

GINIBRE INTERACTING BROWNIAN MOTION IN INFINITE DIMENSIONS IS SUB-DIFFUSIVE

Hirofumi Osada
Chubu University

osada@isc.chubu.ac.jp, osada@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp

ABSTRACT. We prove that the tagged particles of infinitely many Brownian particles in \mathbb{R}^2 interacting via a logarithmic (two-dimensional Coulomb) potential with inverse temperature $\beta = 2$ are sub-diffusive. The associated unlabeled diffusion is reversible with respect to the Ginibre random point field, and the dynamics are thus referred to as the Ginibre interacting Brownian motion. If the interacting Brownian particles have interaction potential Ψ of Ruelle class and the total system starts in a translation invariant equilibrium state, then the tagged particles are always diffusive if the dimension d of the space \mathbb{R}^d is greater than or equal to two. That is, the tagged particles are always non-degenerate under diffusive scaling. Our result is, therefore, contrary to known results. The Ginibre random point field has various levels of geometric rigidity. Our results reveal that the geometric property of infinite particle systems affects the dynamical property of the associated stochastic dynamics.

Keyword: Rigidities of random point field, Tagged particle problem

MSC2020: 60K50, 82C22

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Dirichlet forms of unlabeled dynamics	11
2.1. Dirichlet forms associated with the unlabeled diffusions	12
2.2. Perpendicular carré du champs \mathbb{D}^\perp	14
2.3. Identity of the perpendicular, lower, and upper Dirichlet forms	17
3. One-labeled, tagged particle, and environment processes	19
3.1. One-labeled processes	19
3.2. Tagged particle processes	21
3.3. Environment processes	23
4. Vanishing the self-diffusion matrix	24
4.1. A sufficient condition for the vanishing of the self-diffusion matrix	24
4.2. Invariance principle with the vanishing of the self-diffusion matrix	27
5. Dual reduced Palm measures and mean-rigid conditioning	30
5.1. Dual reduced Palm measures	30
5.2. Mean-rigid conditioning	36
6. Proof of the main theorems (Theorems 1.1–1.4)	39
6.1. Proof of Theorems 1.2–1.4	39
6.2. Preparation for proof of Theorem 1.1	41
6.3. The main terms of perpendicular SDEs	41
6.4. Vanishing of the γ -coefficient terms	45

6.5. Identification of the ISDE for \mathbf{X}^\perp	48
6.6. Proof of Theorem 1.1	49
7. Appendices	50
7.1. Proof of (1.10)	50
7.2. Strongly local, quasi-regular Dirichlet forms	53
7.3. IFC condition and the uniqueness of weak solutions of ISDEs	54
Acknowledgments	55
References	56

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider a system $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of infinitely many Brownian particles moving in \mathbb{R}^d and interacting through a translation invariant, two-body potential $\Psi(x)$. \mathbf{X} is described by the infinite-dimensional stochastic differential equation (ISDE)

$$X_t^i - X_0^i = B_t^i - \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^t \sum_{j \neq i} \nabla \Psi(X_u^i - X_u^j) du,$$

where B^i ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) denotes independent d -dimensional Brownian motions and $\beta \geq 0$ is the inverse temperature, which is taken as a constant. The solution \mathbf{X} provides a description of the interacting Brownian motion [15, 16, 5, 35].

The unlabeled process $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ associated with \mathbf{X} is given by

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{X_t^i},$$

where δ_a is the delta measure at $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and \mathbf{X} is a configuration-valued process by definition.

We suppose that the unlabeled process \mathbf{X} is reversible with respect to a translation invariant equilibrium state $\mu^{\Psi, \beta}$. In many cases, we expect the existence of such an equilibrium state. For example, if Ψ is a Ruelle-class potential (i.e., it is super-stable and regular in the sense of Ruelle), then the associated translation invariant canonical Gibbs measures exist. Here, super-stability is a condition that prevents infinitely many particles agglomerating in a bounded domain, and regularity means the integrability of interactions at infinity and therefore provides the Dobrushin–Lanford–Ruelle equation [30].

We investigate the tagged particles $X^i = \{X_t^i\}_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ in the system. Although the total unlabeled system \mathbf{X} is a $\mu^{\Psi, \beta}$ -reversible Markov process, each tagged particle X^i is a non-Markov process because the total system affects it in a complicated fashion. Applying the Kipnis–Varadhan theory, it can nevertheless be seen that the motion of each tagged particle always reverts to Brownian motion under diffusive scaling [8, 4, 26, 19, 34]. That is,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon X_{t/\epsilon^2}^i = \sigma B_t.$$

The constant may depend on the initial configuration, and we therefore introduce α , defined as the expectation of $(1/2)\sigma^2$ with respect to the reduced Palm measure of the reversible measure $\mu^{\Psi, \beta}$. The constant matrix α is called the self-diffusion matrix.

Once such convergence of motion is established under this fairly general situation, it is natural and important to inquire about the positivity of the self-diffusion matrix α .

Historically, there was a conjecture that $\alpha = 0$ for hard-core potentials and sufficiently large activities in multi-dimensional grand canonical Gibbs measures; cf. [1]. This conjecture seemed to be plausible because the presence of a hard core should suppress the motion of tagged particles. However the contrary was proved in [20]. Indeed, α is always positive definite if $d \geq 2$ and Ψ is a Ruelle-class potential corresponding to a hard core.

In the setting of discrete spaces, the counterpart is a tagged particle problem of exclusion processes in \mathbb{Z}^d . As for the simple exclusion processes, Kipnis–Varadhan [14] proved that α is always positive definite except for the nearest neighborhood jump in one space dimension. Spohn [31] proved that α is always positive definite for general exclusion processes with Ruelle-class potentials when $d \geq 2$.

We note that the set of the Gibbs measures with Ruelle-class potentials is the standard class of random point fields in both continuous and discrete spaces. We hence consider, on good grounds, that it is reasonable to believe that self-diffusion matrices are always positive definite for $d \geq 2$. Nevertheless, we present the antithesis in the present paper.

The Ginibre interacting Brownian motion $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a system of infinite-many Brownian particles moving in \mathbb{R}^2 and interacting via the two-dimensional Coulomb potential $\Psi(x) = -\log|x|$ with inverse temperature $\beta = 2$. The stochastic dynamics $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_t\}$ are then described by the ISDE

$$(1.1) \quad X_t^i - X_0^i = B_t^i + \int_0^t \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|X_u^i - X_u^j| < R, j \neq i} \frac{X_u^i - X_u^j}{|X_u^i - X_u^j|^2} du.$$

The associated unlabeled process \mathbf{X} is reversible with respect to the Ginibre random point field μ_{Gin} . By definition, μ_{Gin} is a random point field on \mathbb{R}^2 for which the n -point correlation function ρ_{Gin}^n with respect to the Lebesgue measure is given by

$$\rho_{\text{Gin}}^n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \det[\mathbf{K}_{\text{Gin}}(x_i, x_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\mathbf{K}_{\text{Gin}} : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the exponential kernel defined by

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{Gin}}(x, y) = \pi^{-1} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2} - \frac{|y|^2}{2}} \cdot e^{x\bar{y}}.$$

Here, we identify \mathbb{R}^2 as \mathbb{C} by the correspondence $\mathbb{R}^2 \ni x = (x_1, x_2) \mapsto x_1 + \sqrt{-1}x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, and $\bar{y} = y_1 - \sqrt{-1}y_2$ gives the complex conjugate of y under this identification.

It is known that μ_{Gin} is translation and rotation invariant. Furthermore, μ_{Gin} is tail trivial [25, 17]. Let \mathbf{S} be the configuration space over \mathbb{R}^2 defined by (1.2). Let \mathbf{S}_* be a Borel subset of $\mathbf{S} \setminus \{0\}$, where 0 is the zero measure. A measurable map $\mathfrak{l} : \mathbf{S}_* \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^2)^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{R}^2)^m\}$ called a label if $\mathfrak{l}(\mathbf{s}) = (\mathfrak{l}^i(\mathbf{s}))_i$ satisfies $\sum_i \delta_{\mathfrak{l}^i(\mathbf{s})} = \mathbf{s}$. Typically, we take a label \mathfrak{l} such that $|\mathfrak{l}^i(\mathbf{s})| \leq |\mathfrak{l}^{i+1}(\mathbf{s})|$ for all i .

For $\mu_{\text{Gin}} \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1}$ -a.s. $\mathbf{s} = (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, (1.1) has a solution $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, of which the unlabeled process \mathbf{X} is μ_{Gin} -reversible [22]. The ISDE has a unique strong solution starting at $\mu_{\text{Gin}} \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1}$ -a.s. \mathbf{s} under a reasonable constraint. We refer to Section 7 in [28] and references therein for the existence and uniqueness of solutions of (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $P_{\mathbf{s}}$ be the distribution of the solution $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of (1.1) starting at $\mathbf{s} \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, under $P_{\mathbf{s}}$ in $\mu_{\text{Gin}} \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1}$ -probability,*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon X_{\cdot/\epsilon^2}^i = 0 \text{ weakly in } C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2).$$

Remark 1.1. The claim in Theorem 1.1 means that for any bounded continuous function F on $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\kappa > 0$, it holds that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mu_{\text{Gin}} \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1} \left(\left\{ \mathbf{s} \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^{\mathbb{N}}; \left| \int F(\epsilon X_{\cdot/\epsilon^2}^i) dP_{\mathbf{s}} - F(0) \right| > \kappa \right\} \right) = 0.$$

Here $0 = \{0_t\}$ of $F(0)$ denotes the constant path with value 0.

Recently, it has become clear that the Ginibre random point field has various geometric rigidities, specifically a small variance property according to Shirai [33], the number rigidity according to Ghosh and Peres [7], and the dichotomy of reduced Palm measures [27]. These properties are different from those of the Poisson random point field and the Gibbs measure with a Ruelle-class potential, which have been extensively studied as the standard class of random point fields appearing in statistical physics.

These geometric properties affect the dynamical properties. Indeed, from these rigidities, our theorem demonstrates that geometric rigidities yield dynamical rigidity in the sense of the sub-diffusivity of each tagged particle of the natural infinite-particle system given by (1.1).

The self-diffusion matrix $\alpha[\mu_{\text{Gin}}]$ is given by the solution to the Poisson equation of the quotient Dirichlet form on the configuration space (cf. [26, 19]). To prove $\alpha[\mu_{\text{Gin}}] = O$, we use the geometric rigidities of the Ginibre random point field we shall introduce in the following.

The dichotomy of the reduced Palm measures of μ_{Gin} was proved in [27], and is the critical geometric rigidity that we use to prove Theorem 1.1. Let $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ be the reduced Palm measure of μ_{Gin} conditioned at $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_i}$ (see (1.17)).

