

# Weighted heat kernel estimates: rate of convergence in Kolmogorov distance

Anderson M. Hernandez\*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dipartimento di Matematica “F. Casorati”, Università di Pavia

August 5, 2020

## Abstract

This paper is concerned about random walks on random environments in the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . This model is analyzed through ergodicity in the form of the logarithmic Sobolev inequality. We assume that the environments are random variables being independent and identically distributed. Here, we give heat kernel estimates for non-diagonal random matrices leading in dimension  $d \geq 3$  a Berry-Esseen upper bound with a rate of convergence  $t^{-\frac{1}{10}}$ .

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	The model . . . . .	2
1.2	Notation . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Setting and main results</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Assumptions . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Auxiliary results</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Pathwise gradient upper bounds . . . . .	18
3.2	Growth of correctors . . . . .	32

## 1 Introduction

Stochastic homogenization deals with the derivation of effective, macroscopic models for problems that involve different length-scales. Typical examples are models for microstructured materials that give rise to partial differential equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients. The first qualitative results in stochastic homogenization were motivated by physical problems which were about the determination of the macroscopic behavior of heterogeneities of composite materials [14, 13, 21, 30, 26, 28]. Most of these results discuss problems with periodic coefficients, and specific analytical tools for periodic homogenization are developed, including for instance the notions of two-scale convergence,  $\Gamma$ -convergence, and unfolding operators [1, 11, 12, 20]. In the last years considerable interest in applied Mathematics emerged in understanding a quantitative theory of stochastic homogenization. Although the first results for stochastic coefficients are known, see [14, 29, 27], the theory of quantitative stochastic homogenization is a recent topic of great interest in literature [5, 6, 8, 7, 15, 17]. In [18], Gloria, Neukamm and Otto considered the elliptic operator  $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) \nabla$  with random, uniformly elliptic coefficients  $\mathbf{a}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and studied the rate of convergence towards the homogenized

\*anderson.melchorhernand01@universitadipavia.it

operator  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} \nabla$  where  $\mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}}$  is a constant matrix. Closely related to the topic of stochastic homogenization is the derivation of invariance principles for Markovian processes driven by operators with oscillating coefficients. Roughly speaking, an invariance principle for a Markov process  $X$  with infinitesimal generator given by  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) \nabla$  states that the scaling limit of  $X$  narrow converges to a Brownian motion with a non-random covariance matrix. The aim of this work is to derive a quantitative central limit theorem for the Markovian process with generator governed by non-diagonal degenerate random coefficient fields. In particular, we are interested in higher integrability and decay estimates for the well-known corrector problem of homogenization. Quantitative central limit theorems are known as Berry-Esseen estimates, and for a detailed exposition we refer to [25]. In the present work, our analysis make use of weighted heat kernel inequalities and ergodicity in the form of logarithmic Sobolev inequalities used in quantitative stochastic homogenization.

## 1.1 The model

Let  $d > 2$ . The starting point is the evolution equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}u(t) + D^* \mathbf{a}(0) Du(t) = 0, \quad (1)$$

which is drive-by a finite-difference operator for the real-valued function  $u(t)$ . This equation is related to the finite-difference equation

$$\nabla^* \mathbf{a}(x) \nabla \phi = -\nabla^* (\mathbf{a}(x) \xi) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (2)$$

which in literature is called corrector equation and a non-trivial solution  $\phi$  is called corrector along  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The symbols  $D$  and  $D^*$  denote the discrete finite-difference gradient and the negative divergence in probability spaces, while  $\nabla$  and  $\nabla^*$  the corresponding discrete gradient and negative divergence on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , see subsection 1.2 for a precise definition. We study the conductance model defined as follows. For any fixed map  $\mathbf{a} : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  it is a reversible continuous Markov chain,  $X = \{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ , on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with generator  $-\nabla^* \mathbf{a}(\cdot) \nabla$  acting on bounded functions  $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We denote by  $P_x^{\mathbf{a}}$  the law of the process starting at the vertex  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and by  $E_x^{\mathbf{a}}$  the corresponding expectation. This random walk waits at  $x$  an exponential time with mean  $\frac{1}{\sum_{ij} \mathbf{a}_{ij}(x)}$  and chooses the vertex  $x \pm e_i$  with probability

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}(x)}{\sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}(x)}.$$

Since the law of the waiting times does depend on the location,  $X$  is also called the variable speed random walk. Recently, the following invariance principle has been proved for random walks drive-by ergodic coefficients. For our purpose, we consider the following probability space  $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ :

**Definition 1.1.** *We define  $\Omega$  as*

$$\Omega := \{\mathbf{a} : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \mathbf{a}(x) \text{ is symmetric for any } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \quad (3)$$

*such that for any pair of positive numbers  $(p, q)$  such that  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{2}{d-1}$ , one has*

$$\left\langle \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}^p(0) + \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{-q}(0) \right\rangle < \infty \quad (4)$$

where we write  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  for the expectation value with respect the probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ .

**Definition 1.2.** *Let us consider the family  $\tau_x : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \mathbf{a}(\cdot + x)$  which is a group of space shifts operators, i.e.*

- (a)  $\tau_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is the identical map,
- (b)  $\tau_{x+y} = \tau_x \circ \tau_y$  for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

We say that  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is stationary if for all  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  the coefficient fields  $\{\mathbb{Z}^d \ni x \mapsto \mathbf{a}(x)\}$  and  $\{\mathbb{Z}^d \ni x \mapsto \mathbf{a}(x+z)\}$  have the same joint distribution, i.e.  $\mathbb{P} \circ \tau_x = \mathbb{P}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . We say that  $\mathbb{P}$  is ergodic, if  $\mathbb{P}(A) \in \{0, 1\}$  for any measurable set, such that  $\tau_x(A) = A$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

**Theorem 1.3** ([9, Theorem 1]). *Suppose that  $\mathbb{P}$  is stationary and ergodic, and that for exponents  $p, q \in (1, \infty)$  satisfying  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{2}{d-1}$  the moment condition*

$$\left\langle \sum_{ij} \mathbf{a}_{ij}(0)^p + \mathbf{a}_{ij}(0)^{-q} \right\rangle < \infty \quad (5)$$

holds. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $X_t^{(n)} := \frac{1}{n} X_{n^2 t}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ . Then, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $X^{(n)}$  converges in law towards a Brownian motion on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with a non-degenerate covariance matrix  $\sigma^2$ .

In this paper, we aim to derive the existence of a stationary solution of equation (2) establishing a quantitative central limit theorem for the Markov process  $X$ . Our main results are presented in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. Let us briefly discuss them already here. Let  $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be fixed and set

$$\sigma_l^2 := l \cdot \sigma^2 l,$$

where  $\sigma^2$  is still the covariance matrix in Theorem 1.3. Then, this invariance principle yields for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\mathbf{a}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \uparrow \infty} P_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left( l \cdot X_t \leq \sigma_l x \sqrt{t} \right) &= \Phi(x), \quad \text{where} \\ \Phi(x) &= (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{-\infty}^x \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{2}\right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

denotes the distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Since the existence of a stationary solution of equation (2) requires quantification of ergodicity in form of spectral gaps (see [10]), we suppose that  $\mathbb{P}$  satisfies the following logarithmic Sobolev inequality.

**Definition 1.4.** *We say that  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant  $\rho > 0$  if for any  $\xi \in C_b(\Omega)$  we have*

$$\left\langle \xi^2 \log \frac{\xi^2}{\langle |\xi|^2 \rangle} \right\rangle \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^2 \right\rangle. \quad (7)$$

In the sequel, we denote by  $C_b(\Omega)$  the space of continuous and bounded functions, and the oscillation  $\text{Osc} \xi$  of a function  $\xi \in C_b(\Omega)$  is defined by taking the oscillation over all  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) &:= \sup \{ \xi(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}) : \tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \Omega, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(y) - \mathbf{a}(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \neq y, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \} \\ &\quad - \inf \{ \xi(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}) : \tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \Omega, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(y) - \mathbf{a}(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \neq y, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \}. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality in (7) replaces the usual Poincaré inequality in the finite-dimensional spaces and it is convenient since on the right-hand side it does not require regularity properties on random variables. The first result concerns with moment bounds of the solution of equation (1) which are new in the case of non-diagonal degenerate random matrices. Under the assumption of stationarity, the moment condition (4), and ergodicity in the form of (7), we have that there exists  $1 \leq p_0 < \infty$  such that for all  $p_0 \leq p < \infty$

$$\langle |u(t)|^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}(1-\frac{1}{p})+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \quad (8)$$

where  $\lesssim$  means  $\leq$  up to multiplicative constant that only depends on  $d, p, \rho$ . Let us mention that for random periodic coefficients  $\mathbf{a}$  with uniform elliptic assumptions, in [18, Theorem 2], they proved the optimal rate

$$\langle |u(t)|^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\right)}$$

via De Giorgi-Nash-Moser regularity theory and a stronger form of ergodicity. Let us anticipate that the general strategy of our proof is the same as the one in [4]. However, there are genuine differences between the case treated there and the degenerate case considered here. In our case, we consider non-diagonal random matrices endowed with the moment condition in the range  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} < \frac{2}{d-1}$ . Moreover, we show the validity of the following inequality. Let us consider a suitable weight function  $w$ , we prove that there exists a stochastic process  $Z_t$  such that the random parabolic Green's function behave as,

$$\left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{2\alpha}(t, y) |\nabla G(t, \cdot, 0, y)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim Z_t (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right)} \quad (9)$$

where for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\langle |Z_t|^n \rangle < \infty$ ,  $\langle \sup_{t \geq 0} |Z_t| \rangle < \infty$ . This inequality entailed with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality yields the existence of a stationary solution of equation (2). The second result compare the density law of the Markov process  $X$  and the standard Gaussian density: Consider  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , under the averaged probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} = \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{a}} \mathbb{P}(d\mathbf{a}), \quad (10)$$

we show that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}[l \cdot X_t \leq \sigma_l x \sqrt{t}] - \Phi(x) \right| \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{10}}, \quad (11)$$

up to a multiplicative constant that depends on moment bounds of the solution of (2),  $\rho$  and  $d$ . Moreover, the constant  $\sigma_l$  in (6) and (11) is explicitly given by

$$\sigma_l^2 := l \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} \cdot l \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is defined as

$$e_i \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} e_j := \langle (e_i + \nabla \phi_i(0)) \mathbf{a}(0) (e_j + \nabla \phi_j(0)) \rangle,$$

where  $\phi_i$  solves (2) along  $e_i$  and is stationary in the sense of

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x + z) = \phi_i(\mathbf{a}(\cdot + x), z) \quad \text{for almost } \mathbb{P}\text{-}\mathbf{a} \in \Omega \quad (13)$$

and all  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . For further invariance principles and its corresponding quantitative version, we refer to [2, 3, 4, 22, 25] and references therein. The proof of inequality (11) follows the classical approach and relies on a decomposition of the process  $X$  into a martingale part and a remainder (see e.g. [4, 23]). It turns out that for the invariance principle the remainder is negligible, and then the scaling limit of  $X$  is the same as the one for the Martingale part. We consider the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &:= \Psi(X_t), \\ \Psi(\mathbf{a}, y) &:= (y_i + \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x) - \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0))_{i=1}^d, \\ X_t &:= M_t - \chi(\mathbf{a}, X_t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{M_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is known to be a martingale and  $\chi$  is called the remainder part satisfying the following property: For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $p, q \in [0, \infty)$  such that under the moment condition (4) the following holds. There exists a random variable  $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X}(d, \delta, p, q)$  which depends on  $d, \delta, p, q$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\mathcal{X}|^n \rangle &< \infty, \\ E_0^{\mathbf{a}} (|l \cdot \chi(\mathbf{a}, X_t)|) &\leq \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{a})(t+1)^\delta \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-}a.e. \mathbf{a}. \end{aligned}$$

For this reason we need to establish the existence of high moments of the corrector  $\phi_i$ . This is done via the modified corrector equation

$$\frac{1}{T}\phi_{i,T} + \nabla^* \mathbf{a} \nabla \phi_{i,T} = -\nabla^* \mathbf{a} \cdot e_i. \quad (14)$$

