by $\frac{1}{2\theta N+1}\sum_{k'}\eta^l_s(k')$ where the summation is over k'-s such that $2l+1\le|k'-k|\le\theta N$. By the entropy inequality, the resulting error vanishes as $N\uparrow\infty$. For each pair (k,k'), we view $\Lambda_{k,k',l}$, the union of the two blocks $\Lambda_{k,l}$ and $\Lambda_{k',l}$, as a single block. Let $\eta^l_s(k,k')$ denote the average number of particles per site over $\Lambda_{k,k',l}$. After a cutoff of large densities (cf. p. 92, [20]), to prove the lemma, it is enough to show, for any $A>0$, that

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{\theta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\sup_{2l+1\le|k'-k|\le\theta N}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\int_0^T\left|\eta^l_s(k')-\eta^l_s(k)\right|\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^l_s(k,k')\le A\}}ds\Big]=0.$$

Let $V_{k,k',l,A}(\eta) := \left|\eta^l(k) - \eta^l(k')\right| \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^l(k,k') \le A\}}$. Following the proof of Lemma 6.3, for fixed l, θ, N, k, k', in order to estimate $\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\int_0^T V_{k,k',l,A}(\eta_s)ds\Big]$, it suffices to bound

$$(\gamma N)^{-1}\lambda_{N,l} = \sup_f \Big\{E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[V_{k,k',l,A} f\right] - \gamma^{-1}N E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\right]\Big\}$$

where the supremum is over all f which are densities with respect to $\mathscr{R}_N$. To make use of spectral gap estimates established in Lemma 7.1, we will need to compare $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\right]$ with $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S_{k,k',l}\sqrt{f})\right]$, that is the Dirichlet form corresponding to S restricted on $\Lambda_{k,k',l}$ with an extra bond connecting $\Lambda_{k,l}$ and $\Lambda_{k',l}$. By a careful examination, we have, for some constant C, that $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S_{k,k',l}\sqrt{f})\right] \le C(1+\theta N)E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\right]$.

We may now resume the scheme of Lemma 6.3 and proceed until the end. Notice that for a successful application of Rayleigh estimate, we need to have that $E_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}}\left[V_{k,k',l,A}\right]$ vanishes where $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}$ is $\mathscr{R}_N$ conditioned on configurations with exactly j particles over $\Lambda_{k,k',l}$. In fact, by Lemma 7.1, $E_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}}\left[V_{k,k',l,A}\right] \le {C_0}^j E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\left[V_{k,k',l,A}\right]$. As ν_ρ is product measure with a common marginal independent of N, the term $E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\left[V_{k,k',l,A}\right]$ does not depend on N or θ. By adding and subtracting $\rho_{j,l} := j/(2(2l+1))$, we only need to bound $E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\left[\left|\eta^l(k) - \rho_{j,l}\right|\right]$. By an equivalence of ensemble estimate (cf. p. 355 [20]), we have $E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\left[\left|\eta^l(k) - \rho_{j,l}\right|^2\right] \le C(A)\mathrm{Var}_{\nu_{l,l}^{\rho_{j,l}}}\left(\eta^l(k)\right)$ (recall $\nu_{l,l}^{\rho}$ defined before Lemma 7.1). Note that the variance is of order $O(l^{-1})$ as the single site variance $\mathrm{Var}_{\nu_{l,l}^{\rho_{j,l}}}\left(\eta(k)\right)$ is uniformly bounded for $\rho_{j,l} \le A$. Hence, $E_{\nu_{l,l,j}}\left[V_{k,k',l,A}\right]$ is of order $O(l^{-1/2})$, finishing the proof. □

8. Tightness of limit measures

In this section, we obtain tightness of the family of probability measures $\left\{Q^N\right\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ on the trajectory space $D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$. We show that $\{Q^N\}$ is tight with respect to the uniform topology, stronger than the Skorokhod topology on $D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 8.1. *$\left\{Q^N\right\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact with respect to the uniform topology. As a consequence, all limit points Q are supported on weakly continuous trajectories π, that is for $G \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ we have $t \in [0,T] \mapsto \langle G, \pi_t\rangle$ is continuous.*

Proof. To deduce that $\{Q^N\}$ is relatively compact with respect to uniform topology, we show the following items (cf. p. 51 [20]).

(1) For each $t \in [0,T]$, $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_{t,\epsilon} \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\sup_N Q^N\left[\pi_\cdot^N : \pi_t^N \notin K_{t,\epsilon}\right] \le \epsilon. \tag{8.1}$$

(2) For every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{\gamma\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty} Q^N\Big[\pi_\cdot^N : \sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} d(\pi_t^N, \pi_s^N) > \epsilon\Big] = 0. \tag{8.2}$$

We now consider (8.1). Notice that, for any $A > 0$, the set $\{\mu \in \mathcal{M} : \langle 1, \mu\rangle \le A\}$ is compact in $\mathcal{M}$. Since the total number of particles is conserved, we have $Q^N\left[\langle 1, \pi_t^N\rangle > A\right] = Q^N\left[\langle 1, \pi_0^N\rangle > A\right] \le \frac{1}{A}\mathbb{E}_N\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N \eta_0(k)\right]$. By (3.1), we have $\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N \eta_0(k)\Big] \le C$ for some constant $C < \infty$ independent of N and A. Then, the first condition (8.1) is checked by taking A large.