Lemma 1.1 ([27, Theorem 1.1]). *Assume that $\mathbf{x}(\mathbb{R}^2) = m$ and $\mathbf{y}(\mathbb{R}^2) = n$ for $m, n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, where we take $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x}) = \mu_{\text{Gin}}$ if $m = 0$. The following then holds.*

- (1) *If $m \neq n$, then $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ and $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{y})$ are singular relative to each other.*
- (2) *If $m = n$, then $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ and $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{y})$ are mutually absolutely continuous.*

We find that $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ is continuous in $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^m$, where $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_i}$. That is, $(\mathbb{R}^2)^m \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \int_S f d\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ is continuous for any $f \in C_b(S)$. This follows from the explicit formula of the Radon–Nikodym density $d\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})/d\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{y})$ in Lemma 1.2.

Lemma 1.2 ([27, Theorems 1.2]). *Let $\mathbf{x}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbf{y}(\mathbb{R}^2) = m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\frac{d\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})}{d\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot \| \mathbf{y})} = \frac{1}{Z_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{|s_j| < R} \frac{|\mathbf{x} - s_j|^2}{|\mathbf{y} - s_j|^2},$$

where $|\mathbf{x} - s_j| = \prod_{i=1}^m |x_i - s_j|$. The normalization constant $Z_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}$ is given by

$$Z_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} = \frac{\det[\mathbf{K}_{\text{Gin}}(x_i, x_j)]_{i,j=1}^m |\Delta(\mathbf{y})|^2}{\det[\mathbf{K}_{\text{Gin}}(y_i, y_j)]_{i,j=1}^m |\Delta(\mathbf{x})|^2}.$$

Here, $Z_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}$ is the unique smooth function on $(\mathbb{R}^2)^m \times (\mathbb{R}^2)^m$ defined by continuity when the denominator has vanished. Furthermore, Δ denotes the difference product for $m \geq 2$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ for $m = 1$.

Intuitively, the dichotomy in Lemma 1.1 indicates the following phenomena. Suppose that we remove a finite unknown number m of particles $\{s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_m}\}$ from a sample point $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}$ of μ_{Gin} . We then deduce the number m from information of $\mathbf{s}_\diamond := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} \delta_{s_i}$. Such a structure is the same as periodic random point fields. Although a sample point \mathbf{s} of μ_{Gin} has enough randomness as seen from the simulation in Fig 1, we can infer the number of the removed particles exactly for μ_{Gin} -a.s. \mathbf{s} .

For $d = 1$, we proved that the non-collision of particles always implies sub-diffusivity [24]. (See also [9, 32].) Using the variational formula of the self-diffusion constant, the proof in [24] relies on the construction of a sequence of functions that reduces this constant to zero. This crucially uses the total order structure of non-collision particle systems in \mathbb{R} , which is specific in one-dimension.

A key point of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to construct such a sequence of functions without using the total order structure. Indeed, we shall use the above-mentioned geometric rigidity of the Ginibre random point field to accomplish this procedure.

We shall present general theorems concerning the sub-diffusivity of the interacting Brownian motions for $d \geq 2$ and prove Theorem 1.1 as a specific example of the general theorems (Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3).

Let $S_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; |x| < R\}$. Let \mathbf{S} be the configuration space over \mathbb{R}^d .

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbf{S} = \{\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}; \mathbf{s}(S_R) < \infty \text{ for all } R \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We endow \mathbf{S} with the vague topology, under which \mathbf{S} is a Polish space. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{S})$ be the Borel σ -field of \mathbf{S} . A probability measure μ on $(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{S}))$ is called a random point field and also a point process.

Let $\{\vartheta_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ be the translation operator on \mathbf{S} such that for $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}$,

$$(1.3) \quad \vartheta_x(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_i \delta_{s_i - x}.$$

Then, $\vartheta_x : \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ is a homeomorphism for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\mathbf{s} \mapsto \vartheta_x(\mathbf{s})$ is a continuous function of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}$. Furthermore, $(x, \mathbf{s}) \mapsto \vartheta_x(\mathbf{s})$ is continuous. A random point field μ on \mathbb{R}^d is called translation invariant if

$$(1.4) \quad \mu = \mu \circ \vartheta_x^{-1} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We assume the following.

(A1) μ is translation invariant and $\mu(\{\mathbf{s}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \infty\}) = 1$.

The translation invariance implies $\mu(\{\mathbf{s}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \infty\}) = 1$ if μ is not a zero measure. Thus, the second assumption in **(A1)** yields no restriction in practice.

A symmetric and locally integrable function $\rho^n : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is called the n -point correlation function of μ with respect to the Lebesgue measure if

$$(1.5) \quad \int_{A_1^{k_1} \times \dots \times A_m^{k_m}} \rho^n(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n = \int_{\mathbf{S}} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{\mathbf{s}(A_i)!}{(\mathbf{s}(A_i) - k_i)!} \mu(d\mathbf{s})$$

for any sequence of disjoint bounded measurable sets $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ and a sequence of natural numbers k_1, \dots, k_m satisfying $k_1 + \dots + k_m = n$. When $\mathbf{s}(A_i) - k_i < 0$, according to our interpretation, $\mathbf{s}(A_i)! / (\mathbf{s}(A_i) - k_i)! = 0$ by convention. We make an assumption.

(A2) μ has a locally bounded k -point correlation function for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We set the projections $\pi_R, \pi_R^c: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ such that

$$(1.6) \quad \pi_R(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{s}(\cdot \cap S_R), \quad \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{s}(\cdot \cap S_R^c).$$

For two measures ν_1 and ν_2 on a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{B}) , we write $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2$ if $\nu_1(A) \leq \nu_2(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $\Psi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a measurable function satisfying $\Psi(x) = \Psi(-x)$. We take Ψ as an interaction potential of μ . Let $S_R^m = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}; \mathbf{s}(S_R) = m\}$. We set $\Lambda_R^m = \Lambda(\cdot \cap S_R^m)$, where Λ is the Poisson random point field whose intensity is the Lebesgue measure.

For $\mathbf{x} = \sum_i \delta_{x_i} \in \mathbf{S}$, let \mathcal{H}_R be the Hamiltonian on S_R such that

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{H}_R(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{x_j, x_k \in S_R, j < k} \Psi(x_j - x_k).$$

Definition 1.1 ([23]). We say a random point field μ on \mathbb{R}^d is a Ψ -quasi-Gibbs measure with inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$ if there exists a sequence of measures $\{\mu_{R,k}^m\}$ on \mathbf{S} such that, for each $R, m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu_{R,k}^m \leq \mu_{R,k+1}^m \text{ for all } k, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{R,k}^m = \mu(\cdot \cap S_R^m) \text{ weakly}$$

and, for all $R, k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and μ -a.s. \mathbf{s} , the regular conditional measures

$$(1.8) \quad \mu_{R,k,s}^m = \mu_{R,k}^m(\pi_R(\mathbf{x}) \in \cdot \mid \pi_R^c(\mathbf{x}) = \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s}))$$

satisfy

$$(1.9) \quad c_{1,1}^{-1} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_R(\mathbf{x})} \Lambda_R^m(d\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_{R,k,s}^m(d\mathbf{x}) \leq c_{1,1} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_R(\mathbf{x})} \Lambda_R^m(d\mathbf{x}).$$

Here, $c_{1,1}$ is a positive constant depending on β, R, k, m and $\pi_R^c(\mathbf{s})$.

Remark 1.2. The definition of quasi-Gibbs measure in Definition 1.1 is a particular case of that of [23]. Because we consider the tagged particle problem in the present paper, we adopt a more restrictive definition of quasi-Gibbs measures as above.

(A3) μ is a Ψ -quasi-Gibbs measure with inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$ such that $\Psi(x) < \infty$ for $x \neq 0$ and that there exist an upper semi-continuous function $\hat{\Psi}$ locally bounded from below and a constant $c_{1,2} > 0$ satisfying $c_{1,2}^{-1} \hat{\Psi}(x) \leq \Psi(x) \leq c_{1,2} \hat{\Psi}(x)$.

Let $\mathbf{S}_{s,i}$ be the set consisting of infinite, single configurations such that

$$\mathbf{S}_{s,i} = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}; \mathbf{s}(\{x\}) \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{s}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \infty\}.$$

We endow $\mathbf{S}_{s,i}$ with the vague topology. Let $W(\mathbf{S}_{s,i})$ be the set consisting of $\mathbf{S}_{s,i}$ -valued continuous paths on $[0, \infty)$. We write $\mathbf{w} = \{\mathbf{w}_t\} \in W(\mathbf{S}_{s,i})$ as

$$(1.10) \quad \mathbf{w}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{w^i(t)}, \quad w^i \in C(I_i; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Here, I_i is an interval of the form $[0, b_i)$ or (a_i, b_i) , where $0 \leq a_i < b_i \leq \infty$. For $\mathbf{w} \in W(\mathbf{S}_{s,i})$, the set $\{(w^i, I_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniquely determined (except labeling). For reader's convenience, we give a proof of this representation of \mathbf{w} in Lemma 7.1.

We write $\mathbf{w} = \{(w^i, I_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ if the representation of \mathbf{w} is $\{(w^i, I_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let

$$(1.11) \quad W_{\text{NE}}(\mathbf{S}_{s,i}) = \{\mathbf{w} = \{(w^i, I_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in W(\mathbf{S}_{s,i}); I_i = [0, \infty) \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

For $\mathbf{w} \in W_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{s},i})$, $w^i \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ holds for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, $W_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{s},i})$ is the set consisting of non-exploding and non-entering paths. For a label \mathbf{l} on $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{s},i}$, we have a unique map $\mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}: W_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{s},i}) \rightarrow C([0, \infty); (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}})$ such that

$$(1.12) \quad \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{w}_0) = \mathbf{w}_0, \quad \mathbf{w} = \left\{ \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{w^i(t)} \right) \right\}_{t \in [0, \infty)} \mapsto \mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w} = (w^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

We give a proof of the construction of \mathbf{l}_{path} in Lemma 7.2.

In Subsection 2.1, we introduce the Dirichlet forms $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$. We call $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ the lower and upper Dirichlet forms, respectively. Such Dirichlet forms exist under **(A2)** and **(A3)**. In Subsection 2.3, we introduce the perpendicular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$, which is a new Dirichlet form provided in the present paper and plays vital role in the proof of the main theorems.

From **(A2)** and **(A3)**, we have a μ -reversible diffusion (P_s, \mathbf{X}_t) associated with $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$ [23]. We set $P_\mu(\cdot) = \int P_s(\cdot) \mu(ds)$. From **(A1)**–**(A3)** and $d \geq 2$, the μ -reversible diffusion (P_s, \mathbf{X}_t) has the non-explosion and non-collision properties (see Lemma 10.2 in [28]):

$$(1.13) \quad P_\mu(\mathbf{X} \in W_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{s},i})) = 1.$$

From (1.12) and (1.13), we have a continuous labeled process $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X})$. By construction, $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{X}_0)$, $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ is such that $\mathbf{X}_t = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{X_t^i}$.