We define the modified corrector  $\phi_{i,T} : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as the unique bounded solution to (14), i.e. for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ , we require  $\phi_{i,T}(\mathbf{a}, \cdot) : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to solve (14) and to be bounded. Note that this definition is pointwise in  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$  and does not invoke any probability measure on  $\Omega$ . This is in contrast to what is typically done in stochastic homogenization (see [26]). We opt for this non-probabilistic approach since later we need to estimate the oscillation of  $\phi_{i,T}$ , which is most conveniently done when  $\phi_{i,T}$  is defined for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$  and not  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -almost surely. It is not clear a-priori whether (14) admits a bounded solution. To overcome this problem, we consider the elliptic Green's function  $G_T : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and prove integrability of  $G_T$ . To this aim, we assume that there exists  $\delta' > 0$  and a constant  $C$  such that

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y)|^2 + |\nabla_x G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y)|^2) \exp(\delta'|x - y|) \leq C \quad (15)$$

for all  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ . The latter then implies existence of  $\phi_{i,T}$  together with some nicely properties, see Proposition 3.8 below for details. To show that for  $p \in (1, \infty)$  the gradient  $\langle |\nabla \phi(x)|^{2p} \rangle$  is finite, we follow the approach in [10] and use the logarithmic Sobolev inequality to upgrade the lower order  $L^2(\Omega)$ -bound to a  $L^{2p}(\Omega)$ -bound. The lower bound

$$\langle |\nabla \phi_{i,T} + e_i|^2 \rangle \lesssim 1$$

is then upgraded via the following coarsen logarithmic Sobolev inequality:

$$\langle |\nabla \phi_{i,T} + e_i|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \langle |\nabla \phi_{i,T} + e_i|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} (\nabla_i \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) + e_i) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is chosen small enough. Then, we need a suitable expression of  $\text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} (\nabla_i \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) + e_i)$ . We show that for degenerate coefficients, there exists a random constant  $C(\mathbf{a})$  with  $\langle C(\mathbf{a}) \rangle < \infty$  such that the response to a variation at  $x$  in the coefficient field is given by the Green's function  $G_T$  as:

$$\text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} (\nabla_i \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) + e_i) \leq C(\mathbf{a}) |\nabla_x \nabla_i G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T + e_i|.$$

The above estimate on the oscillation then yields

$$\left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} (\nabla_i \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) + e_i) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \langle |\nabla \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

up to a multiplicative random constant that only depends on the moment condition (4),  $\rho$ , and  $d$ . On the other hand, we use an upper bound for martingales proved in [19] to estimate the speed of convergence of  $E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left( \left| \frac{\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t}{t} - \sigma_l^2 \right|^2 \right)$  towards zero, where  $\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t$  denotes the quadratic variation of the Martingale  $l \cdot M$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Hence, there exists a constant that only depends on  $d, \rho$  such that for all  $t > 0$ , and  $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\left\langle E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \left| \frac{\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t}{t} - \sigma_l^2 \right|^2 \right] \right\rangle \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

so that the rate of decay of  $E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left( \left| \frac{\langle L, M \rangle_t}{t} - \sigma_t^2 \right|^2 \right)$  is optimal to give the upper bound in (11). **Structure of the present work:** In subsection 1.2, we introduce the precise notation what we use during the present work. In Section 2, we give the precise statements of the main results together with the main assumptions. In section 3, we present the main auxiliary results to make the argument of Theorem 2.1, and then, in Proposition 3.1 we firstly discuss the weighted estimate (9). Subsequently, we present auxiliary Lemmas to split the argument of Theorem 2.2, and in subsection 3.2, we present its argument.

## 1.2 Notation

Unless otherwise stated we always assume that  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is stationary. With a random variable  $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we associate its stationary extension random field  $\bar{\xi} : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via  $\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, x) = \xi(\tau_x(\mathbf{a}))$ . In particular, we say that a random variable  $\bar{\xi} : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is stationary if there exists a random field  $\xi : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\bar{\xi}(\tau_x \mathbf{a}) = \xi(\mathbf{a}, x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . If  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is stationary, then the expectation of the stationary extension of a random variable  $\xi$  is independent of  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , i.e., we simply write  $\langle \bar{\xi} \rangle$  rather than  $\langle \bar{\xi}(x) \rangle$ . For fields  $\nu : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , vector fields  $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and all  $i = 1, \dots, d$  we define the spatial derivatives,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i \nu &:= \nu(x + e_i) - \nu(x), & \nabla_i^* \nu(x) &:= \nu(x - e_i) - \nu(x), \\ \nabla \nu &= (\nabla_1 \nu, \dots, \nabla_d \nu), & \nabla^* \xi &= \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_i^* \xi_i. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $e_1, \dots, e_d$  is the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\nabla$  is the discrete gradient for functions on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $-\nabla^*$  is the discrete divergence for vector fields on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Next, we introduce a similar structure for random variables: for scalar random variables  $\psi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , vector-valued random variables  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $i = 1, \dots, d$  we define the horizontal derivatives,

$$\begin{aligned} D_i \psi(\mathbf{a}) &:= \psi(\mathbf{a} \cdot (\cdot + e_i)) - \psi(\mathbf{a}), & D_i^* \psi(\mathbf{a}) &:= \psi(\mathbf{a} \cdot (\cdot - e_i)) - \psi(\mathbf{a}), \\ D \psi &:= (D_1 \psi, \dots, D_d \psi), & D^* \phi &:= \sum_{i=1}^d D_i^* \phi_i. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 1.5.** *Let consider  $T > 0$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ , the elliptic Green's function  $G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y)$  associated with equation*

$$\frac{1}{T} \phi_T + \nabla^* \mathbf{a} \nabla \phi_T = -\nabla^* (\mathbf{a} \cdot \xi), \quad (16)$$

in direction  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the unique solution in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  to

$$\frac{1}{T} G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y) + \nabla^* \mathbf{a} \nabla G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y) = \delta(x - y), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d \quad (17)$$

where  $\delta : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is the Dirac function centered at 0.

Let us consider the parabolic Green's function defined as follows: for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$  and  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  we denote by  $(t, x) \mapsto G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, y)$  the function in  $C^1([0, T]; \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d))$  given by

$$G(\cdot, \mathbf{a}, \cdot, y) := \exp(-t \nabla^* \mathbf{a} (\cdot) \nabla) \delta(\cdot - y)$$

and that is the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{u}(t, x) + \nabla^* \mathbf{a}(x) \nabla \bar{u}(t, x) = 0 \text{ for all } t > 0, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \\ \bar{u}(t = 0, x) = \delta(x - y). \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Let us mention that we consider random walks starting in 0, and we write simply  $p(t, y) := p^{\mathbf{a}}(t, y, 0)$  where  $p^{\mathbf{a}}(t, x, y) := \mathbb{P}_x^{\mathbf{a}}(X_t = y)$ . Further, we will use the fact that  $p^{\tau_x \mathbf{a}}(t, x + y) = p^{\mathbf{a}}(t, x + z, y + z)$ .

## 2 Setting and main results

### 2.1 Assumptions

In this section, we first present the precise mathematical framework and state the main results of the paper. We recall that that set  $\Omega$  is considered as in Definition 1.1. Here, we concern with  $d > 2$  which indicates the dimension of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and we assume that

(A1)  $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$  is a probability space which is ergodic in the form of the spectral gap (7),

(A2)  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is stationary in the sense of Definition (1.2), and that there exists a random variable  $\mathcal{Y} > 0$  with finite moments such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t, y)^2 \leq \mathcal{Y}(t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}}. \quad (19)$$

(A3) There exists a constant  $C(d, \lambda, T) < \infty$  and a small parameter  $\delta > 0$  such that in Definition 1.5 the elliptic Green's function satisfy that

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y)|^2 + |\nabla_x G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y)|^2) \exp(\delta|x-y|) \lesssim C(d, \lambda, T) \quad (20)$$

for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $T > 0$ .

A few of consequences of these assumptions are the following: for all  $s, t \geq 0$ ,  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  the unique solution of (18) called Green's function, and that we denote as  $G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, y)$

(a) is such that  $(t, x) \mapsto G(t, \cdot, x, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d))$  and is stationary in the sense of

$$G(t, \mathbf{a}, x+z, y+z) = G(t, \mathbf{a}(\cdot+z), x, y),$$

(b) satisfies the semigroup property

$$\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, z) G(s, \mathbf{a}, z, y) = G(t+s, \mathbf{a}, x, y),$$

(c) is symmetric,

$$G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, y) = G(t, \mathbf{a}, y, x).$$

(d) Conservation mass in the sense of

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, y) = 1.$$

On the other hand, given  $u$  as the solution of

$$\frac{d}{dt} u(t) + D^* \mathbf{a}(0) D u(t) = 0$$

and  $\bar{u}$  denoting their stationary extension, by Duhamel formula it can be written as

$$\bar{u}(t, \mathbf{a}, x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, y) \bar{u}(t, y, \mathbf{a}),$$

and from which by  $x = 0$ , we obtain that

$$u(t, \mathbf{a}) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t, \mathbf{a}, 0, y) \bar{u}(t, y, \mathbf{a}).$$

In the sequel, we make extensive use of this identity, and also of the following function

$$\omega(t, x) := \left( \frac{|x|^2}{t+1} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (21)$$

referred as a weight function.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Assume that  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  satisfy (A1)-(A2). Then there exists an exponent  $1 \leq p_0 < \infty$  that only depends on  $d$  such that for any  $p_0 \leq p < \infty$  and  $t \geq 0$  the function*

$$u(t) := \exp(-tD^* \mathbf{a}(0)D) D^* \xi, \quad \xi \in C(\Omega_0)^d,$$

satisfies

$$\langle |u(t)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \rho, p) (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) \right)^{2p} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}$$

up to a multiplicative constant  $C(d, \rho, p)$  that only depends on  $d, \rho, p$ .

**Theorem 2.2.** *Assume that  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  satisfy (A1)-(A3). There exists a constant  $C:=C(\rho)$  such that for all  $t > 0$*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}[l \cdot X_t \leq \sigma_l x \sqrt{t}] - \Phi(x) \right| \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{10}} \quad (22)$$

where  $\Phi(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}} ds$  denotes the distribution of a Gaussian random variable, and  $\sigma_l$  is defined according (12) along  $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Let consider

$$\Omega_0 := \{ \mathbf{a} \in \Omega : \mathbf{a}(x) \text{ is diagonal for any } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \}. \quad (23)$$

We remark that inequality (19) can be proved as soon as  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega_0$  and the moment condition is given for a couple of exponents  $(p, q)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} &< \frac{2}{d}, \quad \text{or,} \\ \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} &< \frac{2}{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

On this subject, we refer to [23, Lemma 2.1] and [9, Theorem 1].

### 3 Auxiliary results

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let us assume (A1)-(A2). There exists a stochastic processes  $(\mathcal{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with  $\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle |\mathcal{Z}_t|^n \rangle \leq C(n)$  such that*

$$\left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{2\alpha}(t, y) |\nabla G(t, \cdot, 0, y)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_1(n) \mathcal{Z}_t (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \quad (24)$$

for some constants  $C(n), C_1(n)$  that only depend on  $n$ .