To show the second condition (8.2), it is enough to show a counterpart of the condition for the distributions of $\langle G, \pi_\cdot^N \rangle$ where G is any smooth test function on $\mathbb{T}$ (cf. p. 54, [20]). In other words, we need to show, for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{\gamma \to 0} \lim_{N \to \infty} Q^N \Big[\pi_\cdot^N : \sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} \Big| \langle G, \pi_t^N \rangle - \langle G, \pi_s^N \rangle \Big| > \epsilon \Big] = 0. \tag{8.3}$$

To this end, notice that $\langle G, \pi_t^N \rangle = \langle G, \pi_0^N \rangle + \int_0^t N^2 L \langle G, \pi_s^N \rangle \, ds + M_t^{N,G}$, then we only need to consider the oscillations of $\int_0^t N^2 L \langle G, \pi_s^N \rangle \, ds$ and $M_t^{N,G}$ respectively.

Recall the generator computation (4.1) and the notation $D_{N,k}^{G,s}$ in (4.2). As g grows at most linearly and $D_{N,k}^{G,s}$ is bounded (cf. (4.3)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} \Big| \int_s^t N^2 L \langle G, \pi_\tau^N \rangle \, d\tau \Big| = \sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} \Big| \int_s^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \le k \le N} D_{N,k}^{G,s} g(\eta_\tau(k)) d\tau \Big| \\ &\le g^* C_G \sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} \int_s^t \Big\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \le k \le N} \eta_\tau(k) \Big\} d\tau = g^* C_G \gamma \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \le k \le N} \eta_0(k). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathbb{E}_N \Big[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \eta_0(k) \Big]$ is uniformly bounded in N. Then, by Markov inequality, we conclude that $Q^N \Big[\sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} \Big| \int_s^t N^2 L \langle G, \pi_\tau^N \rangle \, d\tau \Big| > \epsilon \Big]$ vanishes as $N \uparrow \infty$ and $\gamma \downarrow 0$.

We turn to the martingale $M_t^{N,G}$. By $\big| M_t^{N,G} - M_s^{N,G} \big| \le \big| M_t^{N,G} \big| + \big| M_s^{N,G} \big|$, we have $\mathbb{P}_N \big[\sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} \big| M_t^{N,G} - M_s^{N,G} \big| > \epsilon \big] \le 2 \mathbb{P}_N \big[\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \big| M_t^{N,G} \big| > \epsilon/2 \big]$. Using Chebyshev and Doob's inequality, we further bound it by

$$\frac{8}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_N \Big[\Big(\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \big| M_t^{N,G} \big| \Big)^2 \Big] \le \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_N \Big[\big(M_T^{N,G} \big)^2 \Big] = \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_N \langle M^{N,G} \rangle_T.$$

By Lemma 4.1, $\mathbb{E}_N \langle M^{N,G} \rangle_T = O(N^{-1})$. Then, we conclude

$$\lim_{\gamma \to 0} \lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_N \Big[\sup_{|t-s|<\gamma} \Big| M_t^{N,G} - M_s^{N,G} \Big| > \epsilon \Big] = 0. \qquad \square$$

9. Properties of limit measures.

By Lemma 8.1, the sequence $\{Q^N\}$ is relatively compact with respect to the uniform topology. Consider any convergent subsequence of Q^N and relabel so that $Q^N \Rightarrow Q$. We now consider absolute continuity and an energy estimate for trajectories under Q.

9.1. **Absolute continuity.** We now address absolute continuity and conservation of mass propoerties under Q.

Lemma 9.1. *Q is supported on absolutely continuous trajectories:*

$$Q \left[\pi_\cdot : \pi_t(dx) = \rho(t,x) dx \text{ for all } 0 \le t \le T \right] = 1.$$

Moreover, for all $0 \le t \le T$ we have $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho(t,x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho(0,x) dx$.

Proof. A standard proof, namely that of Lemma 1.6, p. 73, [20], shows the first statement. The second follows directly from the weak convergence of Q^N to Q and the conservation of mass $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(x) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_0(x)$. $\square$

9.2. **Energy estimate.** We now state an important 'energy estimate' for the paths on which Q is supported. We follow the framework presented in Section 5.7 of [20], however, there are major differences due to the inhomogeneous random environment. Previous bounds on the random environment developed in Section 2.1 will be useful in the argument.

Proposition 9.2. *Q is supported on paths $\rho(t,x)dx$ with the property that there exists an $L^1([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})$ function denoted by $\partial_x\Phi(\rho(s,x))$ such that*

$$\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\partial_x G(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds = -\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} G(s,x)\partial_x\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds$$

for all G smooth on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{T}$.