To prove sub-diffusivity, we introduce the new Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ in Lemma 2.7. From Lemma 2.7(3) and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$(1.14) \quad (\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp) \leq (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu) \leq (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu).$$

Here, for non-negative, symmetric bilinear forms $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{D}^i)$, $i = 1, 2$, we write $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{D}^1) \leq (\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{D}^2)$ if $\mathcal{D}^1 \supset \mathcal{D}^2$ and $\mathcal{E}^1(f, f) \leq \mathcal{E}^2(f, f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}^2$.

Taking (1.14) into account, we make an assumption.

$$(A4) \quad (\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp) = (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu).$$

We shall prove **(A4)** for the Ginibre random point field in Proposition 6.3.

For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, we write $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{s}$ if $\mathbf{x}(\{x\}) \leq \mathbf{s}(\{x\})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{s}$, the difference $\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{x}$ belongs to \mathcal{S} . We set

$$(1.15) \quad \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{y} = \{\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{A}\}.$$

By definition $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{y} = \emptyset$ if no $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{A}$ satisfies $\mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{s}$.

Let $\mathcal{S}_m = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}; \mathbf{s}(\mathbb{R}^d) = m\}$ for $m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. By definition, \mathcal{S}_0 consists of the zero measure. Let $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \delta_{x_i}$ for $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_i$. Then $\mathcal{S}_m = \mathbf{u}((\mathbb{R}^d)^m)$. Let $\check{\mu}^m$ be the m th factorial moment measure of μ such that

$$(1.16) \quad \check{\mu}^m(A_1 \times \cdots \times A_m) = \int_{A_1 \times \cdots \times A_m} \rho^m(x_1, \dots, x_m) dx_1 \cdots dx_m$$

for $\{A_i\}$ such that $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Let $\tilde{\mu}_m = \check{\mu}^m \circ \mathbf{u}^{-1}$ be the measure supported on \mathcal{S}_m . For $\tilde{\mu}_m$ -a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_m$, the reduced Palm measure $\mu(\cdot | \mathbf{x})$ exists and satisfies, by definition, for any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_m)$, and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$,

$$(1.17) \quad \int_{\mathbf{A}} \mu(\mathbf{B} | \mathbf{x}) \tilde{\mu}_m(d\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbf{A}} \mu(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{s}) \tilde{\mu}_m(d\mathbf{x}).$$

For each $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$, $\mu(\mathbf{B} | \mathbf{x})$ becomes a $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_m)$ -measurable function in \mathbf{x} .

We write $\nu_1 \ll \nu_2$ if ν_1 is absolutely continuous with respect to ν_2 , where ν_1 and ν_2 are measures. We write $\nu_1 \approx \nu_2$ if $\nu_1 \ll \nu_2$ and $\nu_2 \ll \nu_1$.

Taking the dichotomy of the Ginibre random point field in Lemma 1.1 into account, we introduce the following concept.

Definition 1.2. We call μ k -decomposable with $\{S_m^\diamond\}_{m=0}^k$ if for $0 \leq m \leq k$

$$(1.18) \quad S_m^\diamond \cap S_n^\diamond = \emptyset \quad \text{for } n \neq m, 0 \leq n \leq k,$$

$$(1.19) \quad S_0^\diamond \subset S_m^\diamond + S_m,$$

$$(1.20) \quad S_m^\diamond \in \overline{B(S)}^{\mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{x})} \text{ and } \mu(S_m^\diamond\|\mathbf{x}) = 1 \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in S_m.$$

We call μ irreducibly k -decomposable with $\{S_m^\diamond\}_{m=0}^k$ if, in addition, for $1 \leq m \leq k$

$$(1.21) \quad \mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{x}) \approx \mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{x}') \text{ for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in S_m.$$

Remark 1.3. (1) Let $\mathbf{0}$ be the zero measure. Then $S_0 = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{0}) = \mu$. Hence, we have $\tilde{\mu}_0 = \mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{0}) = \mu$. Thus, (1.20) implies $\mu(S_0^\diamond) = 1$.

(2) From (1.18) and (1.20), μ and $\mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{x})$ are singular relative to each other for $\mathbf{x} \in S_m$ and $\mu(S_m^\diamond) = 0$ for $m \geq 1$.

Example 1.1 (Ginibre random point field). From Lemma 1.1 and Lemma 1.2, we easily see that the Ginibre random point field is irreducibly k -decomposable for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

In Lemma 5.5, we construct a reduced Palm measure $\mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{y})$ for \mathbf{y} such that $\mathbf{y}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \infty$ if μ is irreducibly decomposable in the sense of Definition 1.2. Such Palm measures are called dual reduced Palm measures. The concept of dual reduced Palm measures plays an important role of the proof of main theorems.

(A5) μ is irreducibly one-decomposable with $\{S_0^\diamond, S_1^\diamond\}$.

Theorem 1.2. Assume $d \geq 2$. Assume **(A1)**–**(A5)**. Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X}) = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the labeled process defined after (1.13) with $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s})$. Then, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon X_{\cdot/\epsilon^2}^i = \mathbf{0} \text{ weakly in } C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ under } P_{\mathbf{s}} \text{ in } \mu\text{-probability.}$$

Remark 1.4. (1) In Theorems 1.2–1.4, we assume $d \geq 2$. This assumption is used only for the non-collision property of tagged particles.

(2) In Lemma 5.7, we deduce **(A5)** from **(A6)** introduced below. Thus, we obtain **(A5)** for the Ginibre random point field from Lemma 1.1 and Lemma 5.7.

We write $\mu_x = \mu(\cdot\|\delta_x)$. From **(A1)** and **(A2)**, μ_x exists for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We can and do take $\mu_x \circ \vartheta_x^{-1} = \mu_0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We make an assumption.

(A6) (1) μ and μ_0 are singular relative to each other.

(2) $\mu_0 \approx \mu_x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 1.3. Assume $d \geq 2$. Assume **(A1)**–**(A4)** and **(A6)**. We then obtain the same result as in Theorem 1.2.

We prepare a set of notations for functions on S following [18].

Let $S_R^m = \{\mathbf{s} \in S; \mathbf{s}(S_R) = m\}$ for $R \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$(1.22) \quad S = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} S_R^m.$$

Let $S_R^m = S_R \times \cdots \times S_R$ be the m -product of S_R . We call $\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s}) \in S_R^m$ an S_R^m -coordinate of $\mathbf{s} \in S_R^m$ if $\pi_R(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_R^i(\mathbf{s})}$, where $\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s}) = (x_R^i(\mathbf{s}))_{i=1}^m$.

For $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $R, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x})$ be the function satisfying

$$(1.23) \quad f_{R,\cdot}^m(*) : S \times S_R^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x}),$$

$$(1.24) \quad f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is permutation invariant in } \mathbf{x} \text{ on } S_R^m \text{ for each } \mathbf{s} \in S_R^m,$$

$$(1.25) \quad f_{R,\mathbf{s}(1)}^m(\mathbf{x}) = f_{R,\mathbf{s}(2)}^m(\mathbf{x}) \text{ if } \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s}(1)) = \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s}(2)) \text{ for } \mathbf{s}(1), \mathbf{s}(2) \in S_R^m,$$

$$(1.26) \quad f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s})) = f(\mathbf{s}) \text{ for } \mathbf{s} \in S_R^m,$$

$$(1.27) \quad f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \text{ for } \mathbf{s} \notin S_R^m.$$

Note that $f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m$ is unique and $f(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s}))$ for each $R \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{s} \in S$. Here by convention, $\mathbf{x}_R^0(\mathbf{s}) = \emptyset$ for $\mathbf{s} \in S_R^0$. We see $f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^0(\emptyset) = f(0)$ because S_R^0 consists of the zero configuration 0. The function $f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^0$ is thus constant on S_R^0 . Although the S_R^m -coordinate $\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s})$ of \mathbf{s} is not unique, $f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m$ is well defined by (1.24). For a bounded set A , we set $\mathbf{x}_A^m(\mathbf{s})$ and $f_{A,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x})$ similarly as above by replacing S_R by A .

A function $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called smooth if $f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x})$ is smooth in \mathbf{x} on S_R^m for all $R, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{s} \in S$, and local if f is $\sigma[\pi_R]$ -measurable for some $R \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$(1.28) \quad \mathcal{D}_\bullet = \{f; f \text{ is } \mathcal{B}(S)\text{-measurable and smooth}\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_\circ = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet; f \text{ is local}\},$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\bullet\text{b}} = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet; f \text{ is bounded}\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{\circ\text{b}} = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\circ; f \text{ is bounded}\}.$$

Let $\mu^{[1]}$ be the one-Campbell measure of μ such that

$$(1.29) \quad \mu^{[1]}(dx ds) = \rho^1(x) \mu_x(ds) dx,$$

where ρ^1 is the one-point correlation function of μ with respect to the Lebesgue measure and $\mu_x = \mu(\cdot | \delta_x)$. ρ^1 exists and is constant by **(A1)** and **(A2)**.

We now recall the concept of the logarithmic derivative of μ from [22].

Definition 1.3 ([22]). The logarithmic derivative \mathbf{d}^μ of μ is an \mathbb{R}^d -valued function such that $\mathbf{d}^\mu \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mu^{[1]})^d$ and that, for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\circ\text{b}}$,

$$(1.30) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times S} \mathbf{d}^\mu(x, \mathbf{s}) \varphi(x, \mathbf{s}) \mu^{[1]}(dx ds) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times S} \nabla_x \varphi(x, \mathbf{s}) \mu^{[1]}(dx ds).$$

Here $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mu^{[1]}) = \bigcap_{R=1}^\infty L^1(\mu_R^{[1]})$ and $\mu_R^{[1]} = \mu^{[1]}(\cdot \cap \{S_R \times S\})$.

Once \mathbf{d}^μ is calculated, we obtain the ISDE describing the labeled process $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let $X_t^{i\circ} = \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{X_t^j}$. We consider the ISDE

$$(1.31) \quad X_t^i - X_0^i = B_t^i + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \mathbf{d}^\mu(X_u^i, X_u^{i\circ}) du \quad (i \in \mathbb{N}), \quad \mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}).$$

Then, under **(A2)** and **(A3)**, (1.31) has a weak solution for μ -a.s. \mathbf{s} such that the associated unlabeled process \mathbf{X} is a μ -reversible diffusion associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$ [22]. Under mild constraints, a weak solution of (1.31) is unique in law for μ -a.s. \mathbf{s} (see Lemma 7.4, [28, 13]).