**Lemma 3.2.** *Let us assume (A1)-(A2). There exists a random variable  $\mathcal{X} > 0$  with finite moments such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s for all  $t \geq 0$ , one has*

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|y| + 1)^{2\alpha} G(t, y)^2 \lesssim \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{X}(t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} + \theta - \alpha}, \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|y| + 1)^{2\alpha} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 dt \lesssim \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{X}(T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} - 1}, \quad (26)$$

for some  $\theta \geq \alpha$ , and where we use the short-hand notation  $G(t, y) := G(t, \mathbf{a}, 0, y)$  and

$$|\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{i,j}(y) |\nabla G(t, y, y + e_i)|^2.$$

*Proof.* We use the short-hand notation  $w_0(x) := |x| + 1$ , and we indicate  $\|\mathbf{a}(y)\| := \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{i,j}(y)$  for any  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . We have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} G(t, y) = -\nabla^* \mathbf{a} \nabla G(t, y).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (w_0(y))^{2\alpha} G(t, y)^2 &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (w_0(y))^{2\alpha} G(t, y) \frac{d}{dt} G(t, y) \\ &= - \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla (w_0^{2\alpha} G(t, y)) \mathbf{a} \nabla G(t, y) \\ &\leq - \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| |\nabla G(t, y)|^2 w_0^{2\alpha}(y) \\ &\quad + \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| [G](y) |\nabla w_0^{2\alpha}(y)| |\nabla G(t, y)|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $[G] := \sum_{i=1}^d G(\cdot + e_i) e_i \otimes e_i$ . By Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| [G](y) |\nabla w_0^{2\alpha}(y)| |\nabla G(t, y)| \\ &\leq \frac{C(\alpha)}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| w_0^{2\alpha-2}(y) G^2(t, y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0^{2\alpha}(y) \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| |\nabla G(t, y)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce that,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (w_0(y))^{2\alpha} G(t, y)^2 &\leq \frac{C(\alpha)}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| w_0^{2\alpha-2}(y) G^2(t, y) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 w_0^{2\alpha}(y). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the right-hand side, let us decompose  $2\alpha - 2 = 2\alpha(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}) - 2(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\theta})$ . Then by Hölder's inequality, and the  $\ell^q - \ell^1$  estimate

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| w_0(y)^{2\alpha-2} G(t, y)^2 \leq \mathcal{X} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} G(t, y)^2,$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{X} := \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{-(d+1)} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\|^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-\alpha} \frac{d+1}{2}} \right)^{\frac{\theta-\alpha}{\theta} \frac{2}{d+1}}.$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (w_0(y))^{2\alpha(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} G^2(t, y) \leq \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) \right)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^2(t, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}.$$

It implies that,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) \leq \mathcal{X} \mathcal{Y}^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) \right)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} \cdot (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{\theta}}.$$

Let  $h(t) := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y)$ . Then

$$\frac{d}{dt} h(t)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \mathcal{X} \mathcal{Y}^{\frac{1}{\theta}} (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{\theta}},$$

and from which

$$h(t)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} - 1 \leq C(\theta) \mathcal{X} \mathcal{Y}^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \left( (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{\theta} + 1} - 1 \right)$$

where  $C(\theta) > 0$  since  $\theta > \frac{d}{2}$ . Hence,

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) \lesssim \mathcal{X} \mathcal{Y} (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} + \theta}.$$

up to a multiplicative constant. On the other hand, we choose  $\theta \geq \alpha$ , and we exchange the exponent  $\theta$  with  $\theta - \alpha$  to conclude that

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) \lesssim (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} + \theta - \alpha}.$$

The same argument can be used to get formula (26). Indeed, the starting point is the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (w_0(y))^{2\alpha} G(t, y)^2 &\leq \frac{C(\alpha)}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| w_0^{2\alpha-2}(y) G^2(t, y) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 w_0^{2\alpha}(y), \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 w_0^{2\alpha}(y) &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0^{2\alpha}(y) G(T, y)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{C(\alpha)}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| w_0^{2\alpha-2}(y) G^2(t, y). \end{aligned}$$

By the last argument, the first term on the right-hand side is bounded by

$$\mathcal{Y} \mathcal{X} (T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} + \theta - \alpha},$$

while, with  $\theta$  close enough to  $\frac{d}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| w_0^{2\alpha-2}(y) G^2(t, y) &\leq \mathcal{X} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) \right)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^2(t, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{X} \mathcal{Y} (t+1)^{-\alpha \left( \frac{\theta-1}{\theta} \right)} (t+1)^{-1} \\ &\leq \mathcal{X} \mathcal{Y} (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|\mathbf{a}(y)\| w_0^{2\alpha-2}(y) G^2(t, y) \leq \mathfrak{X} \mathfrak{Y} (T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1}.$$

□

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let us assume (A1)-(A2), and consider  $\theta \geq \alpha$ . Then, there exists a family of random variables  $\{\mathfrak{X}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  such that*

$$I := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(t, y)^{2\alpha} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 \lesssim \mathfrak{X}_t (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}+\theta-\alpha}. \quad (27)$$

*Proof.* Let us to show that

$$\begin{aligned} (A) \quad & \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 dt \lesssim \mathfrak{Y} (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1}, \\ (B) \quad & \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{2\alpha}(t, y) G(t, y)^2 \leq \mathfrak{Y} \mathfrak{X} (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}+\theta-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

We start with the argument for (A). We recall that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^2(t, y) \leq - \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2.$$

For  $T \geq 1$ , by integration on  $(T, 2T)$  and the inequality (19)

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 dt \leq \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^2(T, y) \lesssim \mathfrak{Y} (T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1}.$$

Now, we give the argument for (B). Assume that  $\theta \geq \alpha \geq \frac{d}{2}$ . Since

$$w(t, y)^{2\alpha} \leq \left( \frac{(|y|+1)^{2\alpha}}{(t+1)^\alpha} + 1 \right),$$

by using equations (25) and (19),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(t, y)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) & \lesssim \left( (t+1)^{-\alpha} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|y|+1)^{2\alpha} G^2(t, y) + \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^2(t, y) \right) \\ & \lesssim \mathfrak{Y} \mathfrak{X} (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}+\theta-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The argument for a generic  $\alpha > 0$ , it is sufficient arguing by interpolation. We now deduce due to (26) and (A) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{2\alpha}(t, y) |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 dt & \leq \frac{(T+1)^{-\alpha}}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_0(y)^{2\alpha} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 dt \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \mathfrak{Y} \mathfrak{X} (T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1-\alpha} + \mathfrak{Y} (T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} \\ & \lesssim \mathfrak{Y} \mathfrak{X} (T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1+\theta-\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{2\alpha}(t, y) |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 dt \lesssim \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{X}(T+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1+\theta-\alpha} \quad (28)$$

up to a multiplicate constant that only depends on  $d, \alpha$ .

Next, we make use of the semigroup property, and that  $G^{\tau_z \mathbf{a}}(t, 0, y - z) = G^{\mathbf{a}}(t, y, z)$ . Also, we use the triangle inequality applied to  $w(2t, z)^\alpha$  in the form

$$w(2t, z)^{2\alpha} \leq w(t, z - y)^\alpha w(t, y)^\alpha,$$

and the property (B). So,

$$\begin{aligned} w(2t, z)^\alpha G^{\mathbf{a}}(2t, 0, z) &\lesssim \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(t, y)^\alpha G^{\mathbf{a}}(t, 0, y) w(t, z - y)^\alpha G^{\mathbf{a}}(t, y, z) \\ &\lesssim \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (w(t, y)^\alpha G^{\mathbf{a}}(t, 0, y))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (w(t, z - y)^\alpha G^{\tau_z \mathbf{a}}(t, y - z, 0))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and from (B), we deduce

$$w(2t, z)^\alpha G^{\mathbf{a}}(2t, 0, z) \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{Y}(\mathbf{a})\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{a})\mathcal{Y}(\tau_z \mathbf{a})\mathcal{X}(\tau_z \mathbf{a})} (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}+\theta-\alpha}.$$

With this estimates at hand, we deduce for  $t - s \in (\frac{t}{3}, \frac{2t}{3})$ ,

$$w(t - s, z)^{2\alpha} G^{\mathbf{a}}(t - s, 0, z) = w(t - s, z)^{2\alpha+d+1} G^{\mathbf{a}}(t - s, 0, z) w(t - s, z)^{-(d+1)},$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} &w(t - s, z)^{2\alpha} G^{\mathbf{a}}(t - s, 0, z) \\ &\leq \sqrt{(\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{X})(\mathbf{a})(\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{X})(\tau_z \mathbf{a})} (t - s + 1)^{-\frac{d}{2}+\theta-\alpha} w(t - s, z)^{-(d+1)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{(\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{X})(\mathbf{a})(\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{X})(\tau_z \mathbf{a})} (t + 1)^{\theta-\alpha} \frac{w(t, z)^{-(d+1)}}{(t + 1)^{\frac{d}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for each  $e \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$|\nabla G^{\mathbf{a}}(t, 0, e)|^2 \lesssim \frac{3}{t} \int_{\frac{t}{3}}^{\frac{2t}{3}} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^{\mathbf{a}}(t - s, 0, z) |\nabla G^{\mathbf{a}}(s, z, e)|^2 ds$$

and then with I defined in (27),

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \frac{3}{t} \int_{\frac{t}{3}}^{\frac{2t}{3}} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(t - s, z)^{2\alpha} G^{\mathbf{a}}(t - s, 0, z) \left( \sum_{e \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(s, e - z)^{2\alpha} |\nabla G^{\mathbf{a}}(s, z, e)|^2 \|\mathbf{a}(e)\| \right) \\ &\lesssim (t + 1)^{\theta-\alpha} \mathcal{X}_t \left( \frac{3}{t} \int_{\frac{t}{3}}^{\frac{2t}{3}} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(s, y)^{2\alpha} |\nabla G^{\tau_z \mathbf{a}}(s, 0, y)|_{\omega}^2 dt \right) \\ &\stackrel{(28)}{\lesssim} (t + 1)^{-\frac{d}{2}+2(\theta-\alpha)} \mathcal{X}_t, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\mathcal{X}_t := \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{w(t, z)^{-(d+1)}}{(t+1)^{\frac{d}{2}}} ((\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{X})(\tau_z \mathbf{a}))^{\frac{3}{2}} (\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{X})(\mathbf{a})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (29)$$

From the definition of  $\mathcal{X}_t$  one has  $\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle |\mathcal{X}_t|^n \rangle < \infty$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  as soon as the moment bounds of  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  are finite.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Let us consider

$$\mathcal{Z}_t := (t+1)^{\frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2} - \gamma} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(t, y)^{2\alpha} |\nabla G(t, y)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with  $\gamma := 2(\theta - \alpha) \geq 0$  and  $\theta \geq \alpha \geq \frac{d}{2}$  two arbitrary numbers. We define the following set

$$E_d := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2d} : |x - y| = 1\}.$$

For each  $e \in E_d$  we denote its ending points as  $\underline{e}, \bar{e}$  such that  $\bar{e} - \underline{e} = e_i$  for some  $e_i$  from the canonical base of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Hence,

$$\mathcal{Z}_t^2 \leq (t+1)^{-\gamma+4\alpha} \sum_{e \in E_d} f_t(e) h(e)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(e) &:= (t+1)^{\frac{d}{2} + 1 - 2\theta} w(t, \underline{e})^{2\alpha + \theta} |\nabla G(t, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2, \\ h(e) &:= w(t, \underline{e})^{-\theta} \|\mathbf{a}(e)\|^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have  $\|f_t\|_{\ell^1} \lesssim \mathcal{X}_t$  with  $\mathcal{X}_t$  defined in (29).