A main ingredient for the proof of Proposition 9.2 is the following lemma. For $\epsilon>0$, $\delta>0$, $H(\cdot)\in C^1(\mathbb{T})$ and $N\in\mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}W_N(\epsilon,\delta,H,\eta) &:= \sum_{1\le x\le N}\frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N}\left[\Phi\left(\eta^{\delta N}(x)\right)-\Phi\left(\eta^{\delta N}(x+\epsilon N)\right)\right]\\ &-\frac{4}{c^2N}\sum_{1\le x\le N}\frac{H^2(x/N)}{\epsilon N}\sum_{0\le k\le \epsilon N}\Phi\left(\eta^{\delta N}(x+k)\right)-\sum_{1\le x\le N}\frac{CH(x/N)}{cN}\Phi\left(\eta^{\delta N}(x)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Here, the constants c and C, as we recall from Lemma 2.3, come from the inequalities

$$0<c\le\min_k\phi_{k,N}\le\max_k\phi_{k,N}\le 1,\quad\text{and}\quad\max_k|\phi_{k,N}-\phi_{k+1,N}|\le\frac{C}{N}.$$

Lemma 9.3. *Let $\{H_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a dense sequence in $C^{0,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})$. Then, there exists constant K_0 such that for any $m\ge 1$, and $\epsilon>0$,*

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\max_{1\le j\le m}\Big\{\int_0^T W_N(\epsilon,\delta,H_j(s,\cdot),\eta_s)ds\Big\}\Big]\le K_0.$$

Before going to the proof of the lemma, we turn to Proposition 9.2.

Proof of Proposition 9.2. It follows from Lemma 9.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}E_Q\Big[\sup_{H\in C^{0,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})}\Big\{&\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\partial_x H(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds\\ &-\frac{4}{c^2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}H^2(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds-\frac{C}{c}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}H(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds\Big\}\Big]\le K_0,\end{aligned}$$

cf. p. 103, Lemma 7.2 in [20]. As a result, for Q-a.e. path $\rho(s,u)du$, there exists $B=B(\rho)$ such that, for all $H\in C^{0,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\partial_x H(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds-\frac{4}{c^2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}H^2(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds&\\ -\frac{C}{c}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}H(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds\le B,&\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} H(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds \leq& \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} H^2(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds\\ \leq& \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} H^2(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds + \frac{g^*}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\rho(s,x)dxds\\ =& \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} H^2(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds + \frac{g^*T}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}}\rho(0,x)dx.\end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\partial_x H(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds - C'\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} H^2(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds \leq B'.$$

where $C' = \frac{4}{c^2} + \frac{C}{2c}$ and $B' = \frac{Cg^*T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\rho(0,x)dx}{2c} + B$. Now, the proof follows exactly from proof of Theorem 7.1, p. 105, [20]. □

We now return to the proof of Lemma 9.3.

Proof of Lemma 9.3. By the replacement lemma (Lemma 5.1, and notice that $D^{G,t}_{N,k}$ can be replaced by any bounded function), it suffices to show that there exists constant K_0 such that for any $m \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\Big\{\int_0^T \tilde{W}_N(\epsilon, H_j(s,\cdot),\eta_s)ds\Big\}\Big] \leq K_0 \tag{9.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{W}_N(\epsilon, H(\cdot),\eta) :=& \sum_{1\leq x\leq N}\frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N}\left(g(\eta(x)) - g(\eta(x+\epsilon N))\right)\\ -& \frac{4}{c^2N}\sum_{1\leq x\leq N}\frac{H^2(x/N)}{\epsilon N}\sum_{0\leq k\leq \epsilon N} g(\eta(x+k)) - \sum_{1\leq x\leq N}\frac{CH(x/N)}{cN}g(\eta(x)).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta) := \mathbb{1}_{\sum_{k=1}^N \eta(k)\leq AN}$. Define $W_{A,N}(\epsilon, H(\cdot),\eta) := \tilde{W}_N(\epsilon, H(\cdot),\eta)\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)$.

As in the beginning of proof of the 1-block estimate, stated in Lemma 6.3, where we cut off high densities, assertion (9.1) holds provided we prove that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_N\Big[\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\Big\{\int_0^T W_{A,N}(\epsilon, H_j(s,\cdot),\eta_s)ds\Big\}\Big] \leq K_0. \tag{9.2}$$

To this end, by the entropy inequality, the expectation in (9.2) is bounded from above by

$$\frac{1}{N}H(\mu^N|\mathscr{R}_N) + \frac{1}{N}\ln\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\exp\Big\{\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\Big\{N\int_0^T W_{A,N}(\epsilon, H_j(s,\cdot),\eta_s)ds\Big\}\Big\}\Big].$$

Since the relative entropy $H(\mu^N|\mathscr{R}_N) \leq C_0N$, we obtain the left hand side of (9.2) is bounded from above by

$$C_0 + \max_{1\leq j\leq m}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\ln\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\exp\Big\{N\int_0^T W_{A,N}(\epsilon, H_j(s,\cdot),\eta_s)ds\Big\}\Big].$$

By Feynman-Kac formula, for any fixed index j, the limsup term in previous expression is bounded from above by

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\int_0^T\sup_f\Big\{E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[W_{A,N}(\epsilon, H_j(s,\cdot),\eta)f(\eta)\right] - NE_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\Big]\Big\}ds$$

where the supremum is over all f which are densities with respect to $\mathscr{R}_N$. As $c \le \min_k \phi_{k,N}$ and, by Lemma 2.1, q_k^N is bounded, the Dirichlet form $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\Big]$ is estimated as

$$\sum_{1\le x\le N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\frac{1}{2}\Big(\phi_{x,N}\big(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{q_x^N}{\sqrt{N}}\big)+\phi_{x+1,N}\big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{q_{x+1}^N}{\sqrt{N}}\big)\Big)\big(\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_x)}-\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+1})}\big)^2\Big]$$
$$\ge \sum_{1\le x\le N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\frac{c}{4}\big(\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_x)}-\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+1})}\big)^2\Big]. \tag{9.3}$$

Here, we used, for each x, $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}[g(\eta(x))f(\eta)] = E_{\mathscr{R}_N}[\phi_{x,N} f(\eta+\delta_x)]$, where δ_x stands for the configuration with the only particle at x; $\eta+\delta_x$ is the configuration obtaining from adding one particle at x to η.