The logarithmic derivative $\mathbf{d}^{\mu_{\text{Gin}}}$ of μ_{Gin} is given by

$$(1.32) \quad \mathbf{d}^{\mu_{\text{Gin}}}(x, \mathbf{s}) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|x - s_i| < R} \frac{2(x - s_i)}{|x - s_i|^2} \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]}), 1 \leq p < 2.$$

Hence, taking $\mu = \mu_{\text{Gin}}$ in (1.31), we obtain the ISDE (1.1) (see [22, 28]).

We explain the idea of the proof of the main theorems (Theorems 1.1–1.4). Let μ_0 be the reduced Palm measure conditioned at the origin. It is known that the self-diffusion matrix $\alpha = (\alpha_{p,q})_{p,q=1}^d$ satisfies the variational formula

$$(1.33) \quad \alpha_{p,p} = \inf \left\{ \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} f - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 + \mathbb{D}[f, f] d\mu_0; f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y \right\}.$$

Here, $D^{\text{trn}} = (D_p^{\text{trn}})_{p=1}^d$ is the generator of the translation ϑ_x on S defined by

$$(1.34) \quad D_p^{\text{trn}} f(\mathbf{s}) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \{f(\vartheta_{\epsilon \mathbf{e}_p}(\mathbf{s})) - f(\mathbf{s})\},$$

where \mathbf{e}_p is the unit vector in the p -direction, $\delta_{p,q}$ is the Kronecker delta, \mathbb{D} is the carré du champ defined by (2.4), and \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y is the subset of \mathcal{D}_\bullet given by (3.29). In [26, 19], $\alpha_{p,p}$ was given by replacing \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y by \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y , where \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y is given after (3.28). Because we shall prove that the closures of \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y and \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y coincide in Lemma 3.5, $\alpha_{p,p}$ in (1.33) equals that given in [26, 19]. We set

$$(1.35) \quad \begin{aligned} D^{\text{trn}}[f, g] &= \frac{1}{2} (D^{\text{trn}} f, D^{\text{trn}} g)_{\mathbb{R}^d}, \quad \mathcal{E}^{Y,2}(f, g) = \int_S \mathbb{D}[f, g] d\mu_0, \\ \mathcal{E}^Y(f, g) &= \int_S D^{\text{trn}}[f, g] + \mathbb{D}[f, g] d\mu_0. \end{aligned}$$

In Lemma 4.3, we shall derive $\alpha_{p,p} = 0$ from the following assumption.

(A7) For $1 \leq p \leq d$, we find an \mathcal{E}^Y -Cauchy sequence $\{\chi_{L,p}\}$ in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y such that

$$(1.36) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 d\mu_0 + \mathcal{E}^{Y,2}(\chi_{L,p}, \chi_{L,p}) \right\} = 0.$$

Theorem 1.4. (1) Let $d \geq 2$. Assume (A1)–(A5). Then, (A7) holds.

(2) Let $d \geq 2$. Assume (A1)–(A4) and (A7). We then obtain the same result as in Theorem 1.2.

To verify (A7), we shall construct a sequence of functions $\chi_{L,p}$ such that

$$(1.37) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s}) = \delta_{p,q},$$

$$(1.38) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{D}[\chi_{L,p}, \chi_{L,p}](\mathbf{s}) = 0.$$

At first glance, it is difficult to construct such a sequence of functions satisfying these two conditions. This is because the second condition suggests that the limit function is a constant, while the first condition states that it is not. To resolve this issue, we focus on the tail σ -field $\text{Tail}(S) = \bigcap_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma[\pi_R^c]$.

We note that, from (2.2)–(2.4), all tail measurable functions f satisfy

$$\mathbb{D}[f, f] = 0.$$

We also remark that a tail measurable function $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ is not necessarily continuous under the vague topology. Indeed, it happens that, in general,

$$(1.39) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} f(\pi_R(\mathbf{s})) \neq f(\mathbf{s})$$

even if $f_{R,\mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x})$ in (1.23)–(1.27) for f is constant for each $R, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{s} \in S$.

Let $S_\infty = \{\mathbf{s} \in S; \mathbf{s}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \infty\}$. If f is tail measurable, then f is constant on $S \setminus S_\infty$. In contrast, f is not necessarily constant on S_∞ , as we see in (1.39), even if f

is tail measurable. We note $\mu(\mathbf{S}_\infty) = 1$ by **(A1)**. Thus, it may possible to construct a sequence of tail measurable functions f satisfying both (1.37) and (1.38).

The Ginibre random point field is tail trivial [17, 25]. Hence, a tail measurable function becomes a constant for μ_{Gin} -a.s. and thus does not satisfy (1.37). Hence, we shall introduce the σ -field \mathcal{G}_∞ in (5.41). This σ -field is larger than $\text{Tail}(\mathbf{S})$ and we can construct a sequence of \mathcal{G}_∞ -measurable functions satisfying both (1.37) and (1.38).

From **(A5)**, we shall construct the function $\chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s})$ in (6.4). Using **(A1)**, we deduce that $\{\chi_{L,p}\}$ satisfies (1.37). Furthermore, the function $\chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s})$ is \mathcal{G}_∞ -measurable, and thus satisfies (1.38).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the three types of Dirichlet forms for the unlabeled dynamics. In Section 3, we present various diffusion processes related to the tagged particle problem and the associated Dirichlet forms: namely, one-labeled processes (Subsection 3.1), tagged particle processes (Subsection 3.2), and environment processes (Subsection 3.3). In Subsection 4.1, we present a sufficient condition such that the limit self-diffusion matrix vanishes. In Subsection 4.2, we recall the Kipnis–Varadhan theory and prove an invariance principle of the additive functional of reversible diffusion processes. In Subsection 5.1, we introduce the concept of the dual reduced Palm measures conditioned at infinitely many particles for irreducibly decomposable random point fields. This concept is one of the main tools of our analysis. In Subsection 5.2, we introduce the mean-rigid σ -field \mathcal{G}_∞ , which yields the mean-rigid conditioning of random point fields. This σ -field is also a key point of the proof of the main theorems. In Subsection 6.1, we complete the proof of Theorems 1.2–1.4. In Subsections 6.2–6.6, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. Section 7 consists of appendices: In Subsection 7.1, we prove (1.10). In Subsection 7.2, we prepare the concept of strongly local, quasi-regular Dirichlet forms. In Subsection 7.3, we quote the IFC condition and the result on the uniqueness of weak solutions of ISDEs.

2. DIRICHLET FORMS OF UNLABELED DYNAMICS

In Section 2, we introduce three types of the Dirichlet forms describing the unlabeled dynamics: the perpendicular, lower, and upper Dirichlet forms. From **(A4)**, we deduce these three Dirichlet forms are the same in Lemma 2.8. This result yields the identity of the corresponding three Dirichlet forms of the environment process in Lemma 3.5.

We say that a non-negative symmetric bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(f_n, f_n) = 0$ for any \mathcal{E} -Cauchy sequence $f_n \in \mathcal{D}_0$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{L^2(\mu)} = 0$. If $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$, then there exists a closed extension of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}_0)$. The smallest closed extension $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is called the closure of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}_0)$. We refer to [6] for detail.

For non-negative symmetric bilinear forms $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ and $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ on $L^2(\mu)$, we say $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ is an extension of $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ if

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}_2, \quad \mathcal{E}_1(f, f) = \mathcal{E}_2(f, f) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{D}_1.$$

Suppose that $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ is an extension of $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$. Then, $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2) \leq (\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$. The following simple fact will be used repeatedly in the present paper.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ and $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ be non-negative symmetric bilinear forms on $L^2(\mu)$. Let $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ be an extension of $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$. Let $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ be closable on $L^2(\mu)$. Then, $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$.*

Proof. If $\{f_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence of $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$, then $\{f_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence of $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ by (2.1). Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_2(f_n, f_n) = 0$ because of the closability of $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ on $L^2(\mu)$. Hence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_1(f_n, f_n) = 0$ from (2.1). This completes the proof. \square

We say a closed non-negative symmetric bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ on $L^2(\mu)$ is a symmetric Dirichlet form [6] if any $u \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies

$$v := \min\{1, \max\{0, u\}\} \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } \mathcal{E}(v, v) \leq \mathcal{E}(u, u).$$

For a symmetric Dirichlet form, there exists an associated symmetric Markovian L^2 -semi-group. In addition, if the Dirichlet form is strongly local and quasi-regular (see Subsection 7.2) and the state space is homeomorphic to a complete separable metric space, then the associated symmetric diffusion process exists [3]. In general, a Dirichlet form is not necessarily symmetric. In the present paper, a Dirichlet form means a symmetric Dirichlet form.

2.1. Dirichlet forms associated with the unlabeled diffusions. In Subsection 2.1, we prepare results for the Dirichlet forms associated with the unlabeled diffusions from [12, 18, 23]. Let $S_R^m = \{\mathbf{s} \in S; \mathbf{s}(S_R) = m\}$ as before. Let \mathcal{D}_\bullet be as in (1.28). For $f, g \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ and $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}$, we set

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbb{D}_R^m[f, g](\mathbf{s}) = 1_{S_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_i \in S_R} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m, \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} g_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m \right)_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s})).$$

Here $\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} = (\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{i,1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{i,d}})$, $f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m$ is as in (1.23)–(1.27) for $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$, and $\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s})$ is an S_R^m -coordinate of \mathbf{s} introduced after (1.22). Note that $\mathbb{D}_R^m[f, g](\mathbf{s})$ is independent of the choice of the S_R^m -coordinate $\mathbf{x}_R^m(\mathbf{s})$ and is well defined. Let

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbb{D}_R = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{D}_R^m.$$

Then $\mathbb{D}_R[f, f](\mathbf{s})$ is non-decreasing in R for all $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ and $\mathbf{s} \in S$. Hence, we set

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbb{D}[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{D}_R[f, f](\mathbf{s}) \leq \infty.$$

We set the carré du champs $\mathbb{D}[f, g]$ by polarization. We set

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{E}^\mu(f, g) = \int_S \mathbb{D}[f, g] d\mu, \quad \mathcal{E}_R^\mu(f, g) = \int_S \mathbb{D}_R[f, g] d\mu,$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\bullet^\mu = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet; \mathcal{E}^\mu(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu)\},$$

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{D}_{R, \bullet}^\mu = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet; \mathcal{E}_R^\mu(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu)\}.$$

Using the method in [18, 23, 12], we deduce from **(A3)** that $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \mathcal{D}_{R, \bullet}^\mu)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$. Hence, we denote by $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ its closure. Clearly, the sequence of the closed forms $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ is increasing in the sense that

$$\mathcal{E}_R^\mu(f, f) \leq \mathcal{E}_{R+1}^\mu(f, f) \quad \text{for all } f \in \underline{\mathcal{D}}_{R+1}^\mu, \quad \underline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu \supset \underline{\mathcal{D}}_{R+1}^\mu.$$

Let $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^\mu)$ be the increasing limit of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_R^\mu)$, $R \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^\mu(f, f) &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_R^\mu(f, f), \\ \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^\mu &= \{f \in \bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_R^\mu; \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_R^\mu(f, f) < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^\mu)$ is a closed form on $L^2(\mu)$. We easily see that $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\mu)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$ and its closure coincides with $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^\mu)$.