Take  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , by Hölder's inequality and the  $\ell^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - \ell^1$  estimate both yields

$$\mathcal{Z}_t^2 \leq (t+1)^{-\gamma+2\alpha} \|h\|_{\ell^{\frac{n}{2}}} \|f_t\|_{\ell^1}.$$

Hence, by Holder's inequality with respect the exponent  $\frac{2q}{n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{Z}_t^n \rangle &\leq (t+1)^{(-\gamma+2\alpha)\frac{n}{2}} \left\langle \left( \|g\|_{\ell^{\frac{n}{2}}} \|f_t\|_{\ell^1} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \right\rangle \\ &\lesssim \left( (t+1)^{(-\gamma+2\alpha)\frac{n}{2}} \sum_{e \in E_d} w(t, \underline{e})^{-\theta\frac{n}{2}} \right) \left\langle \|\mathbf{a}(e)\|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|f_t\|_{\ell^1}^{\frac{nq}{2q-n}} \right\rangle^{\frac{2q-n}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim (t+1)^{-n\theta + \frac{d}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $n\theta - \frac{d}{2} > 1$ . We conclude that  $\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle \mathcal{Z}_t^n \rangle < \infty$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  satisfy the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (7) with constant  $\rho > 0$ . Then for any  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $\xi$  bounded and continuous real function defined on  $\Omega$ , in short,  $\xi \in C_b(\Omega)$  it holds that*

$$\langle |\xi - \langle \xi \rangle|^{2p} \rangle \leq C(p, \rho) \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle$$

up to a multiplicative constant  $C(p, \rho)$  that depends on  $\rho, p$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume that  $\xi \in C_b(\Omega_0)$  and  $\langle \xi \rangle = 0$ . The triangle inequality and the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (7) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle &\leq 2 \left\langle (|\xi|^p - \langle |\xi|^p \rangle)^2 \right\rangle + 2 (\langle |\xi|^p \rangle)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\rho} \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} |\xi|^p \right)^2 \right\rangle + 2 \langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}} \langle |\xi|^2 \rangle^{\frac{p}{p-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality, we may absorb  $\langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle$  on the left-hand side and we obtain that

$$\langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle \leq \frac{2}{\rho} \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} |\xi|^p \right)^2 \right\rangle + C(p) \langle |\xi|^2 \rangle^p.$$

Notice that from (7) we have

$$\langle \xi^2 \rangle^p \leq \rho^{-p} \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} |\xi|^2 \right\rangle^p$$

for each  $\xi \in C_b(\Omega_0)$  such that  $\langle \xi \rangle = 0$ . Moreover, by Jensen's inequality

$$\langle \xi^2 \rangle^p \leq \rho^{-p} \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} |\xi|^2 \right)^p \right\rangle.$$

On the other hand, we note that the inequality  $|t - s|^p \leq C(p) (|t|^{p-1}|t - s| + |t - s|^p)$  for all  $t, s \geq 0$  yields for every two coefficient fields  $\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \Omega$ :

$$|\xi(\mathbf{a})|^p - |\xi(\tilde{\mathbf{a}})|^p \leq C(p) (|\xi(\mathbf{a})|^{p-1} |\xi(\mathbf{a}) - \xi(\tilde{\mathbf{a}})| + |\xi(\mathbf{a}) - \xi(\tilde{\mathbf{a}})|^p).$$

Letting  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  run over all the coefficient fields that differs with  $\mathbf{a}$  only at point  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  yields

$$\text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} |\xi|^p \leq C(p) \left( |\xi|^{p-1} \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi + \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^p \right).$$

Consequently we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} |\xi|^p \right)^2 \right\rangle &\leq C(p) \left\langle |\xi|^{2(p-1)} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^2 \right\rangle + C(p) \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^{2p} \right\rangle \\ &\leq C(p) \langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\quad + C(p) \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

by Hölder's inequality and the  $\ell^2$ - $\ell^p$  inequality. Hence

$$\langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle \leq C(p, \rho) \left( \langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle \right).$$

Again by Young's inequality we may absorb the term  $\langle |\xi|^{2p} \rangle$  concluding the proof of Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let assume (A1)-(A2). Ther exists an exponent  $1 \leq p_0 < \infty$  (that only depends on  $\lambda$  and  $d$ ) such that for all  $p_0 \leq p < \infty$  we have*

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \langle u^{2p}(t) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} &\lesssim (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \times \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) \right)^{2p} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ &+ \int_0^t (t-s+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \langle |Du(s)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} ds. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (30)$$

*Proof.* We assume that  $\langle u(t) \rangle = 0$  for each  $t > 0$ . By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\langle |u(t)|^{2p} \rangle \leq C(p, \rho) \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} u(t)(\mathbf{a}) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle.$$

Now we aim to derive an explicit formula for  $\text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} u(t)(\mathbf{a})$ . Let us consider a random field  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  that differs from  $\mathbf{a}$  only at point  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , and consider the stationary extension of the equation

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} u(t) + D^* \mathbf{a}(0) Du(t) &= 0, \\ u(t=0) &= D^* \xi \end{aligned} \right.$$

given by

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{u}(t, x) + \nabla^* \mathbf{a}(x) \nabla \bar{u}(t) &= 0, \\ \bar{u}(t=0) &= \nabla^* \bar{\xi}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Let consider

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(x) &:= \nabla^* \bar{\xi}(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x) - \nabla^* \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, x), \\ g(t, x) &:= -\nabla^* (\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(x) - \mathbf{a}(x)) \nabla \bar{u}(t, x, \mathbf{a}). \end{aligned}$$

By Duhamel's formula

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x) - \bar{u}(t, \mathbf{a}, x) &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x, y) g_0(y) \\ &+ \int_0^t \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t-s, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x, y) g(s, y) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} u(t)(\mathbf{a}) &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \\ &+ \int_0^t \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t-s, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \cdot (\delta \mathbf{a}(y)) \nabla \bar{u}(t, y, \mathbf{a}) ds \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta \mathbf{a}(y) = \delta(y-x)(\mathbf{a}(x) - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(x))$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} u(t)(\mathbf{a}) &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \\ &+ \int_0^t \nabla_x G(t-s, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, x) \cdot B(x) \nabla \bar{u}(s, x, \mathbf{a}) ds \end{aligned}$$

for some matrix  $B(x) = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(x) - \mathbf{a}(x)$ . Let assume that  $\|B\| \ll 1$ . Using this representation of  $\text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} u(t)(\mathbf{a})$ , and the

triangle inequality with respect to  $\langle (\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\cdot)^2)^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \langle u(t)^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} &\leq \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ &+ \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_0^t |\nabla_x G(t-s, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, x)|^2 |\nabla \bar{u}(s, x, \mathbf{a})|^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (31)$$

To finish the proof of the inequality (30), we aim to estimate each term on the right-hand side of (31). By triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ & \leq C(p) \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \end{aligned}$$

up to a constant  $C(p)$  that depends on  $p$ . On the other hand, by Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) w^\alpha(t, y))^2 \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( w^{-\alpha}(t, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ & \leq \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) w^\alpha(t, y))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \\ & \quad \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{-2p\alpha}(t, y) \left\langle \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^{2p} \right\rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

By stationarity of  $\xi$  we finally get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ & \leq \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) w^\alpha(t, y))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \\ & \quad \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega^{-2p\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) \right)^{2p} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, chosen  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $2p\alpha > d$  we have

$$\left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega^{-2p\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq (t+1)^{\frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{2p}},$$



and from which together with Proposition 3.1

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_y G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0, y) \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \bar{\xi}(\mathbf{a}, y) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\
& \lesssim (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right)} (t+1)^{\frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{2p}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) \right)^{2p} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\
& \lesssim (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\right)} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) \right)^{2p} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we aim to consider the remaining term. We call

$$H_1(t, s) := \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_y G(t-s, 0, y)|_{\mathbf{a}}^2 |\nabla u(s, x, \mathbf{a})|^2 \right).$$

By triangle inequality we aim to estimate

$$\int_0^t \langle H_1^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} ds.$$

As before, we make use of Proposition 3.1 and stationarity to gain

$$\langle |H_1(t, s)|^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim (t-s+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\right)} \langle |\nabla u(s)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}$$

and from which we conclude the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6** (Caccioppoli's). *Lets us consider a stationary ensemble  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  defined on  $\Omega$ . For a measurable function  $\xi$  consider  $u(t) = \exp(-tD^* \mathbf{a}(0)D)\xi$ . Then for all  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  we have*

$$\langle |Du(t)|^{2p} \rangle \lesssim \left( -\frac{1}{2p} \frac{d}{dt} \langle |v(t)|^{2p} \rangle \right)^{1-\frac{r}{2}} \cdot \langle |u(t)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{r}{2}}$$

for some  $r \in (0, 1)$ , and where  $\lesssim$  means up to a multiplicative constant that depends on  $p$  and  $d$ .

*Proof.* We observe that

$$\langle |Du(t)|_{\mathbf{a}}^{2p} \rangle \lesssim -\frac{1}{2p} \frac{d}{dt} \langle |u(t)|^{2p} \rangle.$$

Further, by choosing  $r \in (0, 1)$  and defining  $r_0 := 2 - r$ , by using Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle |Du(t)|^{2p} \rangle &= \left\langle \sum_{i,j=1}^d |D_i u(t)|^{2p \left(\frac{r_0+r}{2}\right)} \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{\frac{r_0}{2}} \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{-\frac{r_0}{2}} \right\rangle \\
&\lesssim \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle |D_i u(t)|^{2p} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \rangle \right)^{\frac{r_0}{2}} \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle |D_i u(t)|^{2p} \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{-\frac{r_0}{r}} \rangle \right)^{\frac{r}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By using Hölder's inequality, and the fact that  $\langle |Du(t)|^p \rangle \leq \langle |u(t)|^p \rangle$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |Du(t)|^{2p} \rangle &\lesssim \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \langle |D_i u(t)|^{2p} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \rangle \right)^{\frac{r_0}{2}} \langle |u(t)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{r}{2}} \left\langle \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{-\frac{r_0}{r}} \right\rangle^{\frac{r}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle |D_i u(t)|^{2p} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \rangle \right)^{1-\frac{r}{2}} \cdot \langle |u(t)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{r}{2}} \left\langle \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{-\frac{r_0}{r}} \right\rangle^{\frac{r}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left( -\frac{1}{2p} \frac{d}{dt} \langle |v(t)|^{2p} \rangle \right)^{1-\frac{r}{2}} \cdot \langle |u(t)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{r}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 3.7** ([16, Lemma 3.1]). *Assume that*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq a(t) &\leq C_0 \left( (t+1)^{-\beta_0} + \int_0^t (t-s+1)^{-\beta_0} b^{\beta_1}(s) ds \right), \\ 0 \leq b^{2p}(t) &\leq -\frac{d}{dt} a^{2p}(t) \end{aligned}$$

with  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\beta_0 \in [1, \infty)$ , and  $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$  small. Then there exists a constant  $C := C(p, \beta_0, \beta_1, C_0)$  such that

$$a(t) \leq C b(t)^{-\beta_0}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Let consider  $p_0$  given by Lemma 3.5 and consider  $\alpha > 0$  such that for  $p_0 \leq p$ ,  $2p\alpha > d$ . Let consider

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= \langle u^{2p}(t) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \quad g(t) = \langle |Du(t)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{2}{2p(2-r)}}, \\ \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\langle \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \xi(\mathbf{a}) \right)^{2p} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Both Lemma's 3.5 and 3.6 imply

$$\begin{cases} f(t) \lesssim (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\right)} + \int_0^t (t-s+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\right)} g^{\beta_1}(t) ds, \\ g(t)^{2p} \lesssim -\frac{d}{dt} f(t)^{2p} \end{cases}$$

where  $\beta_1 := \frac{2-r}{2}$ . Hence, by the Lemma 3.7,

$$f(t) \lesssim (t+1)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\right)}.$$

□

### 3.1 Pathwise gradient upper bounds

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let us assume (A1)-(A3). Let consider  $p > 1$ , and  $\{\tau_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$  a family of shift operators defined on  $\Omega$ . Given  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and the coordinate direction  $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the problem (2) admits a non-trivial solution given by*

$$\phi_i^0 := \lim_{T \uparrow +\infty} \int_0^T u(t) dt,$$

where  $u \in C^1([0, T], L^p(\Omega))$ , is a solution of equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}u(t) + D^* \mathbf{a}(0)Du(t) = 0, \quad (32)$$

$$u(t=0) = \wp \quad (33)$$

with initial condition  $\wp := -D^* \mathbf{a}(0)e_i$  along  $e_i$ . Further, With  $\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x) := \phi_i^0(\tau_x \mathbf{a}) - \phi_i^0(\mathbf{a})$  we get,

1  $\phi_i$  satisfies the anchoring condition  $\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) = 0$  for  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -almost every  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ .

2 The elliptic Green's function  $\tilde{G}(x, y, \mathbf{a})$  defined as

$$\tilde{G}(\mathbf{a}, 0, \cdot) := \lim_{T \uparrow +\infty} G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, \cdot) \quad \text{in } \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$$

exist, and for any  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and every  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \tilde{G}(x, y, \mathbf{a})|^2 \lesssim 1, \quad (34)$$

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \tilde{G}(x, y, \mathbf{a})|^2 \lesssim 1, \quad (35)$$

up to a multiplicative constant that only depends on  $d, \rho$  and the moment condition (4).