It now remains to show, for all H in $C^{0,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})$, that

$$E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[W_{A,N}(\epsilon, H(s,\cdot),\eta) f(\eta)\right] - N E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\Big] \le 0. \tag{9.4}$$

We first compute that $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[W_{A,N}(\epsilon, H(s,\cdot),\eta) f(\eta)\right]$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{1\le x\le N}\frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N}(g(\eta(x))-g(\eta(x+\epsilon N)))\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta) f(\eta)\Big] \\ &-\frac{4}{c^2 N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{1\le x\le N}\frac{H^2(x/N)}{\epsilon N}\sum_{0\le k\le \epsilon N} g(\eta(x+k))\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)\Big] \\ &-E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{1\le x\le N}\frac{CH(x/N)}{cN} g(\eta(x))\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.5}$$

Notice that $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}[g(\eta(x))\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)f(\eta)]$ may be written as

$$E_{\mathscr{R}_N}[\phi_{x,N}\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta+\delta_x)f(\eta+\delta_x)] = E_{\mathscr{R}_N}[\phi_{x,N}\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)f(\eta+\delta_x)].$$

Then, the first expectation in (9.5) is written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{x=1}^N \frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\big(\phi_{x,N} f(\eta+\delta_x) - \phi_{x+\epsilon N,N} f(\eta+\delta_{x+\epsilon N})\big)\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\Big] \\ &\le \sum_{x=1}^N \frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\big(f(\eta+\delta_x)(\phi_{x,N}-\phi_{x+\epsilon N,N})\big)\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\Big] \\ &\quad + \sum_{x=1}^N \frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\big(\phi_{x+\epsilon N,N}(f(\eta+\delta_x)-f(\eta+\delta_{x+\epsilon N}))\big)\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.6}$$

Using that $0 < c \le \min_{1\le k\le N}\phi_{k,N} \le \max_k \phi_{k,N} \le 1$ and $\max_{1\le k\le N}|\phi_{k,N}-\phi_{k+1,N}| \le CN^{-1}$, the first sum in the right hand side of the inequality (9.6) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{x=1}^N \frac{H(x/N)}{N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[f(\eta+\delta_x)\frac{|\phi_{x,N}-\phi_{x+\epsilon N,N}|}{\epsilon}\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\Big] \\ &\le \sum_{x=1}^N \frac{CH(x/N)}{N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\big[f(\eta+\delta_x)\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\big] \\ &= \sum_{x=1}^N \frac{CH(x/N)}{N\phi_{x,N}} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\big[g(\eta(x))\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)f(\eta)\big] \;\le\; \sum_{x=1}^N \frac{CH(x/N)}{cN} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\big[g(\eta(x))\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)f(\eta)\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.7}$$

Now, we proceed to the second sum in the right hand side of (9.6). Using $0 < c \le \min_k \phi_{k,N} \le \max_k \phi_{k,N} \le 1$, the sum is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{x=1}^{N} \frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\big(f(\eta+\delta_x) - f(\eta+\delta_{x+\epsilon N})\big)\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\Big]$$

which is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{x=1}^{N}\sum_{k=0}^{\epsilon N-1} \frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N}\big(f(\eta+\delta_{x+k}) - f(\eta+\delta_{x+k+1})\big)\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\Big] \\ =&E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{x=1}^{N}\sum_{k=0}^{\epsilon N-1} \frac{H(x/N)}{\epsilon N}\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\big(\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k})} + \sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k+1})}\big) \\ &\qquad\qquad \times \big(\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k})} - \sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k+1})}\big)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.8}$$

Using $2ab \le a^2 + b^2$, for any $\beta > 0$, (9.8) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{x=1}^{N}\sum_{k=0}^{\epsilon N-1} \frac{H^2(x/N)}{2\epsilon N\beta}\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\big(\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k})} + \sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k+1})}\big)^2\Big] \\ &\qquad + E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{x=1}^{N}\sum_{k=0}^{\epsilon N-1} \frac{\beta}{2\epsilon N}\big(\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k})} - \sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+k+1})}\big)^2\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.9}$$

The first expectation in (9.9) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{x=1}^{N}\sum_{k=0}^{\epsilon N-1} \frac{H^2(x/N)}{2\epsilon N\beta} 2\big(f(\eta+\delta_{x+k}) + f(\eta+\delta_{x+k+1})\big)\mathbb{1}_{A-1/N,N}(\eta)\Big] \\ =&\sum_{x=1}^{N} \frac{H^2(x/N)}{\epsilon N\beta}\sum_{k=0}^{\epsilon N-1} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\Big(\frac{g(x+k)}{\phi_{x+k,N}} + \frac{g(x+k+1)}{\phi_{x+k+1,N}}\Big)\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)f(\eta)\Big] \\ \le&\sum_{x=1}^{N} \frac{2H^2(x/N)}{c\epsilon N\beta}\sum_{k=0}^{\epsilon N} E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[g(x+k)\mathbb{1}_{A,N}(\eta)f(\eta)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.10}$$