Let \mathcal{D}_\circ be as in (1.28). Clearly, $\mathcal{D}_\circ \subset \mathcal{D}_\bullet$. We set

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\circ; \mathcal{E}_R^\mu(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu), f \text{ is } \sigma[\pi_R]\text{-measurable}\}.$$

Note that $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \mathcal{D}_{R,\bullet}^\mu)$ is an extension of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu)$ and that $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \mathcal{D}_{R,\bullet}^\mu)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$. Hence, $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$ by Lemma 2.1. Then we denote the closure of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$ as $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$. By construction, $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_R^\mu)$ is an extension of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$. In particular, we have

$$(2.9) \quad (\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_R^\mu) \leq (\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu).$$

If $f \in \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu$, then f is $\sigma[\pi_R]$ -measurable. Then $\mathbb{D}_R[f, f] = \mathbb{D}_{R+1}[f, f]$. Hence

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{E}_R^\mu(f, f) = \mathcal{E}_{R+1}^\mu(f, f) = \mathcal{E}^\mu(f, f) \text{ for all } f \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu, \quad \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu \subset \overline{\mathcal{D}}_{R+1}^\mu.$$

From (2.10), $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ is decreasing in R . Let $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ be the decreasing limit. Note that $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^\mu)$ is an extension of $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^\mu)$ is a closed form on $L^2(\mu)$. Hence, the decreasing limit $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$ by Lemma 2.1.

We denote the closure of $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$ by $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$:

$$(2.11) \quad \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu := \overline{\bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu}.$$

Lemma 2.2. Assume (A1)–(A3). Let $\mathcal{D}_\circ^\mu = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\circ; \mathcal{E}^\mu(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu)\}$. Then $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}_\circ^\mu)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$ and its closure $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\circ^\mu)$ satisfies $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\circ^\mu = \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu$ and

$$(2.12) \quad (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^\mu) \leq (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$$

Proof. From (2.7)–(2.11), it is clear that (2.12) holds. If f is $\sigma[\pi_R]$ -measurable, then $\mathbb{D}[f, f] = \mathbb{D}_R[f, f]$. Hence from (2.8) and (2.11),

$$(2.13) \quad \mathcal{D}_\circ^\mu = \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu \subset \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu \subset \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu.$$

Then $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}_\circ^\mu)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$ by Lemma 2.1 because $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ is an extension of $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}_\circ^\mu)$ from (2.13) and $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ is closed on $L^2(\mu)$. Thus, from this and (2.13),

$$(2.14) \quad \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\circ^\mu \subset \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu.$$

Because $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu)$ is the closure of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\mu, \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu)$, $\mathcal{D}_\circ^\mu \supset \mathcal{D}_{R,\circ}^\mu$, and (2.10) holds, we have $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\circ^\mu \supset \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu$ for all R . Hence, $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\circ^\mu \supset \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu$. From this and (2.11), we deduce

$$(2.15) \quad \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\circ^\mu \supset \overline{\bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_R^\mu} = \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu.$$

We thus obtain $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\circ^\mu = \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu$ from (2.14) and (2.15). \square

It is known that $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$ is a quasi-regular Dirichlet form and the associated μ -reversible diffusion (P_s, \mathbf{X}_t) satisfies (1.13) (see [23], Lemma 10.2 in [28], Lemma 2.5 in [12]). Hence, we have the labeled process $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X})$.

2.2. Perpendicular carré du champs \mathbb{D}^\perp . In Subsection 2.2, we introduce the concept of the carré du champ perpendicular to the generator of the translation operator $D^{\text{trn}} = (D_p^{\text{trn}})_{p=1}^d$ defined by (1.34).

For a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i} \in \mathbf{S}$, we set

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(A)} = \sum_{s_i \in A} \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i}.$$

Note that the orthogonal projection of $\partial/\partial s_i$ onto the subspace perpendicular to $\partial/\partial \Gamma(A)$ is then given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(A)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(A)}.$$

We note that $\mathbf{s}(A)$ becomes the number of particles in A for $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}$.

The orthogonality above is with respect to the inner product such that

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{i,p}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{j,q}} \right) = \delta_{i,j} \delta_{p,q},$$

where $s_i = (s_{i,p})_{p=1}^d$, $s_j = (s_{j,q})_{q=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For each $s_i \in A$, we have

$$(2.16) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(A)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(A)}, \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(A)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(A)} \right) = 0.$$

Let $A \subset B$. Then

$$(2.17) \quad \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(A)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(A)} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(A)}}{\mathbf{s}(B)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(B)}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(B)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(B)} \right) = 0.$$

Let $T_1 = S_1$ and $T_R = S_R \setminus S_{R-1}$ for $R \geq 2$. Note that $\{T_R\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a partition of \mathbb{R}^d . For each $R \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{\mathbf{T}_R^m\}_{m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}}$ be the partition of \mathbf{S} such that $\mathbf{T}_R^m = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}; \mathbf{s}(T_R) = m\}$. We set the carré du champs such that

$$(2.18) \quad \mathbb{T}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbf{T}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \sum_{s_i \in T_R} \left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_R)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} \right) f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2,$$

$$(2.19) \quad \mathbb{T}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbf{T}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_R)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet.$$

Here for f , the functions $f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m$ are given by (1.23)–(1.27).

Lemma 2.3. *For each $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ and $R \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(2.20) \quad \mathbb{D}_R[f, f] = \sum_{Q=1}^R \mathbb{T}_Q^\perp[f, f] + \sum_{Q=1}^R \mathbb{T}_Q^\gamma[f, f].$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i} \in \mathbb{T}_Q^m$, we see from (2.16)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s_i \in T_Q} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 &= \sum_{s_i \in T_Q} \left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_Q)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_Q)} \right) f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m + \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_Q)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_Q)} \right) f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 \\ (2.21) \quad &= \sum_{s_i \in T_Q} \left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_Q)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_Q)} \right) f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 + \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_Q)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_Q)} f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence from (2.18), (2.19), and (2.21), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{T}_Q^m}(\mathbf{s}) \sum_{s_i \in T_Q} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{T}_Q^m}(\mathbf{s}) \left\{ \sum_{s_i \in T_Q} \left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_Q)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_Q)} \right) f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 + \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_Q)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_Q)} f_{T_Q, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{T}_Q^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{T}_Q^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}). \end{aligned}$$

Summing both sides over $Q = 1, \dots, R$, we obtain (2.20). \square

Let $\mathbb{S}_R^m = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S}; \mathbf{s}(S_R) = m\}$. Note that $S_{R-1} \cup T_R = S_R$ and $S_{R-1} \cap T_R = \emptyset$ for $R \in \mathbb{N}$. We set, for $R \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 \leq R$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{S}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \left| \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right) f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 \\ (2.22) \quad &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{S}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \left| \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right) f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{S}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m \right|^2 \quad \text{for } R \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let \mathbb{T}_R^γ be as in (2.19). For $R \geq 2$, we have*

$$(2.24) \quad \mathbb{U}_{R-1}^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{T}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{U}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

Proof. From (2.22) and (2.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{U}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{S}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}} \frac{\partial f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{S}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}} \frac{\partial f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2 \\ (2.25) \quad &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\mathbb{S}_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1}) + \mathbf{s}(T_R) = \mathbf{s}(S_R)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)}$, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}} \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2 \\
& + \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}} \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2 \\
& = \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} \right|^2 + \frac{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)^2} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2 - \frac{2}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \left(\frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})}, \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right)_{\mathbb{R}^d} \\
& + \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_R)} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} \right|^2 + \frac{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)^2} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2 - \frac{2}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \left(\frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)}, \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right)_{\mathbb{R}^d} \\
& = \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_R)} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} \right|^2 + \frac{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1}) + \mathbf{s}(T_R)}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)^2} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{2}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \left(\frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} + \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)}, \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right)_{\mathbb{R}^d} \\
(2.26) \quad & = \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_R)} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)} \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting (2.26) into (2.25) and using (2.19) and (2.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{U}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{S_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{S_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_R)} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} \right|^2 \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{S_R^m}(\mathbf{s}) \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})} \left| \frac{\partial f_{R-1,s}^m}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} \right|^2 + \mathbb{T}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) \\
& = \mathbb{U}_{R-1}^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{T}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}).
\end{aligned}$$

We have thus completed the proof of (2.24). \square

Let $\mathbb{D}_1^\perp = \mathbb{T}_1^\perp$ and

$$(2.27) \quad \mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{Q=1}^R \mathbb{T}_Q^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \sum_{Q=2}^R \mathbb{U}_Q^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) \quad \text{for } R \geq 2.$$

Lemma 2.5. *For each $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ and $R \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(2.28) \quad \mathbb{D}_R[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

Proof. Using (2.24), we have

$$(2.29) \quad \mathbb{U}_1^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \sum_{Q=2}^R \mathbb{T}_Q^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{Q=2}^R \mathbb{U}_Q^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

Note that $S_1 = T_1$ by definition. Hence from (2.19) and (2.23), we have

$$(2.30) \quad \mathbb{T}_1^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{U}_1^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

Combining (2.29) and (2.30), we deduce

$$(2.31) \quad \sum_{Q=1}^R \mathbb{T}_Q^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{Q=2}^R \mathbb{U}_Q^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

Using (2.20), (2.27), and (2.31), we obtain (2.28). \square

We now introduce the perpendicular carré du champs \mathbb{D}^\perp such that

$$(2.32) \quad \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{Q=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{T}_Q^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) + \sum_{Q=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{U}_Q^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

Then from (2.27), $\mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s})$ is increasing in R and satisfies

$$(2.33) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

Lemma 2.6. *For each $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}$,*

$$(2.34) \quad \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbb{D}[f, f](\mathbf{s}).$$

In particular, $\mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) < \infty$ holds for each $f \in \mathcal{D}_\circ$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}$.

Proof. Note that both $\mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s})$ and $\mathbb{D}_R[f, f](\mathbf{s})$ are increasing in R and thus have the limits $\mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s})$ and $\mathbb{D}[f, f](\mathbf{s})$. Then, we obtain (2.34) from (2.28).