3 The gradient  $\nabla \phi_i$  is stationary and

$$\langle |\phi_i(x)|^{2p} + |\nabla \phi_i(x)|^{2p} \rangle < \infty$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . In particular, it implies that

$$\lim_{T \uparrow +\infty} \max_{|x| \leq T} \frac{|\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x)|}{T} = 0$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ .

4 There exist the random matrix field  $\sigma^i : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with the following properties

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^* \sigma^i &= q_i \quad \text{on } \mathbb{Z}^d, \\ \nabla^* \nabla \sigma^i &= S q_i \quad \text{on } \mathbb{Z}^d, \end{aligned}$$

where  $q_i : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $S q_i : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &:= \mathbf{a}(\nabla \phi_i + e_i) - \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} e_i \\ S q_i &:= (S q_i)_{kl} = \nabla_k q_{il} - \nabla_l q_{ik} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} e_i := \langle \mathbf{a}(\nabla \phi_i + e_i) \rangle$  and  $(\nabla^* \sigma^i)_k = \sum_{l=1}^d \nabla_l^* \sigma_{kl}^i$ .

5 Given  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , there exists  $p(\theta) > 2$  such that

$$\left\langle |\sigma^i(x)|^{p(\theta)} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p(\theta)}} \lesssim (|x| + 1)^\theta.$$

Next, we aim to present the proof of this Proposition as soon as we proof the following auxiliary Lemmas.

**Lemma 3.9.** *There exists a positive random constant  $C$  that only depends on the moment condition (4) such that  $\langle C \rangle < \infty$ , and for any  $T > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s*

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, y - x)|^2 \leq C, \quad y \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $T > 0$ , and denote with  $\|\mathbf{a}(x)\|$ , the quantity

$$\|\mathbf{a}(x)\| := \sum_{ij=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}(x).$$

Let consider  $w \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  as  $\nabla_{y,j} G_T(\cdot, y)$ , then

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_{y,j} G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y) w(x) + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla w(x) \cdot \mathbf{a}(x) \nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y) = \nabla_j w(y),$$

from which

$$\left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla w(x) \cdot \mathbf{a}(x) \nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y)| \right\rangle \leq \langle |\nabla_j \nabla_j G_T(y, y)| \rangle.$$

By stationarity,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla w(x) \cdot \mathbf{a}(x) \nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(\mathbf{a}, x, y)| \right\rangle = \\ & \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(a, 0, y-x) \cdot \mathbf{a}(0) \nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, y-x)| \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(a, 0, y-x)|^2 \|\mathbf{a}(0)\| \right\rangle & \leq \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(a, 0, y-x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rangle \\ & \leq \left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(a, 0, y-x)|^2 \|\mathbf{a}(0)\| \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad \cdot \langle \|\mathbf{a}(0)\|^{-2} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\left\langle \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(a, 0, y-x)|^2 \right\rangle \leq \langle \|\mathbf{a}(0)\|^{-2} \rangle < \infty.$$

Hence, there exists a positive random constant  $C$  such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s,

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla_x \nabla_{y,j} G_T(a, 0, y-x)|^2 \leq C.$$

□

**Lemma 3.10.** For all  $T > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $j = 1, \dots, d$  we have,

$$\text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) \leq C(\|\mathbf{a}\|, d) |\nabla_x G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi| \quad (36)$$

$$\text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \nabla_j (\phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) + \xi_j) \leq C(\|\mathbf{a}\|, d) |\nabla_x \nabla_j G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi|. \quad (37)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$  and  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  be fixed, and let  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \Omega$  denote an arbitrary coefficient field that differs from  $\mathbf{a}$  only at  $x$ . We consider the difference  $\phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x) - \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, x)$ . From equation (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} (\phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \cdot) - \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, \cdot)) + \\ & \nabla^* (\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(\cdot) (\nabla \phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \cdot) - \nabla \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, \cdot))) = \nabla^* ((\mathbf{a} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}})(\cdot) (\nabla \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, \cdot) + \xi)) \end{aligned}$$

and from Green's function representation

$$\phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, y) - \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, y) = \nabla_x G_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x, y) \cdot ((\mathbf{a}(x) - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(x))) (\nabla \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, x + \xi))$$

for all  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . In particular, taking the gradient with respect to  $y_j$  and setting  $y = x$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_j \phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x) - \nabla_j \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, x)| & \leq |\nabla_x \nabla_j G_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x, x)| \text{Osc} \|\mathbf{a}\| |\nabla \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, x) + \xi| \\ & \leq C(\mathbf{a}) |\nabla \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, x) + \xi| \end{aligned}$$

where  $\langle C(\mathbf{a}) \rangle < \infty$ . Moreover,

$$|\phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0) - \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0)| \leq \text{Osc} \|\mathbf{a}\| |\nabla_x G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x) + \xi|,$$

and then

$$|\phi_T(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, 0) - \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0)| \lesssim |\nabla_x G_T(\mathbf{a}, 0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, x) + \xi|,$$

up to multiplicative random constant  $C(d, \mathbf{a})$  such that  $\langle C \rangle < \infty$ . Thus, due that  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  is arbitrary it follows (36). By using the same argument, we deduce (37).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let us assume (A1)-(A2). Then the modified corrector defined via (17) satisfies*

$$\langle |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle \leq C(d, \rho, p) |\xi|^{2p}$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $p < \infty$ , and  $T \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* We claim the following energy estimate

$$\langle |\nabla \phi_T(0)|^2 \rangle \leq C |\xi|^2$$

with  $C$  a positive constant. Thanks to the stationarity of  $\phi_T$  we have that

$$\langle \phi_T(0) \nabla^* w(x) \rangle = \langle \nabla \phi_T(0) w(x) \rangle$$

for all stationary vector field  $w : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{T} \langle |\phi_T(0)|^2 \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi_T(0) \cdot \mathbf{a}(0) \nabla \phi_T(0) \rangle = - \langle \nabla \phi_T(0) \cdot \mathbf{a}(0) \xi \rangle.$$

Thus, by Jensen and Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\nabla \phi_T \mathbf{a}(0) \nabla \phi_T(0)|^2 \rangle & \leq \langle \nabla \phi_T \mathbf{a}(0) \nabla \phi_T(0) \rangle \\ & \leq \langle |\nabla \phi_T(0)|^2 \rangle \langle \|\mathbf{a}(0)\|^2 |\xi|^2 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\langle |\nabla \phi_T|^2 \rangle \leq \langle \|\mathbf{a}(0)\|^2 \rangle \langle \|\mathbf{a}(0)^{-1}\|^2 \rangle |\xi|^2.$$

Now, we aim to estimate  $\langle (\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi|)^p \rangle$ . We start by applying Hölder inequality in the form of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_x |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi|^2 \right)^p \\ & \leq \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 \right)^{p-1} \sum_x |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi|^{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  and stationarity of  $G_T$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \sum_x |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi|^2 \right)^p \right\rangle \\ & \leq \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 \right)^{p-1} \sum_x \langle |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle \\ & \leq \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 \right)^{p-1} \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 \right) \langle |\nabla \phi_T(0) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from Lemma 3.9, there exists a random constant  $C > 0$  such that  $\langle C \rangle < \infty$ , and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 \right) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} C(\mathbf{a}).$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set

$$A_n := \{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega : C(\mathbf{a}) > n\},$$

and we write  $\langle C \rangle := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ . Then by Borel-Cantelli

$$\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) < \infty,$$

and from which we choose a suitable constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)|^2 \right) \leq \tilde{C}.$$

Hence,

$$\left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla \nabla G_T(0, x)| |\nabla \phi_T(x) + \xi| \right)^p \right\rangle \lesssim \langle |\nabla \phi_T(0) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle,$$

and with the help of inequality (37),

$$\left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} (\nabla_i \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) + \xi) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \langle |\nabla \phi_T(0) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . We now use ergodicity in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\nabla_i \phi_T(0) + \xi_i|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} & \leq C(\delta, p) \langle |\nabla_i \phi_T(0) + \xi_i|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + \delta \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} (\nabla_i \phi_T(\mathbf{a}, 0) + \xi) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $\delta > 0$  small enough. Thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \langle |\nabla_i \phi_T(0) + \xi_i|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, p, \rho) |\xi|.$$

□

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let us consider the elliptic Green's function  $\tilde{G}$  in the form of*

$$\tilde{G}(\mathbf{a}, x, 0) := \int_0^\infty G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, 0) dt,$$

where  $G(t, \mathbf{a}, x, 0)$  denotes the parabolic Green's function. Then

$$\left\langle |\nabla \tilde{G}(x, 0)|^2 \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim (|x| + 1)^{-\frac{7}{4}d+2}$$

up to multiplicative constant that depends on the moment condition (4),  $d$ , and  $\rho$ .

*Proof.* First of all, we show that for all  $t > 0$

$$\langle |\nabla G(t, y, 0)|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-\frac{1}{2}+\theta} w(t, y)^{-\alpha}$$

Set  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . By interpolation

$$\|\nabla G(t, y)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\nabla G(t, y)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^\lambda \|\nabla G(t, y)\|_{L^{\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{1-2\lambda}}(\Omega)}^{1-\lambda}.$$

Moreover, for  $p > 1$  and Proposition (3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\nabla G(t, y)|^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{2\alpha}(t, x) |G(t, y)|^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} w^{-\alpha}(t, y) \\ &\lesssim \langle \mathcal{Z}_t^p \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}} (t+1)^{-(\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2})} w^{-\alpha}(t, y). \end{aligned}$$

For  $p = 1$ , we can prove that

$$\langle |\nabla G(t, y)| \rangle \lesssim (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} w^{-\alpha}(t, y).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\nabla G(t, y, 0)|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim (t+1)^{-(\frac{d}{2}+1)\lambda - (\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2})(1-\lambda)} w^{-\alpha}(t, y) \\ &= (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2}-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}(1-\lambda)} w^{-\alpha}(t, y), \end{aligned}$$

from which we put  $\theta := \frac{d}{4}(1-\lambda)$ . We observe that

$$w(t, y)^{-\alpha} \leq (t+1)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (|x| + 1)^{-\alpha}.$$

In this case,

$$\langle |\nabla G(t, y, 0)|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim (t+1)^{-\frac{7}{8}d-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2}} (|x| + 1)^{-\alpha},$$

and then for  $\alpha := \frac{7}{4}d - 2$

$$\left\langle |\nabla \tilde{G}(y, 0)|^2 \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim (|y| + 1)^{-\alpha}.$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 3.8.* Theorem 2.1 yields that  $\phi_i^0$  is well defined and  $\varphi = D^* \mathbf{a} D \phi_i^0$ . We set  $\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x) := \phi_i^0(\tau_x \mathbf{a}) - \phi_i^0(\mathbf{a})$ , it implies that  $\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) = 0$ . Moreover, we observe that  $\nabla_j \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x) = \phi_i(\tau_{e_j} \mathbf{a}, x) - \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x) = D_j \phi_i^0(\tau_x \mathbf{a})$ . Hence,

$$\nabla^*(\mathbf{a}(x)(\nabla \phi_i + e_i) = (D^* \mathbf{a}(0)(D \phi_i^0 + e_i))(\tau_x \mathbf{a}) = 0$$

and  $\phi$  satisfies all the claimed properties. Moreover, the inequalities (34) and (35) come out from Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.12. Moreover, from Lemma 3.11, we deduce that for  $p < \infty$

$$\langle |\nabla\phi(x)|^{2p} \rangle < \infty.$$

Now, we show that

$$\langle |\phi_i(x)|^{2p} \rangle < \infty$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