The second expectation in (9.9) is rewritten and bounded, noting (9.3), as

$$E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sum_{x=1}^{N}\frac{\beta}{2}\big(\sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_x)} - \sqrt{f(\eta+\delta_{x+1})}\big)^2\Big] \le \frac{2\beta}{c}E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\Big[\sqrt{f}(-S\sqrt{f})\Big].$$

Now, we set $\beta = cN/2$. Putting together (9.5), (9.7), and (9.10), we obtain (9.4). □

10. Uniqueness of Weak Solutions

In this section, we present results on uniqueness of weak solutions to the PDE

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\rho(t,x) = \partial_{xx}\Phi(\rho(t,x)) + \partial_x\left(\alpha(x)\Phi(\rho(t,x))\right), \quad x\in\mathbb{T}, t\ge 0 \\ \rho(0,x) = \rho_0(x) \end{cases} \tag{10.1}$$

where $\Phi(\cdot) \in C^1[0,\infty)$ satisfies $0 \le \Phi'(\cdot) \le C_g$ (cf. below (2.6)); $|\alpha(x)| < A$ for some constant $A < \infty$. and ρ_0 is nonnegative and belongs to the class $L^1(\mathbb{T})$.

Definition 10.1. *We say $\rho(t,x) : [0,T]\times\mathbb{T} \mapsto [0,\infty)$ is a weak solution to* (10.1) *if*

(1) $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho(t,x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho_0(x)dx$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$.
(2) $\rho(t,\cdot)$ *is weakly continuous, that is, for all* $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$, $\int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x)\rho(t,x)dx$ *is a continuous function in* t.
(3) *There exists an* $L^1([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})$ *function denoted by* $\partial_x\Phi(\rho(s,x))$ *such that for all* $G(s,x) \in C^{0,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T})$

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x G(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds = -\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(s,x)\partial_x\Phi(\rho(s,x))dxds. \tag{10.2}$$

(4) *For all* $G(s,x) \in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T})$

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_s G(s,x)\rho(s,x)dxds + \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(0,x)\rho_0(x)dx$$
$$= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left[-\partial_{xx}G(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x)) + \partial_x G(s,x)(\alpha(x)\Phi(\rho(s,x)))\right] dxds.$$

Proposition 10.2. *There exists at most one weak solution to* (10.1).

Proof. Since $\partial_x\Phi(\rho(s,x))$ exists, for all $G(s,x) \in C_c^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{T})$, we have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_s G(s,x)\rho(s,x)dxds = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x G(s,x)\left[\partial_x\Phi(\rho(s,x)) + \alpha(x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))\right] dxds. \tag{10.3}$$

Define $\varphi(s,x) = \int_0^x \rho(s,u)du$. For any $G(s,x) \in C_c^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{T})$, let

$$F(s,x) := \int_0^x G(s,x)dx - x\int_{\mathbb{T}} G(s,x)dx.$$

Note that $F(s,x)$ is also in the space $C_c^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{T})$. Therefore we may apply (10.3) for $F(s,x)$. The left hand side, after integration by parts, becomes

$$\int_0^T \left[\partial_s F(s,x)\varphi(s,x)\right]\big|_0^1 ds - \int_0^T \int_0^1 \partial_s\Big(G(s,x) - \int_0^1 G(s,x)dx\Big)\varphi(s,x)dxds. \tag{10.4}$$

The term $\int_0^T \left[\partial_s F(s,x)\varphi(s,x)\right]\big|_0^1 ds$ vanishes as the total mass $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho(s,x)dx$ is conserved. Then, (10.4) can be rewritten as

$$-\int_0^T \int_0^1 \partial_s\Big(G(s,x) - \int_0^1 G(s,x)dx\Big)\varphi(s,x)dxds$$
$$= -\int_0^T \int_0^1 \partial_s G(s,x)\Big(\varphi(s,x) - \int_0^1 \varphi(s,x)dx\Big)dxds.$$

Define $\phi(s,x) = \varphi(s,x) - \int_0^1 \varphi(s,x)dx$. We now have

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \partial_s G(s,x)\phi(s,x)dxds. = -\int_0^T \int_0^1 G(s,x)h(s,x)dxds \tag{10.5}$$

where

$$h(s,x) = \partial_x\Phi(\rho(s,x)) + \alpha(x)\Phi(\rho(s,x)) - \int_0^1 \alpha(x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))dx.$$

By straightforward approximation, we obtain from (10.5), for any $G(\cdot) \in C_c^\infty(0,T)$ and $q(\cdot) \in L^\infty[0,1]$,

$$\int_0^T \partial_s G(s)\Big[\int_0^1 q(x)\phi(s,x)dx\Big]ds. = -\int_0^T G(s)\Big[\int_0^1 q(x)h(s,x)dx\Big]ds \tag{10.6}$$