For each $f \in \mathcal{D}_\circ$, we there exists an $R \in \mathbb{N}$ such that f is $\sigma[\pi_R]$ -measurable. Because $\mathbb{D}[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{D}_R[f, f](\mathbf{s})$ and $\mathbf{s}(S_R) < \infty$, we have $\mathbb{D}[f, f](\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{D}_R[f, f](\mathbf{s}) < \infty$. Hence from (2.34), we obtain $\mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) < \infty$. \square

2.3. Identity of the perpendicular, lower, and upper Dirichlet forms. In Subsection 2.3, we introduce the concept of the perpendicular Dirichlet form. We shall prove that the perpendicular, lower, and upper Dirichlet forms coincide under **(A4)**. We set for $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{R,1}^m &= \left\{ v = \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{\mathbf{s}(T_R)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)}; s_i \in T_R, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{T}_R^m \right\}, \quad R \in \mathbb{N}. \\ \Upsilon_{R,2}^{m,n} &= \left\{ v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1})}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)}; \mathbf{s} \in S_{R-1}^m \cap \mathbf{T}_R^n \right\}, \\ \Upsilon_{R,3}^{m,n} &= \left\{ v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} - \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}(T_R)}}{\mathbf{s}(S_R)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)}; \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{T}_R^m \cap S_R^n \right\}, \quad R \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

If $v \in \Upsilon_{R,1}^m$, then v is a partial derivative on T_R . To be precise, $v \in \Upsilon_{R,1}^m$ is a partial derivative on T_R^m . We disregard m and simply call a partial derivative on T_R for convenience. Because v is a local operator, we can regard v as a partial derivative on any domain A including T_R .

For $f: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \Upsilon_{R,1}^m$, we denote $f \in \text{Dom}(v)$ if $f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x})$ is in the domain of v , where $f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m$ is the representation of f defined by (1.23)–(1.27).

Let $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \delta_{x_i}$ for $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_i$ as before. We set $vf(\mathbf{s}) = 0$ for $\mathbf{s} \notin \mathbf{T}_R^m$ and

$$vf(\mathbf{s}) = vf_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{T}_R^m \text{ such that } \pi_{T_R}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}).$$

For $f: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \Upsilon_{R,k}^{m,n}$, $k = 2, 3$, we define $f \in \text{Dom}(v)$ similarly. For $v \in \Upsilon_{R,2}^{m,n}$, we set $vf(\mathbf{s}) = 0$ for $\mathbf{s} \notin S_{R-1}^m \cap \mathbf{T}_R^n$ and

$$vf(\mathbf{s}) = vf_{S_{R-1}, \mathbf{s}}^{m+n}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{s} \in S_{R-1}^m \cap \mathbf{T}_R^n \text{ such that } \pi_{S_R}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}).$$

For $v \in \Upsilon_{R,3}^{m,n}$, we set $vf(\mathbf{s}) = 0$ for $\mathbf{s} \notin \mathbf{T}_R^m \cap \mathbf{S}_R^n$ and

$$vf(\mathbf{s}) = vf_{S_R, \mathbf{s}}^n(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{T}_R^m \cap \mathbf{S}_R^n \text{ such that } \pi_{S_R}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Let $\mathbb{D}_v[f, g] = \frac{1}{2}(vf, vg)_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ be the carré du champ generated by v . Then,

$$(2.35) \quad \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, g] = \sum_{v \in \Upsilon} \mathbb{D}_v[f, g].$$

Here \mathbb{D}^\perp is the perpendicular carré du champ defined by (2.32) and Υ is

$$(2.36) \quad \Upsilon = \left\{ \bigcup_{R, m \in \mathbb{N}} \Upsilon_{R,1}^m \right\} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{R \geq 2, m, n \in \mathbb{N}} \Upsilon_{R,2}^{m,n} \right\} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{\substack{R \geq 2, m, n \in \mathbb{N} \\ m < n}} \Upsilon_{R,3}^{m,n} \right\},$$

where the right-hand side is a disjoint union of $\Upsilon_{R,1}^m$, $\Upsilon_{R,2}^{m,n}$, and $\Upsilon_{R,3}^{m,n}$. Thus, Υ is a collection of partial derivatives constituting \mathbb{D}^\perp . We set

$$(2.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_R^\perp(f, g) &= \int_S \mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, g] d\mu, \quad \mathcal{E}^\perp(f, f) = \int_S \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f](\mathbf{s}) d\mu, \\ \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp &= \{f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet; \mathcal{E}^\perp(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathbb{D}_R^\perp is as in (2.27). In (2.37), we suppress μ from the notation.

Lemma 2.7. *Assume (A2) and (A3). Then the following hold.*

- (1) $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ are closable on $L^2(\mu)$.
- (2) Let $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ be the closures of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu)$, respectively. Then, $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ is the increasing limit of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$.
- (3) $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp) \leq (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}^\mu)$.

Proof. For $v \in \Upsilon$, let $\mathcal{E}^v(f, g) = \int_S \mathbb{D}_v[f, g] d\mu$. Then, $(\mathcal{E}^v, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ is closable on $L^2(\mu)$ by (A3). Thus from (2.18), (2.22), (2.27), and (2.32), $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ are countable sums of closable forms $(\mathcal{E}^v, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu)$. Hence, we obtain (1).

From (1) and (2.33), $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ is the increasing limit of closable forms $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu)$. From this we obtain (2).

From (2.6), (2.34), and (2.37), $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp) \leq (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\mu)$. This yields (3). \square

Lemma 2.8. *Assume (A2)–(A4). Then $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp) = (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}^\mu) = (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.7(3) and Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$(2.38) \quad (\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp) \leq (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}^\mu) \leq (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu).$$

By (A4), we have $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp) = (\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$. This and (2.38) complete the proof. \square

Let T_t^μ be the Markovian semi-group on $L^2(\mu)$ associated with $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$. Then there exists an unlabeled diffusion (P_s, X_t) associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$ [18, 22, 23, 28]. By construction, (P_s, X_t) is μ -reversible and $T_t^\mu f(\mathbf{s}) = E_s[f(X_t)]$ for each $f \in L^2(\mu)$. From Lemma 2.8, (P_s, X_t) is also associated with $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{D}^\mu)$.

3. ONE-LABELED, TAGGED PARTICLE, AND ENVIRONMENT PROCESSES

In Section 3, we introduce the three stochastic processes related to the tagged particle problem: one-labeled, tagged particle, and environment processes.

We can obtain these three stochastic processes from the labeled process $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ by change of coordinate. These stochastic processes are diffusion processes and we identify the associated Dirichlet forms. We remark that the original labeled process \mathbf{X} does not have any associated Dirichlet form.

3.1. One-labeled processes. Let (P_s, X_t) be the μ -reversible diffusion associated with $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$ given in Subsection 2.1. From (A1)–(A3), (P_s, X_t) satisfies (1.13). Then using $\mathfrak{l}_{\text{path}}$ defined by (1.12), we have the corresponding labeled process $\mathbf{X} = \mathfrak{l}_{\text{path}}(X)$. From the labeled process $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, we construct the one-labeled processes $(X^i, X^{i\circ})$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where $X_t^{i\circ} = \sum_{j \neq i}^\infty \delta_{X_t^j}$.

The same construction is also possible for the unlabeled processes given by $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^\mu)$ on $L^2(\mu)$. If we assume (A4) in addition, then these three processes are the same by Lemma 2.8. We shall present the Dirichlet form associated with the one-labeled processes $(X^i, X^{i\circ})$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The Dirichlet form is independent of $i \in \mathbb{N}$ because of the symmetry of the particle system.

Let ∇ be the nabla in \mathbb{R}^d . We set for $f, g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\nabla[f, g](x) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla f, \nabla g)_{\mathbb{R}^d}(x).$$

We naturally regard ∇ and \mathbb{D} as the carré du champs on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ in such a way that, for $f = f_1 \otimes f_2$ and $g = g_1 \otimes g_2$,

$$\nabla[f, g] = \nabla[f_1, g_1]f_2g_2, \quad \mathbb{D}[f, g] = f_1g_1\mathbb{D}[f_2, g_2].$$

We regard \mathbb{D}_R^m , \mathbb{D}^\perp , and \mathbb{D}_R^\perp as the carré du champs on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ in the same fashion. Let $\mu^{[1]}$ be the one-Campbell measure of μ given by (1.29). Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}(f, g) &= \int_{S_R \times \mathcal{S}} \{\nabla[f, g] + \mathbb{D}_R[f, g]\} d\mu^{[1]} \\ (3.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_R^{[1], \perp}(f, g) &= \int_{S_R \times \mathcal{S}} \{\nabla[f, g] + \mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, g]\} d\mu^{[1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Assume (A1)–(A3). Then $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1], \perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1], \perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$, and $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\circ^{[1]})$ are closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$.*

Proof. Let $\mu_{R, s}$ be the regular conditional probability measure such that

$$(3.2) \quad \mu_{R, s} = \mu(\pi_R(\mathbf{x}) \in \cdot \mid \pi_R^c(\mathbf{x}) = \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s})).$$

Let $\mu_{R, s}^{[1]}$ be the one-Campbell measure of $\mu_{R, s}$. We set for $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(3.3) \quad \mu_{R, s}^{[1], m}(\cdot) = \mu_{R, s}^{[1]}(\cdot \cap S_R \times \mathcal{S}^{m-1}).$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_R(\mathbf{x})$ be as in (1.7). Recall that μ is a Ψ -quasi-Gibbs measure. Then using (1.9), (3.2), and (3.3), we have for $(x, \mathbf{x}) \in S_R \times \mathcal{S}^{m-1}$

$$(3.4) \quad c_{3.1}^{-1} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_R(\delta_x + \mathbf{x})} \Lambda_R^{[1], m}(dxd\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_{R, s}^{[1], m}(dxd\mathbf{x}) \leq c_{3.1} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_R(\delta_x + \mathbf{x})} \Lambda_R^{[1], m}(dxd\mathbf{x}).$$

Here, $\Lambda_R^{[1],1}(dxdx) = 1_{S_R}(x)dx\delta_0(x)$ and $\Lambda_R^{[1],m}(dxdx) = 1_{S_R}(x)dx\Lambda_R^{m-1}(dx)$ for $m \geq 2$. Furthermore, $c_{3.1}$ is a positive constant depending on β , R , m , and $\pi_R^c(s)$. We set

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{E}_{R,s}^{[1],m}(f, g) = \int \{\nabla[f, g] + \mathbb{D}_R[f, g]\} d\mu_{R,s}^{[1],m}.$$

Using **(A3)**, (3.4), and (3.5) and applying the method in [18, Lemma 3.2], we see that $(\mathcal{E}_{R,s}^{[1],m}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu_{R,s}^{[1],m})$. Let

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{E}_R^{[1],m}(f, g) = \int \{\nabla[f, g] + \mathbb{D}_R[f, g]\} d\mu_R^{[1],m}.$$

We write $\pi_R(s) = x$ and $\pi_R^c(s) = y$. Thus $s = (x, y)$. From (3.3), we have

$$(3.7) \quad \mu^{[1]}(dxds) = \int \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu_{R,s}^{[1],m}(dxdx) \mu \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1}(dy).$$

From (3.6) and (3.7), we deduce that $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],m}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$ is the integral of closable bilinear forms $(\mathcal{E}_{R,s}^{[1],m}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ on $L^2(\mu_{R,s}^{[1],m})$. Hence using the method in “Proof of Theorem 4” in [18, p.130], we see that $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],m}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$.