We start by applying Hölder inequality in the form of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_x |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 |\nabla\phi(x) + \xi|^2 \right)^p \\ & \leq \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 \right)^{p-1} \sum_x |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 |\nabla\phi(x) + \xi|^{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  and stationarity of  $\tilde{G}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \sum_x |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 |\nabla\phi(x) + \xi|^2 \right)^p \right\rangle \\ & \leq \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 \right)^{p-1} \sum_x \langle |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 |\nabla\phi(x) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle \\ & \leq \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 \right)^{p-1} \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 \right) \langle |\nabla\phi(0) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.12,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 \lesssim \sup_{t \geq 0, \mathbf{a} \in \Omega} \mathcal{Z}_t \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|x| + 1)^{-\frac{7}{4}d+2} < \infty,$$

where  $\mathcal{Z}_t$  is defined as in Proposition 3.1, and  $\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle |\mathcal{Z}_t|^n \rangle < \infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence,

$$\left\langle \left( \sum_x |\nabla\tilde{G}(0, x)|^2 |\nabla\phi_i(x) + \xi|^2 \right)^p \right\rangle \lesssim \langle |\nabla\phi(0) + \xi|^{2p} \rangle.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) & \lesssim |\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(x) - \mathbf{a}(x)| \left( 1 + |\tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}| |\nabla_j \nabla_x \tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, x, x)| \right) |\nabla_x \tilde{G}(\mathbf{a}, 0, x)| |\nabla\phi(x) + \xi| \\ & \leq C(\mathbf{a}) |\nabla_x \tilde{G}(\mathbf{a}, 0, x)| |\nabla\phi(x) + \xi| \end{aligned}$$

up to a multiplicative random constant  $C(\mathbf{a})$  that depends on the moment condition (4). Moreover, from Lemma 3.12,  $\langle |C|^n \rangle < \infty$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, from the logarithmic Sobolev inequality in the form of

$$\langle |\phi_i(0) + e_i|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \left\langle \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \text{Osc}_{\mathbf{a}(x)} (\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) + e_i) \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{p}},$$



one has,

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \langle |\phi_i(0) + e_i|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, p) \sum_{i=1}^d \langle |\nabla_i \phi(0) + e_i|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Next, for  $T \gg 1$ , let  $\sigma_{T,kl}^i$  denote the unique bounded solution to

$$\frac{1}{T} \sigma_{T,kl}^i + \nabla^* \nabla \sigma_{T,kl}^i = \nabla_k q_{il} - \nabla_l q_{ik}.$$

Since  $q_i$  is stationary and has vanishing expectation,  $\sigma_{T,kl}^i$  is stationary and has vanishing expectation. Moreover, by standard arguments

$$\sup_{T \gg 1} \langle |\sigma_{T,kl}^i|^2 \rangle < \infty.$$

We deduce that up to a subsequence that  $\nabla \sigma_{T,kl}^i$  weakly converges to some random vector  $V_{kl}^i := (V_{kl,1}^i, \dots, V_{kl,d}^i)$  such that

$$\nabla^* V_{kl}^i = \nabla_k q_{il} - \nabla_l q_{ik}.$$

Further, it is possible to prove that  $V_{kl}^i$  is curl-free, that is  $\nabla_r V_{kl,j}^i = \nabla_j V_{kl,r}^i$ . Thus, there exists a random field  $\sigma_{kl}^i$  such that  $\nabla \sigma_{kl}^i(\omega, x) = V_{kl}^i$ . Hence, by stationarity

$$\nabla^* \nabla \sigma_{kl}^i = \nabla_k q_{il} - \nabla_l q_{ik}.$$

Now, we claim that

$$\nabla^* \nabla (\nabla_l^* \sigma_{kl}^i - q_{ik}) = 0.$$

It follows since  $\nabla^* q_i = 0$ , by using that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^* \nabla \nabla_l^* \sigma_{kl}^i &= \nabla_l^* \nabla^* \nabla \sigma_{kl}^i = \nabla_l^* \nabla_k q_{il} - \nabla_l^* \nabla_l q_{ik} \\ &= \nabla_k \nabla^* q_i - \nabla^* \nabla q_{ik}. \end{aligned}$$

By skew-symmetric property of  $\sigma$  and stationarity property, we get that  $q_{ik} - \nabla_l^* \sigma_{kl}^i = 0$ . Set  $Q_{kl}(\mathbf{a}, y) := q_k(\tau_y \mathbf{a}, e_l) e_l - q_l(\tau_y \mathbf{a}, e_k) e_l$ ,  $e_l$  from the canonical base of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and define

$$I := \left\langle \left( \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla f(y)| \left| \frac{\partial Q_{kl}(y)}{\partial z} \right| \right)^2 \right)^p \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}$$

with  $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  compactly supported, and where  $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$  denotes the Stein derivative introduced in [18]. For  $1 + \frac{1}{2} := \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s}$  with  $r \geq 1$  and  $s > \frac{d}{d-1}$  we prove that,

$$I \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z}^d)}.$$

Let us consider  $[\psi]_y$  the commutator of a random variable  $\psi$  with  $\mathbf{a}$ , that is,

$$[\psi]_y := \frac{\partial(\mathbf{a}(y)\psi)}{\partial y} - \mathbf{a}(y) \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} = \mathbf{a}(y) \langle \psi \rangle_y - \langle \mathbf{a}(y)\psi \rangle_y. \quad (38)$$

Denoting the vertical derivative  $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$  by  $\partial_z$ , by stationarity, one has

$$\langle |\partial_z Q_{kl}(\mathbf{a}, y)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} = \langle |\partial_{z-y} Q_{kl}(\mathbf{a}, 0)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}.$$

Further, by triangle inequality

$$I \lesssim \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|\nabla f(y)| |g(y)|)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where  $g(y) := \langle |\partial_{z-y} Q_{kl}(\mathbf{a}, 0)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}}$ . We will observe that

$$\langle |\partial_{z-y} Q_{kl}(\mathbf{a}, 0)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim (|z-y|+1)^{-\gamma}$$

for some  $\gamma > \frac{d}{s}$ . To this aim, we need to compute  $\partial_{z-y} Q_{kl}(\cdot, 0)$ . Taking  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x Q_{kl}(\mathbf{a}, 0) &= \partial_x Q^k(\mathbf{a}, e_l) e_l - \partial_x Q^l(\mathbf{a}, e_k) e_k \\ &= \partial_x (\mathbf{a}(\nabla \phi_k(e_l) + e_l) e_l) - \partial_x (\mathbf{a}(\nabla \phi_l(e_k) + e_k) e_k). \end{aligned}$$

Set  $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ . By using the corrector problem (2), we will show that

$$\partial_x (\mathbf{a}^{ij}(\nabla \phi_k(e_l) + e_l)) = (\delta(e_l - x) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}(e_l) \nabla_x \nabla_{e_l} G(x, e_l)) \cdot ([\nabla \phi_k(x) + e_l]_x), \quad (39)$$

and then, for  $d > 2$  and the moment condition (4) one has

$$\langle |(\delta(e_l - x) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}(e_l) \nabla_x \nabla_{e_l} G(x, e_l)) \cdot ([\nabla \phi_k(x) + e_l]_x)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim (|x - e_l| + 1)^{-d + \frac{2p-1}{p}}$$

since

$$\langle |[\nabla \phi_k(x) + e_l]_x|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim 1.$$

By choosing  $\gamma := d - \frac{2p-1}{p}$ , and the Young's convolution formula for  $s, r$  as before,

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \left( \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla f(y)| (|z-y|+1)^{-\gamma} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \cdot \|(|\cdot|+1)^{-\gamma}\|_{\ell^s(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{\ell^r(\mathbb{Z}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

With such estimate at hand, we look for a suitable sublinear growth of  $\sigma$ . We follow arguments in [4, 24]. Consider  $L \geq 1$  and define

$$v_L(\omega) := \sigma(\mathbf{a}, 0) - \frac{1}{\#B(L)} \sum_{y \in B(L)} \sigma(\mathbf{a}, y)$$

with  $B(L) := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |x| < L\}$ . Let us consider the elliptic problem

$$\nabla^* \nabla f = h \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d$$

with  $h := \delta_0 - \frac{1}{\#B(L)} \mathbb{1}_{B(L)}$ . By Green's representation one has

$$\nabla f(x) := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla G(x, y) h(y).$$

It implies that

$$|\nabla f(y)| \lesssim (L \wedge |y|) (|y| + 1)^{-d}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} v_L(\mathbf{a}) &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sigma(\mathbf{a}, y) h(y) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sigma(\mathbf{a}, y) \nabla^* \nabla f(y) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla^* \nabla \sigma(\mathbf{a}, y) f(y) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Q(\mathbf{a}, y) \cdot \nabla f(y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\partial_x v_L := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \partial_x Q(\mathbf{a}, y) \cdot \nabla f(y)$  and  $\langle |v_L|^{2p} \rangle \lesssim 1$ . Similarly, for every  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  let us consider

$$v'_L(\mathbf{a}) := \frac{1}{\#B(L)} \sum_{y \in B(L)} (\sigma(\mathbf{a}, x+y) - \sigma(\mathbf{a}, y)).$$

We have that  $\langle |v'_L|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim |x| L^{\frac{d}{r}-d} \log(L)$ . To this estimate, we only change  $h := \frac{1}{\#B(L)} (\mathbb{K}_{B(L)}(\cdot - x) - \mathbb{K}_{B(L)}(\cdot))$  and thus  $|\nabla f(y)| \lesssim (L \vee |y|)^{-d} |x| \log(L)$ , and, for  $v'_L$  we do as before. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathbf{a}, x) &= \sigma(\mathbf{a}, x) - \frac{1}{\#B(L)} \sum_{y \in B(L)} \sigma(\mathbf{a}, x+y) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\#B(L)} \sum_{y \in B(L)} (\sigma(\mathbf{a}, x+y) - \sigma(\mathbf{a}, y)) + \frac{1}{\#B(L)} \sum_{y \in B(L)} \sigma(\mathbf{a}, y) - \sigma(\mathbf{a}, 0) \\ &= v_L(\tau_x \mathbf{a}) + v'_L(\mathbf{a}) - v_L(\mathbf{a}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\langle |\sigma(x)|^{2p} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim |x| L^{\frac{d}{r}-d} \log(L) \approx |x|^{\frac{d}{r}-d+1} \log(|x|)$ . To finish, we only need to prove the formula (39). From (38), we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\mathbf{a}(x) (\nabla \phi_j(x) + e_j)) = \mathbf{a}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \nabla \phi_j(x) + \delta(x-y) [\nabla \phi_j(y) + e_j]_y.$$

Now, we make use of equation (2). We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \nabla^* \mathbf{a}(x) (\nabla \phi_j(x) + e_j) - \langle \nabla^* \mathbf{a}(x) (\nabla \phi_j(x) + e_j) \rangle_y \\ &= \nabla^* \left( \mathbf{a}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \nabla \phi_j(x) + \mathbf{a}(x) \langle \nabla \phi_j(x) + e_j \rangle_y - \langle \mathbf{a}(x) (\nabla \phi_j + e_j) \rangle_y \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\nabla^* \left( \mathbf{a}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \nabla \phi_j(x) \right) = -\nabla^* (\delta(x-y) [\nabla \phi_j(x) + e_j]_y),$$

and then, by Green's representation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \phi_j(x) &= -\nabla_y \tilde{G}(x, y) \cdot [\nabla \phi_j(x) + e_j]_y, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \nabla_x \phi_j(x) &= -\nabla_x \nabla_y \tilde{G}(x, y) \cdot [\nabla \phi_j(x) + e_j]_y, \end{aligned}$$

and from which follows formula (39). □

In the sequel, we give a few of preliminaries to make the argument of Theorem 2.2. We start with the following divergence formula.