As $\phi(s,\cdot)$ and $h(s,\cdot)$ are both in $L^1\big([0,T];L^1(\mathbb{T})\big)$, (10.6) implies that $\frac{d}{ds}\phi(s,\cdot)$, the weak derivative of $\phi(s,\cdot)$, exists and $\frac{d}{ds}\phi(s,\cdot)=h(s,\cdot)$. Moreover, in terms of the Bochner integral (cf. [5][p. 302]),

$$\phi(t,\cdot)=\int_0^t \frac{d}{ds}\phi(s,\cdot)ds+\phi(0,\cdot). \tag{10.7}$$

Now, assume there are two solutions ρ_1,ρ_2 and therefore ϕ_1,ϕ_2. If we show that $\phi_1=\phi_2$, then it follows $\varphi_1(s,x)-\varphi_2(s,x)=\int_0^1\varphi_1(s,u)-\varphi_2(s,u)du$ for all s,x. By conservation of mass, it holds $\varphi_1(s,1)-\varphi_2(s,1)=0$ for all s. Then, we conclude $\varphi_1=\varphi_2$, hence, $\rho_1=\rho_2$ a.e..

To this end, let $\overline{\phi}=\phi_1-\phi_2$ and $\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}=\Phi(\rho_1(s,x))-\Phi(\rho_2(s,x))$. Therefore, by Lemma 10.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1\big(\overline{\phi}(t,x)\big)^2dx-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1\big(\overline{\phi}(0,x)\big)^2dx\\ =&\int_0^t\int_0^1\overline{\phi}(s,x)\left[\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}+\alpha(x)\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}\right]dxds-\int_0^t\int_0^1\overline{\phi}(s,x)\left[\int_0^1\alpha(u)\overline{\Phi}_{s,u}du\right]dxds.\end{aligned} \tag{10.8}$$

Notice, from Lemma 10.4, that

$$\int_0^t\int_0^1\overline{\phi}(s,x)\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds=-\int_0^t\int_0^1\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds=-\int_0^t\int_0^1(\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x))^2\Phi'_{s,x}dxds.$$

Here, we have applied the mean value theorem so that $\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}=\Phi'_{s,x}\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)$.

Let A be such that $|\alpha(x)|\le A<\infty$. Note that $\Phi(\cdot)$ is an increasing function and $0<\Phi'(\cdot)\le C_g$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t\int_0^1\overline{\phi}(s,x)\alpha(x)\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds\ \le\ \int_0^t\int_0^1 A\left|\overline{\phi}(s,x)\right|\left|\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\right|\Phi'_{s,x}dxds\\ \le&\int_0^t\int_0^1\Big[\frac{A^2}{2}\big(\overline{\phi}(s,x)\big)^2\Phi'_{s,x}+\frac{1}{2}\big(\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\big)^2\Phi'_{s,x}\Big]dxds\\ \le&\frac{A^2C_g}{2}\int_0^t\int_0^1\big(\overline{\phi}(s,x)\big)^2dxds+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_0^1\big(\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\big)^2\Phi'_{s,x}dxds.\end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}&-\int_0^t\int_0^1\overline{\phi}(s,x)\left[\int_0^1\alpha(u)\overline{\Phi}_{s,u}du\right]dxds\\ \le&A\sqrt{C_g}\int_0^t\left(\int_0^1\left|\overline{\phi}(s,x)\right|dx\right)\cdot\left(\int_0^1\left|\sqrt{\Phi'_{s,x}}\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\right|dx\right)ds\\ \le&\frac{A^2C_g}{2}\int_0^t\left(\int_0^1\left|\overline{\phi}(s,x)\right|dx\right)^2ds+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\left(\int_0^1\left|\sqrt{\Phi'_{s,x}}\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\right|dx\right)^2ds\\ \le&\frac{A^2C_g}{2}\int_0^t\int_0^1\big(\overline{\phi}(s,x)\big)^2dxds+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_0^1\Phi'_{s,x}\big(\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\big)^2dxds.\end{aligned}$$

Putting together the above, from equation (10.8), we get

$$\int_0^1\big(\overline{\phi}(t,x)\big)^2dx-\int_0^1\big(\overline{\phi}(0,x)\big)^2dx\le 2A^2C_g\int_0^t\int_0^1\big(\overline{\phi}(s,x)\big)^2dxds.$$

Notice that $\overline{\phi}(0,x)=0$. The desired result now follows from Gronwall's inequality. □

Lemma 10.3. *Let* $\overline{h}(s,\cdot) := \dfrac{d}{ds}\overline{\phi}(s,\cdot)$. *We have*

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \big(\overline{\phi}(t,x)\big)^2\,dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \big(\overline{\phi}(0,x)\big)^2\,dx = \int_0^t\int_0^1 \overline{\phi}(s,x)\overline{h}(s,x)dxds.$$