From (3.6) and (3.7), $\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_R^{[1],m}$. Because $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is a countable sum of closable forms $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],m}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$, $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$.

The proof of the closability of $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$ on $L^2(\mu)$ is similar to that of $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ on $L^2(\mu)$. Hence we omit it. \square

We set

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{E}^{[1]}(f, g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times S} \{\nabla[f, g] + \mathbb{D}[f, g]\} d\mu^{[1]},$$

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]} = \{f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_\bullet; \mathcal{E}^{[1]}(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu^{[1]})\}.$$

We define $\mathcal{D}_\circ^{[1]}$ by (3.9) through replacing \mathcal{D}_\bullet with \mathcal{D}_\circ . We define $\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}$ by (3.8) through replacing \mathbb{D} with \mathbb{D}^\perp . We define $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp}$ by (3.9) through replacing \mathcal{D}_\bullet and $\mathcal{E}^{[1]}$ with $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp$ and $\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}$, respectively. Here $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp$ was given by (2.37). We deduce from (2.34) and $\mathcal{D}_\bullet \supset \mathcal{D}_\circ$

$$(3.10) \quad (\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp}) \leq (\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]}) \leq (\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\circ^{[1]}).$$

Lemma 3.2. *Assume **(A1)**–**(A3)**. Then $(\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$, and $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\circ^{[1]})$ are closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$.*

Proof. Because $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is the increasing limit of $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ and $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$ by Lemma 3.1, $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$.

Note that $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is an extension of $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\circ^{[1]})$ and that $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$. Hence, $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\circ^{[1]})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$ by Lemma 2.1.

We see that $(\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$ is the increasing limit of $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$. From Lemma 3.1, $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$. Hence, $(\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$. \square

Let $(\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}_\bullet^{[1]})$, and $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\bullet^{[1]})$ be the closures of $(\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1]})$, and $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \mathcal{D}_\circ^{[1]})$ on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$, respectively.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume (A1)–(A4). Then*

$$(3.11) \quad (\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}^{[1],\perp}) = (\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{[1]}) = (\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{[1]}).$$

The diffusion $(X^i, X^{i\circ})$ is associated with the closed forms in (3.11) on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$.

Proof. We see $\overline{\mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\perp}} = \mathcal{D}^{\perp}$ by definition and $\overline{\mathcal{D}^{\mu}} = \overline{\mathcal{D}_o^{\mu}}$ by Lemma 2.2. From Lemma 2.8, $(\mathcal{E}^{\perp}, \mathcal{D}^{\perp}) = (\mathcal{E}^{\mu}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mu}) = (\mathcal{E}^{\mu}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mu})$. Combining these, we have $\overline{\mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\perp}} = \overline{\mathcal{D}_o^{\mu}}$. Hence,

$$(3.12) \quad C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\perp} \subset C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\perp}} = C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}_o^{\mu}}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$(3.13) \quad C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}_o^{\mu}} \subset \overline{C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_o^{\mu}} \equiv \overline{\mathcal{D}^{[1]}}.$$

From (3.12) and (3.13), we obtain

$$(3.14) \quad (\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}^{[1],\perp}) \geq (\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{[1]}).$$

From (3.10), we see

$$(3.15) \quad (\mathcal{E}^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}^{[1],\perp}) \leq (\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{[1]}) \leq (\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{[1]}).$$

Hence combining (3.14) and (3.15), we obtain (3.11).

Using [21, Theorem 2.4], we see that $(X^i, X^{i\circ})$ is the diffusion associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^{[1]}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{[1]})$ on $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$. Hence, (3.11) yields the second claim. \square

3.2. Tagged particle processes. The tagged particle problem of interacting Brownian motions is to prove the diffusive scaling limit of each particle in the system [8, 4, 19, 20]. The standard device for this problem is to introduce the environment process seen from the tagged particle [8]. We use this device and define it by changing the coordinates as follows. For the labeled process $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ given after (1.13), we set

$$(3.16) \quad X = X^1, \quad Y^i = X^{i+1} - X^1 \quad (i \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Here, X denotes the tagged particle and $\mathbf{Y} = (Y^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the labeled environment process seen from the tagged particle. The unlabeled environment process $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{Y}_t\}_t$ is given by

$$(3.17) \quad \mathbf{Y}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{Y_t^i}.$$

For $R, T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{w} = (w^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$, we set

$$(3.18) \quad I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w}) = \sup\{i \in \mathbb{N}; \min_{t \in [0,T]} |w^i(t)| \leq R\}.$$

For $\mathbf{w} = (w^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$, let \mathbf{w} be such that $\mathbf{w}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{w^i(t)}$. If $I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w}) < \infty$ for all $R, T \in \mathbb{N}$, then \mathbf{w} is an \mathbf{S} -valued continuous path. See Lemma 7.3 for proof. Conversely, if $I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w}) = \infty$ for some R or $T \in \mathbb{N}$, then \mathbf{w} is *not* necessarily an \mathbf{S} -valued continuous path. See [28, Remark 3.10].

Example 3.1. We present the ISDE of (X, \mathbf{Y}) for the Ginibre interacting Brownian motion. Using (1.1) and (3.16), we see that X and $\mathbf{Y} = (Y^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= dB_t^1 - \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{|Y_t^j| < R, j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{Y_t^j}{|Y_t^j|^2} \right) dt, \\ dY_t^i &= \sqrt{2} d\tilde{B}_t^i + \frac{Y_t^i}{|Y_t^i|^2} dt + \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{\substack{|Y_t^j| < R, \\ j \in \mathbb{N}}} \frac{Y_t^j}{|Y_t^j|^2} \right) dt + \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{\substack{|Y_t^i - Y_t^j| < R, \\ i \neq j, j \in \mathbb{N}}} \frac{Y_t^i - Y_t^j}{|Y_t^i - Y_t^j|^2} \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\tilde{B}_t^i = (1/\sqrt{2})(B_t^{i+1} - B_t^1)$. $\{\tilde{B}_t^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are not independent and each \tilde{B}_t^i is equivalent in law to the standard Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^2 . The second equation above is self-contained as an equation of \mathbf{Y} . We see that the unlabeled process \mathbf{Y} of \mathbf{Y} is a diffusion process with invariant probability measure $\mu_{\text{Gin},0}$ in Section 3.3. This property is critical in the Kipnis–Varadhan theory to the tagged particle problem [4, 14, 19].

Although (X, \mathbf{Y}) is a diffusion with state space $\mathbb{R}^d \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}$, there exists no associated Dirichlet space. Indeed, suitable invariant measures are lacking for (X, \mathbf{Y}) . In contrast, (X, \mathbf{Y}) is a diffusion with an invariant measure. As a result, it has the associated Dirichlet space. This fact is important in the analysis of the Dirichlet form version of the Kipnis–Varadhan theory in [19]. We shall specify the Dirichlet form associated with (X, \mathbf{Y}) .

Let D^{trn} be the generator of the translation operator given by (1.34). Let

$$(3.19) \quad (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[f, g] = \frac{1}{2}((\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})f, (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})g)_{\mathbb{R}^d}.$$

We introduce the bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{X\mathbf{Y}})$ such that

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}(f, g) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{S}} (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[f, g] + \mathbb{D}[f, g] dx \times \mu_0, \\ \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{X\mathbf{Y}} &= \{f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes (\mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}} \cap \mathcal{D}_\bullet); \mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(dx \times \mu_0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, \mathcal{D}^{trn} is the domain of D^{trn} : i.e., \mathcal{D}^{trn} is the set of functions for which the limit in (1.34) exists for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}$ and $1 \leq p \leq d$. We define $\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp}$ through (3.20) by replacing \mathbb{D} with \mathbb{D}^\perp . We define $\mathcal{D}_\circ^{X\mathbf{Y}}$ by replacing \mathcal{D}_\bullet with \mathcal{D}_\circ in $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^{X\mathbf{Y}}$. We also set $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp}$ by replacing $(\mathcal{D}_\bullet, \mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}})$ with $(\mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp, \mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp})$ in $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^{X\mathbf{Y}}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Make the same assumptions as Lemma 3.3. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{X\mathbf{Y}})$, and $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}, \mathcal{D}_\circ^{X\mathbf{Y}})$ are closable on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$.
- (2) Let $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp}, \mathcal{D}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{X\mathbf{Y}})$ and $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{X\mathbf{Y}})$ be the closures of the closable forms in (1) on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$, respectively. Then,

$$(3.21) \quad (\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp}, \mathcal{D}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp}) = (\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{X\mathbf{Y}}) = (\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{X\mathbf{Y}}).$$

- (3) The diffusion (X, \mathbf{Y}) is associated with $(\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp}, \mathcal{D}^{X\mathbf{Y}, \perp})$ on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$, where X and \mathbf{Y} are as in (3.16) and (3.17), respectively.

Proof. Let $\{\vartheta_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ be as in (1.3). Let ι be the transformation on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{S}$ defined by $\iota(x, \mathbf{s}) = (x, \vartheta_x(\mathbf{s}))$. Using this and (A1), we deduce that

$$(3.22) \quad \mu^{[1]} \circ \iota^{-1} = dx \times \mu_0.$$

Hence, ι is the unitary transformation between $L^2(\mu^{[1]})$ and $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$ such that

$$(3.23) \quad (f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota)_{L^2(\mu^{[1]})} = (f, g)_{L^2(dx \times \mu_0)}.$$

Recall that $\vartheta_x(s) = \sum_i \delta_{s_i - x}$ by (1.3). Hence

$$(3.24) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(f(x, \vartheta_x(s)) \right) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f \right) (x, \vartheta_x(s)) - \left(D^{\text{trn}} f \right) (x, \vartheta_x(s)).$$

Hence from (3.19), (3.24), and $\iota(x, s) = (x, \vartheta_x(s))$, we deduce that

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\nabla[f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota] + \mathbb{D}^\perp[f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota]) \circ \iota^{-1} = (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[f, g] + \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, g], \\ & (\nabla[f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota] + \mathbb{D}[f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota]) \circ \iota^{-1} = (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[f, g] + \mathbb{D}[f, g]. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.20), (3.22), and (3.25), we see the isometry of the bilinear forms such that

$$(3.26) \quad \mathcal{E}^{[1], \perp}(f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota) = \mathcal{E}^{X^Y, \perp}(f, g), \quad \mathcal{E}^{[1]}(f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota) = \mathcal{E}^{X^Y}(f, g).$$

Using (3.23) and (3.26) together with Lemma 3.2, we obtain (1).