**Proposition 3.13.** *Let  $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|l| = 1$  be fixed and let  $(\phi, \sigma)$  the correctors and corrector fluxes. Consider,*

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{a}) &:= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega(0, y) \psi(\mathbf{a}, y)^2, \\ \psi(\mathbf{a}, y) &:= l \cdot y + \phi(\mathbf{a}, y) - \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0), \\ \phi(\mathbf{a}, y) &:= \sum_i^d l_i (\phi_i(\mathbf{a}, y) - \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0)), \\ \omega(x, y) &:= \begin{cases} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}(x) |x_i - y_i| & \text{if } |x - y| = 1, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$g(\mathbf{a}) - \langle g \rangle = \nabla^* H(\mathbf{a}, 0) \quad (40)$$

where  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_d)$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(\mathbf{a}, x) &:= \omega(x, x + e_i)(l_i + \nabla_i \phi(\mathbf{a}, x))^2 \\ &\quad + 2(\sigma^t \cdot l + \phi(\mathbf{a}, x + e_i)\mathbf{a}(x)(l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, x))) \cdot e_i. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Defined  $H'_i$  and  $H''_i$  as

$$\begin{aligned} H'_i(\mathbf{a}, x) &:= \omega(x, x + e_i)(l_i + \nabla_i \phi(\mathbf{a}, x))^2 \\ H''_i(\mathbf{a}, x) &:= \phi(\mathbf{a}, x + e_i)(e_i \cdot \mathbf{a}(x)(l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, x))) \end{aligned}$$

note that  $H_i = H'_i + 2(\sigma^t l) \cdot e_i + 2H''_i$ . We have  $\psi(\mathbf{a}, e_i) = l_i + \nabla_i \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0)$ , and by stationarity of  $\nabla \phi_i$ , one has  $\psi(\mathbf{a}, -e_i) = -l_i - \nabla_i \phi(\mathbf{a}, -e_i) = -l_i - \nabla_i \phi(\tau_{-e_i} \mathbf{a}, 0)$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{a}) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \omega(0, e_i)(l_i + \nabla_i \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0))^2 + \sum_{i=1}^d \omega(-e_i, 0)(-l_i - \nabla_i \phi(\mathbf{a}, -e_i))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d H'_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) + \sum_{i=1}^d H'_i(\tau_{-e_i} \mathbf{a}, 0) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^d H'_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) + D^* H'(\mathbf{a}, 0) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^d H'_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) + \nabla^* H'(\mathbf{a}, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where the last identity holds owed that  $H'(\tau_x \mathbf{a}, y) = H'(\mathbf{a}, x + y)$ . On the other hand, with

$$q(\mathbf{a}, x) = \mathbf{a}(x)(l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, x)) - \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} l,$$

and that  $\nabla^* \mathbf{a}(0)(\nabla \phi + l) = 0$ , we can write  $\sum_{i=1}^d H'_i(\mathbf{a}, 0)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d H'_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) &= (l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0)) \mathbf{a}(0)(l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0)) \\ &= l \cdot q(\mathbf{a}, 0) + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0) \mathbf{a}(0)(l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0)) + l \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} l \\ &= \nabla^*(\sigma^t l)(\mathbf{a}, 0) + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0) \mathbf{a}(0)(l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, 0)) + l \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} l. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we make use of the followinf discrete Leibniz rule: Consider a vector field  $F := (F_i)_{i=1}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \phi \cdot F &= \nabla^*[\phi, F] - \phi \nabla^* F, \\ [\phi, F]_i(x) &:= \phi(x + e_i) F_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, with  $F(x) := \mathbf{a}(x)(l + \nabla \phi(\mathbf{a}, x))$ , and that  $\nabla^* F(x) = 0$ , we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^d H'_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) = \nabla^*(\sigma^t l)(\omega, 0) + \nabla^* H''(\mathbf{a}, 0) + l \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} l$$

and from which

$$g(\mathbf{a}) = 2 \left( \nabla^*(\sigma^t l)(\omega, 0) + \nabla^* H''(\mathbf{a}, 0) + l \mathbf{a}_{\text{hom}} l \right) + \nabla^* H'(\mathbf{a}, 0).$$

Therefore,

$$g(\mathbf{a}) - \langle g \rangle := \nabla^* H(\mathbf{a}, 0).$$

□

**Corollary 3.14.** *Let  $d \geq 3$ , and assume (A1)-(A2). Consider for any direction  $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_l &:= \sum_{i=1}^d l_i \phi_i, \\ g_l(\mathbf{a}) &:= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega(0, y) \psi_l(\mathbf{a}, y)^2, \\ \omega(x, y) &:= \begin{cases} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_{ij}(x) |x_i - y_i| & \text{if } |x - y| = 1, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Further, for  $p \geq 1$  let define  $P_t : L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)$  given by

$$P_t u(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G(t, 0, y) u(\tau_y \mathbf{a}).$$

Then,

$$\left\langle P_t (g_l - \langle g_l \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$$

up to a multiplicative constant which only depends on  $d$  and the moment condition (4).

*Proof.* We have by proposition 3.1,

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla p(t, y)|^2 w(t, y)^\alpha \lesssim \mathcal{Z}_t^2 (t+1)^{-(\frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2})}. \quad (41)$$

From the last formula (40),

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle [P_t (g_l - \langle g_l \rangle)^2] \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim \left\langle \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla p(t, y)|^2 w(t, y)^\alpha \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |H(y)|^2 w(t, y)^{-\alpha} \right) \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim (t+1)^{-(\frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2})} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{-\alpha} \langle \mathcal{Z}_t^2 |H(y)|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality followed from (41). Moreover, by the moment bounds on  $\sigma$  on  $\phi$ , there exists  $\theta_0 > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle \mathcal{Z}_t^2 |H(y)|^2 \rangle \lesssim (t+1)^{\theta_0} w(t, y)^{2\theta_0}$$

On the other hand,

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(t, y)^{-\alpha + 2\theta_0} \lesssim (t+1)^{\frac{d}{4}}$$

for  $\alpha - 2\theta_0 > \frac{d}{2}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle [P_t (g_l - \langle g_l \rangle)^2] \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim (t+1)^{-(\frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{\theta_0}{2}} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w(t, y)^{-\alpha + 2\theta_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim (t+1)^{-(\frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{\theta_0}{2} + \frac{d}{8}} \\ &\lesssim (t+1)^{-(\frac{d}{8} + \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{\theta_0}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \begin{cases} c(t+1)^{-\frac{1}{4}} & \text{if } d = 3, \frac{1}{2} < \theta_0 < \frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{2}, \\ c(t+1)^{-\frac{1}{4}} & \text{if } d > 4, \theta_0 = 0 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

for some  $c > 0$ . □

**Proposition 3.15.** *Let  $d \geq 3$  and assume (A1)-(A2). Also, let define*

$$M_t := \Psi(X_t), \quad (42)$$

$$\Psi(\mathbf{a}, x) := (x_i + \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x) - \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0))_{i=1}^d. \quad (43)$$

*There exists a constant  $c = c(d)$  such that for all  $t > 0, l \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\left\langle E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \left| \frac{\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t}{t} - \sigma_l^2 \right|^2 \right] \right\rangle \lesssim t^{-1/2}. \quad (44)$$

*where  $\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t$  denotes the quadratic variation of  $M_t$ .*

The proof of this Proposition is mainly based on the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.16** ([19]). *Let  $(N_{t \geq 0})_{t \geq 0}$  be a locally sequence-integrable martingale w.r.t some probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  and denote by  $\Delta N_t := N_t - N_{t-}$  its jump process and  $\langle N \rangle_t$  its quadratic variation process. Then, for any  $p > 1$ , there exists a constant  $c > 0$  depending on  $p$  such that*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}[N_1 \leq x] - \Phi(x) \right| \leq c \left( E(|\langle N \rangle_1 - 1|^p) + E\left(\sum_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\Delta N_t|^{2p}\right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2p+1}}. \quad (45)$$

*Proposition 3.15.* Arguing as in [23], defined  $M_t$  as above, and set  $G_l := g_l - \langle g_l \rangle$  where  $\sigma_l^2 = \langle g_l \rangle$ , with  $g_l$  defined as in Corollary 3.14. Firstly, note that

$$\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \Gamma^{\mathbf{a}}(\psi_l(\mathbf{a}, \cdot))(X_s) ds.$$

where  $\Gamma^{\mathbf{a}}$  denotes the Carré du Champ operator associated to  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{a}} := -\nabla^* \mathbf{a} \nabla$  defined as

$$\Gamma^{\mathbf{a}} f(x) := \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{a}} f^2(x) - 2f(x) \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{a}} f(x), \quad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

and  $\psi_l(\mathbf{a}, x) := l \cdot \Psi(\mathbf{a}, x)$ . Moreover,

$$\Gamma^{\mathbf{a}} \psi_l(\mathbf{a}, 0) \leq g_l(\mathbf{a}),$$

and then

$$\left| \frac{\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t}{t} - \sigma_l^2 \right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{t^2} \left( \int_0^t G_l(\tau_{X_s} \mathbf{a}) ds \right)^2.$$

Hence, by stationarity of  $(\tau_{X_s} \mathbf{a})$ , a change of variable and Corollary(3.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left| \frac{\langle l \cdot M \rangle_t}{t} - \sigma_l^2 \right|^2 \right\rangle &\leq \frac{2}{t^2} \int_{0 \leq s \leq u \leq t} \langle E_0^{\mathbf{a}} [G_l(\tau_{X_s} \mathbf{a}) G_l(\tau_{X_u} \mathbf{a})] ds du \rangle \\ &= \frac{2}{t^2} \int_0^t (t-s) \langle (G_l(\mathbf{a}) P_s G_l(\mathbf{a})) \rangle ds \\ &\leq \frac{2t}{t^2} \int_0^t \langle (P_{\frac{s}{2}} G_l(\mathbf{a}))^2 \rangle ds \\ &\leq \frac{2c^2}{t} \int_0^t \left(\frac{s}{2} + 1\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds \\ &\lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

To finish, we note that  $\nabla^* \mathbf{a} \nabla \Psi_i = 0$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , so  $\Psi_i$  is harmonic, and then  $M := (M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ ,  $l \cdot M$  are  $P_0^{\mathbf{a}}$ -martingales.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.17.** *Let consider  $d \geq 3$  and assume (A1)-(A2). There exist exponents  $p_1, q_1 \in [1, \infty)$  (only depending on  $d, \rho$ ) such that under the moment condition (4) the following holds. There exists a constant  $c = c(d, \rho)$  such that for all  $t \geq 0, l \in \mathbb{R}^d$  one has*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}[l \cdot M_t \leq \sigma_l x \sqrt{t}] - \Phi(x) \right| \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{10}}, \quad (46)$$

where  $M_t$  is defined in (42).

*Proof.* Let us consider in Theorem 3.16 the choice  $p=2$  with the martingale defined as

$$N_s := \frac{l \cdot M_{st}}{\sqrt{t} \sigma_l} \text{ with } 0 \leq s \leq 1.$$

Hence, we get from Proposition 3.15,

$$\langle E_0^{\mathbf{a}} [|\langle N \rangle_1 - 1|^2] \rangle \lesssim t^{-1/2}.$$

Furthermore, we claim that

$$E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \sum_{s \leq 1} |\Delta N_s|^4 \right] \lesssim t^{-1}.$$

Note that,

$$\sum_{s \leq 1} |\Delta N_s|^4 = (t \sigma_l^2)^{-2} \sum_{s \leq 1} |l \cdot M_s - l \cdot M_{s-}|^4.$$

For  $d \geq 3$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist a random variable  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $p_1 > 0, q_1 > 0$  such that if the moment condition hold, we have for  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.e  $\mathbf{a}$

$$E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} |l \cdot M_s - l \cdot M_{s-}|^n \right] \leq \mathcal{Y} t.$$

Their argument follows the next lines. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \frac{1}{t} \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} |l \cdot M_s - l \cdot M_{s-}|^n \right] &= E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \frac{1}{t} \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\psi_l(\mathbf{a}, X_s) - \psi_l(\mathbf{a}, X_{s-})|^n \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t ds E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{a}(X_{s-}, y) |\psi_l(\mathbf{a}, y) - \psi_l(\mathbf{a}, X_{s-})|^n \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t ds E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\tau_{X_{s-}} \mathbf{a})(0, y - X_{s-}) |\psi_l(\tau_{X_{s-}} \mathbf{a}, y - X_{s-})|^n \right] \\ &\rightarrow \left\langle \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{a}(0, y) |\psi_l(\mathbf{a}, y)|^n \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where the last step, comes out by a classical ergodic theorem as  $t$  goes to infinity, provided that moment bounds of  $\psi_l$  are finite, with  $\psi_l := l \cdot \Psi$ , with  $\Psi$  defined as the harmonic directions in (43). For our argument, it is sufficient to define

$$\mathcal{Y} := \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t ds E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\tau_{X_{s-}} \mathbf{a})(0, y - X_{s-}) |\psi_l(\tau_{X_{s-}} \mathbf{a}, y - X_{s-})|^n \right].$$