Proof. For each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, let $t_{k,n} = \dfrac{kt}{n}$, $k=0,1,\dots,n-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \Big[\big(\overline{\phi}(t,x)\big)^2 - \big(\overline{\phi}(0,x)\big)^2\Big]dx \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\Big[\big(\overline{\phi}(t_{k+1,n},x)\big)^2 - \big(\overline{\phi}(t_{k,n},x)\big)^2\Big]dx\\
&=\int_0^1\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\Big[\frac{\overline{\phi}(t_{k+1,n},x)+\overline{\phi}(t_{k,n},x)}{2}\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\overline{h}(s,x)ds\Big]dx\\
&=\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\int_0^1 \frac{\overline{\phi}(t_{k+1,n},x)+\overline{\phi}(t_{k,n},x)}{2}\overline{h}(s,x)dxds
\end{aligned}$$

Define $\overline{\phi}_n(s,x) := \dfrac{\overline{\phi}(t_{k+1,n},x)+\overline{\phi}(t_{k,n},x)}{2}$ if $s\in[t_{k,n},t_{k+1,n})$. Then, by weak continuity of $\rho(t,x)$, we have that $\overline{\phi}_n(s,x)$ converges a.e. to $\overline{\phi}(s,x)$ on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{T}$. By dominated convergence, noting that $\overline{h}(s,x)$ belongs to $L^1([0,T],L^1(\mathbb{T}))$, we have, as $n\uparrow\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \Big[\big(\overline{\phi}(t,x)\big)^2 - \big(\overline{\phi}(0,x)\big)^2\Big]dx &= \int_0^t\int_0^1 \overline{\phi}_n(s,x)\overline{h}(s,x)dxds\\
&\to \int_0^t\int_0^1 \overline{\phi}(s,x)\overline{h}(s,x)dxds.
\end{aligned}\tag{10.9}$$

Since the left hand side of (10.9) is independent of n, the lemma is proved. □

Lemma 10.4. *We have* $\displaystyle\int_0^t\int_0^1 \overline{\phi}(s,x)\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds = -\int_0^t\int_0^1 \partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds.$

Proof. We first extend the class of test functions in (10.2). Assume that $F:[0,T]\times[0,1]\mapsto\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following: (1) F is measurable; (2) for any fixed s, $F(s,\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous; (3) there is a constant $C<\infty$ such that $|\partial_x F(s,x)|\le C$ for almost all s,x; (4) $\int_0^1\partial_x F(s,x)dx = 0$ for all s.

Let $\tau_\epsilon(x)$ be the standard mollifier supported on $[-\epsilon,\epsilon]$. Define

$$F_\epsilon(s,x) = \int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} F(s,u)\tau_\epsilon(x-u)\tau_\epsilon(s-q)dudq$$

with F extended to be 0 for $s\notin[0,T]$. By (10.2),

$$\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} F_\epsilon(s,x)\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds = -\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\partial_x F_\epsilon(s,x)\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds.$$

Taking $\epsilon\to 0$, as $\partial_x F$ (and therefore F) is bounded and $\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}$ is integrable, dominated convergence gives

$$\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}} F(s,x)\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds = -\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\partial_x F(s,x)\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds.\tag{10.10}$$

We now extend the admissible test functions further from F to $\overline{\phi}$ as claimed in the lemma. Introduce a truncation on $\partial_x\overline{\phi}$:

$$(\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u} = \begin{cases} \partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,u) & -A \le \partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,u) \le A \\ A & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Apply (10.10) with $F(s,x) = \big[\int_0^x (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du - x\int_0^1 (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du\big]\mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(s)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t\int_0^1 \Big[\int_0^x (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du - x\int_0^1 (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du\Big]\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds \\ &= -\int_0^t\int_0^1 \Big[(\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,x} - \int_0^1 (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du\Big]\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds.\end{aligned}$$

As $|(\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,x}| \le |\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)| = |\rho_1(s,u) - \rho_2(s,u)|$, by conservation of mass, and that $\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}$ is integrable, we have by dominated convergence that

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{A\to\infty}\int_0^t\int_0^1 \Big[\int_0^x (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du - x\int_0^1 (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du\Big]\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds \\ &= \int_0^t\int_0^1 \Big[\int_0^x \partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,u)du - x\int_0^1 \partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,u)du\Big]\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds = \int_0^t\int_0^1 \overline{\phi}(s,x)\partial_x\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds.\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used $\int_0^1 \partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,u)du = \int_0^1(\rho_1(s,u) - \rho_2(s,u))du = 0$. Similarly,

$$\lim_{A\to\infty}\int_0^t\int_0^1 \Big[\int_0^1 (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,u}du\Big]\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds = 0.$$

Finally, notice that $(\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,x}\overline{\Phi}_{s,x} = (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,x}\partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\Phi'_{s,x}$ increases in A since $\Phi'_{s,x} \ge 0$ (cf. (2.6)). By monotone convergence, we have

$$\lim_{A\to\infty}\int_0^t\int_0^1 (\partial_x\overline{\phi})_{A,s,x}\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds = \int_0^t\int_0^1 \partial_x\overline{\phi}(s,x)\overline{\Phi}_{s,x}dxds,$$

finishing the proof. □

Acknowledgements. C.L. has been partly supported by FAPERJ CNE E-26/201.207/2014, by CNPq Bolsa de Produtividade em Pesquisa PQ 303538/2014-7, by ANR-15-CE40-0020-01 LSD of the French National Research Agency. S.S. was partly supported by ARO-W911NF-18-1-0311 and a Simons Foundations Sabbatical grant.

References

[1] Andjel, E.: *Invariant measures for the zero range processes.* Ann. Probab. 10 (1982), no. 3, 525–547.
[2] Andriopoulos, G.: *Invariance principles for random walks in random environment on trees.* (2018), arXiv:1812.10197v1
[3] Brox, T.: *A one-dimensional diffusion process in a Wiener medium.*. Ann. Probab. 14, (1986), 1206–1218.
[4] DeMasi, A.; Presutti, E.: *Mathematical methods for hydrodynamic limits.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1501**, (1991), Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
[5] Evans, L.: *Partial differential equations.* Second edition. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **19**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (2010).
[6] Faggionato, A.: *Bulk diffusion of 1D exclusion process with bond disorder.* Markov Processes and Related Fields, 13, (2007), 519–542.
[7] Faggionato, A.: *Random walks and exclusion processes among random conductances on random infinite clusters: homogenization and hydrodynamic limit.* Elec. J. Probab. 13, (2008), 2217–2247.
[8] Faggionato, A.; Jara, M.; Landim, C.: *Hydrodynamic behavior of 1D subdiffusive exclusion processes with random conductances.* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, 144, (2009), 633–667.

[9] Fatkullin, I.; Sethuraman, S.; Xue, J.: *On hydrodynamic limits of Young diagrams.* Elec. J. Probab. **25**, (2020), no. 58, 1–44.
[10] Funaki, T.; Hoshino, M.; Sethuraman, S.; Xie, B.: *Asymptotics of PDE in random environment by paracontrolled calculus.* (2020), arXiv:2005.03326
[11] Golosov, A.O.: *On limiting distribution for a random walk in a critical one-dimensional random environment.* Russian Math. Surveys 41, (1986), 199-200.
[12] Goncalves, P.; Jara, M.: *Scaling limits for gradient systems in random environment.* J. Stat. Phys. 131, (2008), 69–716.
[13] Hu, Y.; Le, K.; Mytnik, L.: *Stochastic differential equation for Brox diffusion.* Stoch. Proc. Appl. 127, (2017), 2281–2315.
[14] Jara, M.; Landim, C.: *Nonequilibrium central limit theorem for a tagged particle in symmetric simple exclusion.* Ann. I. H. Poincaré Probab. Stat., 42, (2006), 567–577.
[15] Jara, M. D.; Landim, C.; Sethuraman, S.: *Nonequilibrium fluctuations for a tagged particle in mean-zero one-dimensional zero-range processes.* Probab. Theory Related Fields 145 (2009), no. 3–4, 565–590.
[16] Jara, M. D.; Landim, C.; Sethuraman, S.: *Nonequilibrium fluctuations for a tagged particle in one dimensional sublinear rate zero-range processes.* Ann. IHP Prob. Stat. 49, (2013), 611-637.
[17] Jara, M.; Landim, C.; Teixeira, A.: *Quenched scaling limits of trap models.* Ann. Probab. 39, (2011), 176–223.
[18] Jara, M.; Peterson, J.: *Hydrodynamic limit for a system of independent, sub-ballistic random walks in a common random environment.* Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., 53, (2017), 1747–1792.
[19] Kesten, H. *The limit distribution of Sinai's random walk in random environment.* Phys. A 138, (1986), 299-309.
[20] Kipnis, C.; Landim, C.: *Scaling limits of interacting particle systems.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 320. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1999).
[21] Landim, C.; Sethuraman, S.; Varadhan, S.: *Spectral gap for zero-range dynamics.* Ann. Probab. 24 (1996), no. 4, 1871–1902.
[22] Liggett, T.M.: *Interacting particle systems.* Springer-Verlag, New York, (1985).
[23] Matzavinos, A.; Roitershtein, A.; Seol, Y.: *Random walks in a sparse random environment.* Elec. J. Probab. 21, (2016), 1-20.
[24] Nagy, K.: *Symmetric random walk in random environment.* Period. Math. Ung. 45, (2002), 101–120.
[25] Pacheco, C.G.: *From the Sinai's walk to the Brox diffusion using bilinear forms.* (2018), arXiv:1605.02826v1
[26] Peterson, J.: *Systems of one-dimensional random walks in a common random environment.* Elec. J. Probab. 15, (2010), 1024–1040.
[27] Seignourel, P. *Discrete schemes for processes in random medium* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 118, (2000), 293–322.
[28] Sinai, Y. : *The limit behavior of a one-dimensional random walk* Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen. 27 (1982), 247–258.
[29] Zeitouni, O.: *Random walks in random environment.* XXXI Summer School in Probability (St. Flour, 2001), Lecture Notes in Math. 1837, Springer, (2004), 193–312.
[30] Zeitouni, O.: *Random walks in random environments.* J. Phys. A, 39, (2006), R433–R464.

IMPA, Estrada Dona Castorina 110, J. Botanico, 22460 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; CNRS UPRES A 6085, Université de Rouen, 76128 Mont Saint Aignan Cedex, France
E-mail address: landim@impa.br

Department of Mathematics, CINVESTAV-IPN, Av. IPN 2508, CP. 07360, Mexico City, Mexico
E-mail address: cpacheco@math.cinevistav.mx

Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA
E-mail address: sethuram@math.arizona.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721,USA
E-mail address: jxue@math.arizona.edu