Now, we apply Theorem 3.16 and conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}[l \cdot M_t \leq x\sqrt{t}] - \Phi(x) \right| = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}[N_1 \leq x] - \Phi(x) \right| \\
& \lesssim \left( E_0^{\mathbf{a}} [|\langle N \rangle_1 - 1|^2] + E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |\Delta N_s|^4 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{5}} \\
& \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{10}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

### 3.2 Growth of correctors

**Proposition 3.18.** *Let assume  $d \geq 3$  and that (A1)-(A3) hold. For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $p, q \in [0, \infty)$  for such that under the moment condition (4) the following holds. There exists a random variable  $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X}(d, \delta, p, q)$  which only depends on  $d, \delta, p, q$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle |\mathcal{X}|^n \rangle < \infty, \\
& E_0^{\mathbf{a}} (|l \cdot \chi(\mathbf{a}, X_t)|) \leq \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{a})(t+1)^\delta \quad \mathbb{P} - a.e \mathbf{a}.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This proof is mainly based on quantitative bounds on correctors, which for the sake of simplicity we present as follows. Consider the distance  $d$  on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , i.e., the minimal length between two points  $x, y$  denoted as  $d(x, y)$ . With a slight abuse of notation, we write

$$B(r) := \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d(0, z) \leq r\}.$$

Consider  $\alpha \in (\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} + 2\delta)$  and  $k$  such that  $d + \frac{2d}{k} < \alpha$ . Also, we consider the weight function (21). During the proof of Lemma 3.3, we show that

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p^{\mathbf{a}}(t, 0, y)^2 w^\alpha(t, y) \lesssim (t+1)^{-\frac{d}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Then, by Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p^{\mathbf{a}}(t, 0, y) d(0, y)^{\frac{d}{k}} & \leq \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p^{\mathbf{a}}(t, 0, y)^2 w^\alpha(t, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w^{-\alpha}(t, y) d^{\frac{2d}{k}}(0, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{a})(t+1)^{-\frac{d}{4} + \frac{\alpha}{4}}, \\
& \leq \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{a})(t+1)^\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{X}$  coming from Lemma 3.3. Set  $R_t := d(0, X_t)$ , and note that

$$E_0^{\mathbf{a}} \left( R_t^{\frac{d}{k}} \right) \leq \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p^{\mathbf{a}}(t, 0, y) d(0, y)^{\frac{d}{k}} \leq \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{a})(t+1)^\delta.$$

Let consider a nearest-neighbour path  $x_0, \dots, x_{R_t}$ , where  $x_0 := 0, x_{R_t} := X_t$ . Then by the cocycle property

$$\begin{aligned}
& y_i + \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, y) - \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0) - (x_i + \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, x) - \phi_i(\mathbf{a}, 0)) \\
& = y_i - x_i + \phi_i(\tau_x \mathbf{a}, y - x) - \phi_i(\tau_x \mathbf{a}, 0), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d,
\end{aligned}$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned}
|l \cdot \chi(\mathbf{a}, X_t)|^k & \leq \sum_{i=0}^{R_t-1} |l \cdot \chi(\mathbf{a}, x_{i+1}) - l \cdot \chi(\mathbf{a}, x_i)|^k \\
& = \sum_{i=0}^{R_t-1} |l \cdot \chi(\tau_{x_i} \mathbf{a}, x_{i+1} - x_i)|^k.
\end{aligned}$$



To finish, we set

$$H_0(\mathbf{a}) := \sum_{|e|=1} |l \cdot \chi(\mathbf{a}, X_t)|^k,$$

$$H_1(\mathbf{a}) := \sup_{R>0} \frac{1}{\#B(R)} \sum_{y \in B(R)} H_0(\tau_y \mathbf{a}),$$

from which

$$|l \cdot \chi(\mathbf{a}, X_t)| \lesssim R_t^{\frac{d}{k}} \left( \frac{1}{\#B(R)} \sum_{y \in B(R)} H_0(\tau_y \mathbf{a}) \right)^{\frac{1}{k}}$$

$$\lesssim H_1^{\frac{1}{k}} \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{a})(t+1)^\delta.$$

By the ergodic theorem

$$\langle H_1^{\frac{2n}{k}} \rangle \lesssim \langle H_0^{\frac{2n}{k}} \rangle < \infty$$

since correctors are bounded for any  $2n > k$ , up to multiplicative constant that only depends on  $d, \rho$ .  $\square$

To finish, we finally present the argument of Theorem 2.2:

*Theorem 2.2.* Set  $\chi_t(\omega) = \chi(\mathbf{a}, X_t) := M_t(\mathbf{a}, X_t) - X_t$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  consider  $p, q \in [1, \infty)$  for which moment condition (4) holds. Moreover, by the moment bound of correctors, let us consider  $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{10})$  as in Proposition 3.18 such that

$$E_0^{\mathbf{a}}(|l \cdot \chi(\omega, X_t)|) \lesssim \mathcal{X}(t+1)^\delta$$

for some random variable  $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X}(n, p, q, d)$  such that  $\langle \mathcal{X}^n \rangle < \infty$ . By Chebyshev's inequality

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(|l \cdot \chi_t| > t^{\frac{2}{10}}) \lesssim \mathcal{X}(t+1)^{-\frac{1}{10}}.$$

Further, from Proposition 3.15 we have

$$\left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(l \cdot M_t \leq y\sqrt{t}) - \phi\left(\frac{y}{\sigma_l}\right) \right| = O(t^{-\frac{1}{10}}).$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(l \cdot M_t \leq (x - t^{\frac{1}{5}})\sqrt{t}) \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(l \cdot X_t \leq x\sqrt{t}) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(|\chi_t| > t^{-\frac{1}{10}}),$$

and then

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(l \cdot X_t \leq x\sqrt{t}) \geq \Phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma_l}\right) - O(t^{-\frac{1}{10}}) - \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(|\chi_t| > t^{-\frac{1}{10}}). \quad (47)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(l \cdot X_t \leq x\sqrt{t}) &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(l \cdot M_t \leq (x + t^{-\frac{1}{5}})\sqrt{t}) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(|\chi_t| > t^{-\frac{1}{10}}) \\ &\leq \Phi\left(\frac{x + t^{-\frac{1}{5}}}{\sigma_l}\right) + O(t^{-\frac{1}{10}}) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(|\chi_t| > t^{-\frac{1}{10}}) \\ &\leq \Phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma_l}\right) + O(t^{-\frac{1}{5}}) + O(t^{-\frac{1}{10}}) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(|\chi_t| > t^{-\frac{1}{10}}). \end{aligned}$$

Latter inequality together to (47) gives,

$$\left| \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(l \cdot X_t \leq x\sqrt{t}) - \Phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma_l}\right) \right| \leq O(t^{-\frac{1}{10}}) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(|\chi_t| > t^{-\frac{1}{10}})$$

$$\lesssim O(t^{-\frac{1}{10}}).$$

$\square$

## References

- [1] Grégoire Allaire. Homogenization and two-scale convergence. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 23(6):1482–1518, 1992.
- [2] Sebastian Andres, Alberto Chiarini, Jean-Dominique Deuschel, Martin Slowik, et al. Quenched invariance principle for random walks with time-dependent ergodic degenerate weights. *The Annals of Probability*, 46(1):302–336, 2018.
- [3] Sebastian Andres, Jean-Dominique Deuschel, Martin Slowik, et al. Heat kernel estimates and intrinsic metric for random walks with general speed measure under degenerate conductances. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 24, 2019.
- [4] Sebastian Andres and Stefan Neukamm. Berry–esseen theorem and quantitative homogenization for the random conductance model with degenerate conductances. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, pages 1–57, 2018.
- [5] Scott Armstrong, Alexandre Bordas, and Jean-Christophe Mourrat. Quantitative stochastic homogenization and regularity theory of parabolic equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07672*, 2017.
- [6] Scott Armstrong, Tuomo Kuusi, and Jean-Christophe Mourrat. The additive structure of elliptic homogenization. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 208(3):999–1154, 2017.
- [7] Peter Bella, Benjamin Fehrman, Julian Fischer, and Felix Otto. Stochastic homogenization of linear elliptic equations: Higher-order error estimates in weak norms via second-order correctors. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 49(6):4658–4703, 2017.
- [8] Peter Bella and Felix Otto. Corrector estimates for elliptic systems with random periodic coefficients. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 14(4):1434–1462, 2016.
- [9] Peter Bella and Mathias Schäffner. Quenched invariance principle for random walks among random degenerate conductances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.05793*, 2019.
- [10] Jonathan Ben-Artzi, Daniel Marahrens, and Stefan Neukamm. Moment bounds on the corrector of stochastic homogenization of non-symmetric elliptic finite difference equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 42(2):179–234, 2017.
- [11] Andrea Braides. *Gamma-convergence for Beginners*, volume 22. Clarendon Press, 2002.
- [12] Doina Cioranescu, Alain Damlamian, and Georges Griso. Periodic unfolding and homogenization. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 335(1):99–104, 2002.
- [13] Doina Cioranescu and Patrizia Donato. Introduction to homogenization. 2000.
- [14] Gianni Dal Maso and Luciano Modica. *Nonlinear stochastic homogenization and ergodic theory*. Università di Pisa. Dipartimento di Matematica, 1985.
- [15] Julian Fischer and Stefan Neukamm. Optimal homogenization rates in stochastic homogenization of nonlinear uniformly elliptic equations and systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.02273*, 2019.
- [16] Arianna Giunti, Jean-Christophe Mourrat, et al. Quantitative homogenization of degenerate random environments. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, volume 54, pages 22–50. Institut Henri Poincaré, 2018.
- [17] Antoine Gloria, Stefan Neukamm, and Felix Otto. A regularity theory for random elliptic operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.2678*, 2014.
- [18] Antoine Gloria, Stefan Neukamm, and Felix Otto. Quantification of ergodicity in stochastic homogenization: optimal bounds via spectral gap on glauher dynamics. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 199(2):455–515, 2015.
- [19] Erich Haeusler. On the rate of convergence in the central limit theorem for martingales with discrete and continuous time. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 275–299, 1988.

- [20] Martin Heida. Stochastic homogenization of rate-independent systems and applications. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, 29(3):853–894, 2017.
- [21] Sergei Mikhailovich Kozlov. The method of averaging and walks in inhomogeneous environments. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 40(2):73–145, 1985.
- [22] Takashi Kumagai. *Random walks on disordered media and their scaling limits*. Springer, 2014.
- [23] Jean-Christophe Mourrat et al. A quantitative central limit theorem for the random walk among random conductances. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 17, 2012.
- [24] Stefan Neukamm. An introduction to the qualitative and quantitative theory of homogenization. *Interdisciplinary Information Sciences*, 24(1):1–48, 2018.
- [25] Ivan Nourdin and Giovanni Peccati. Steins method on wiener chaos. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 145(1-2):75–118, 2009.
- [26] George C Papanicolaou. Boundary value problems with rapidly oscillating random coefficients. In *Colloquia Math. Soc., Janos Bolyai*, volume 27, pages 853–873, 1979.
- [27] Ben Schweizer and M Veneroni. Homogenization of plasticity equations with two-scale convergence methods. *Applicable Analysis*, 94(2):375–398, 2015.
- [28] Luc Tartar. *The general theory of homogenization: a personalized introduction*, volume 7. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [29] Augusto Visintin. Scale-integration and scale-disintegration in nonlinear homogenization. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 36(4):565, 2009.
- [30] V. V. Yurinskii. Averaging of symmetric diffusion in random medium. *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 27(4):603–613, 1986.