Combining (3.11) and (3.26), we obtain (2) immediately.

We regard ι as the transformation of $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S})$, denoted by the same symbol ι , such that $\iota(X^1, \mathbf{X}^{1\circ}) = \{\iota(X_t^1, \mathbf{X}_t^{1\circ})\}_{t \in [0, \infty)}$. Then

$$(3.27) \quad \iota(X^1, \mathbf{X}^{1\circ}) = (X, \mathbf{Y}).$$

Using Lemma 3.3, (3.23), (3.26), and (3.27), we obtain (3). \square

3.3. Environment processes. Let \mathbf{Y} be the environment process given by (3.17). Note that \mathbf{Y} itself is a diffusion. Hence, we specify the Dirichlet form associated with \mathbf{Y} .

Let D^{trn} , \mathbb{D} , and \mathbb{D}^\perp be as in (1.35), (2.4) and (2.32), respectively.

Let $(\mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp})$ be the bilinear form defined by

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}(f, g) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}} D^{\text{trn}}[f, g] + \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, g] d\mu_0, \\ \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp} &= \{f \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}} \cap \mathcal{D}_\bullet; \mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu_0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y)$ be the bilinear forms defined by

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^Y(f, g) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}} D^{\text{trn}}[f, g] + \mathbb{D}[f, g] d\mu_0, \\ \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y &= \{f \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}} \cap \mathcal{D}_\bullet; \mathcal{E}^Y(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu_0)\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y &= \{f \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}} \cap \mathcal{D}_\circ; \mathcal{E}^Y(f, f) < \infty, f \in L^2(\mu_0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For a random variable Z and a probability measure ν , we write $Z \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \nu$ if the law of Z coincides with ν .

Lemma 3.5. *Make the same assumptions as Lemma 3.3. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $(\mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y)$, and $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y)$ are closable on $L^2(\mu_0)$.
- (2) Let $(\mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp})$, $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y)$, and $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y)$ be the closures of the closable forms in (1) on $L^2(\mu_0)$, respectively. Then,

$$(3.30) \quad (\mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp}) = (\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y) = (\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\circ^Y).$$

- (3) Let (X, \mathbf{Y}) be as in (3.16) and (3.17). Suppose that $(X_0, \mathbf{Y}_0) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \zeta \times f d\mu_0$, where ζ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d and $0 \leq f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{S}} f d\mu_0 = 1$. The

distribution of Y in (X, Y) is then the same as that of the diffusion Y associated with $(\mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}, \mathcal{D}^{Y, \perp})$ such that $Y_0 \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} f d\mu_0$.

Proof. For $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp}$, we see

$$(3.31) \quad \|\varphi \otimes f\|_{L^2(dx \times \mu_0)} = \|\varphi\|_{L^2(dx)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mu_0)},$$

$$(3.32) \quad \mathcal{E}^{XY, \perp}(\varphi \otimes f, \varphi \otimes f) = \|\varphi\|_{L^2(dx)}^2 \mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}(f, f) + \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(dx)}^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\mu_0)}^2.$$

Indeed, (3.31) is a straightforward calculation and (3.32) follows from the following.

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[\varphi \otimes f, \varphi \otimes f] + \mathbb{D}^\perp[\varphi \otimes f, \varphi \otimes f] \\ &= \varphi^2 \otimes \{D^{\text{trn}}[f, f] + \mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f]\} + |\nabla \varphi|^2 \otimes f^2 - 2(\varphi \nabla \varphi, f D^{\text{trn}} f)_{\mathbb{R}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (3.33) over $\mathbb{R}^d \times S$ with respect to $dx \times \mu_0$ and using

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times S} (\varphi \nabla \varphi, f D^{\text{trn}} f)_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx \times \mu_0 = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \nabla \varphi dx, \int_S f D^{\text{trn}} f d\mu_0 \right)_{\mathbb{R}^d} = 0,$$

we obtain (3.32).

Let $\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mu_0)} \neq 0$. Let $\{f_n\}$ be an $\mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}$ -Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{L^2(\mu_0)} = 0$. Then from (3.31) and (3.32), we see that $\{\varphi \otimes f_n\}$ is an $\mathcal{E}^{XY, \perp}$ -Cauchy sequence such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi \otimes f_n\|_{L^2(dx \times \mu_0)} = 0.$$

By Lemma 3.4(1), $(\mathcal{E}^{XY, \perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{Y, \perp})$ is closable on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$. Hence we deduce

$$(3.34) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{XY, \perp}(\varphi \otimes f_n, \varphi \otimes f_n) = 0.$$

From (3.32), (3.34), $\|\varphi\|_{L^2(dx)} \neq 0$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{L^2(\mu_0)} = 0$, we deduce

$$\mathcal{E}^{Y, \perp}(f_n, f_n) = \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(dx)}^2} \left\{ \mathcal{E}^{XY, \perp}(\varphi \otimes f_n, \varphi \otimes f_n) - \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(dx)}^2 \|f_n\|_{L^2(\mu_0)}^2 \right\} \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies the first claim in (1). The proof of the second and third claim in (1) is same. Hence, we omit it. Claim (2) follows from Lemma 3.4(2) and (3.32). Claim (3) follows from Lemma 3.4(3), (3.31), and (3.32). \square

4. VANISHING THE SELF-DIFFUSION MATRIX

In Section 4, we present a sufficient condition of vanishing the self-diffusion matrix. The goal of Section 4, is to prove Theorem 4.1, which is an “in μ_0 -measure” version of Theorem 1.4(2).

4.1. A sufficient condition for the vanishing of the self-diffusion matrix.

In Subsection 4.1, μ is a random point field on \mathbb{R}^d satisfying **(A1)**–**(A4)**.

Let $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y)$ be the bilinear form defined by (3.29). We set

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{E}^{Y, 1}(f, g) = \int_S D^{\text{trn}}[f, g] d\mu_0, \quad \mathcal{E}^{Y, 2}(f, g) = \int_S \mathbb{D}[f, g] d\mu_0.$$

From this, we have a decomposition of the bilinear form such that

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{E}^Y(f, g) = \mathcal{E}^{Y, 1}(f, g) + \mathcal{E}^{Y, 2}(f, g) \quad \text{for } f, g \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^Y.$$

Using (4.1) and the obvious inequalities $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},i}(f, f) \leq \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(f, f)$, we extend the domain of $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},i}$ from $\mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ to $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, where $i = 1, 2$. Hence, (4.2) yields

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(f, g) = \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},1}(f, g) + \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(f, g) \quad \text{for } f, g \in \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}.$$

Because of Lemma 3.5, $(\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}, \mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{Y}})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu_0)$. Meanwhile, each of $(\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},1}, \mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{Y}})$ and $(\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}, \mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{Y}})$ is not necessarily closable on $L^2(\mu_0)$. Still, (4.3) makes sense for $f, g \in \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$.

$\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ is a Hilbert space with inner product $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}} + (\cdot, *)_{L^2(\mu_0)}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ is a pre-Hilbert space with non-negative bilinear form $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}$. Let \sim be the equivalence relation on $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ such that $f \sim g$ if and only if $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(f - g, f - g) = 0$. The quotient space $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}} / \sim$ is a pre-Hilbert space with inner product $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}) = \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(f, g) \quad \text{for } f, g \in \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}},$$

where $\tilde{f} = f / \sim$ and $\tilde{g} = g / \sim$. The completion $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ of $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}} / \sim$ is then a Hilbert space with inner product $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$.

Let D_p^{trn} be as defined in (1.34). For $1 \leq p \leq d$ and $g \in \mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, we set

$$(4.5) \quad F_p(g) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{2} D_p^{\text{trn}} g \, d\mu_0.$$

By the Schwartz inequality, (4.2), and (4.4), we obtain for any $g \in \mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{Y}}$

$$(4.6) \quad |F_p(g)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},1}(g, g) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(g, g) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}).$$

From (4.6), we regard F_p as a bounded linear functional on $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, and we denote it by the same symbol F_p .

Lemma 4.1. *For $1 \leq p \leq d$, there exists a unique solution $\psi_p \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ of the equation*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\psi_p, g) = F_p(g) \quad \text{for all } g \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}.$$

Proof. Because we regard F_p as a bounded linear functional of the Hilbert space $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ with inner products $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, Lemma 4.1 is obvious from the Riesz theorem. \square

We consider a resolvent equation. For each $\lambda > 0$ and $1 \leq p \leq d$, let $\psi_{\lambda,p} \in \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ be the unique solution of the equation such that for any $g \in \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\psi_{\lambda,p}, g) + \lambda(\psi_{\lambda,p}, g)_{L^2(\mu_0)} = F_p(g).$$

Lemma 4.2. *For each $1 \leq p \leq d$, the following hold.*

(1) $\{\psi_{\lambda,p}\}_{\lambda>0}$ is an $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ -Cauchy sequence in $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ satisfying

$$(4.8) \quad \lim_{\lambda, \lambda' \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\psi_{\lambda,p} - \psi_{\lambda',p}, \psi_{\lambda,p} - \psi_{\lambda',p}) = 0,$$

$$(4.9) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda \|\psi_{\lambda,p}\|_{L^2(\mu_0)}^2 = 0.$$

(2) $\{\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p}\}_{\lambda>0}$ is an $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ -Cauchy sequence in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ satisfying

$$(4.10) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p} - \psi_p, \tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p} - \psi_p) = 0.$$

Here, $\psi_p \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ is the limit of $\{\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p}\}_{\lambda>0}$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$.

Proof. Lemma 4.2 follows from the standard argument; see [14, 26]. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Assume (A7). Then, for $1 \leq p \leq d$,*

$$(4.11) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 \mu_0(dy) + \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\psi_{\lambda,p}, \psi_{\lambda,p}) \right\} = 0.$$

In particular, $\alpha_{p,p} = 0$ for $1 \leq p \leq d$.

Proof. Let $g \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y}}$. From (4.1) and (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\chi_{L,p}, g) - \int_S \frac{1}{2} D_p^{\text{trn}} g d\mu_0 \\ &= \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d (D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p})(D_q^{\text{trn}} g) d\mu_0 + \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\chi_{L,p}, g) - \int_S \frac{1}{2} D_p^{\text{trn}} g d\mu_0 \\ &= \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d (D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} - \delta_{p,q})(D_q^{\text{trn}} g) d\mu_0 + \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\chi_{L,p}, g) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } L \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (1.36) and the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality to the last line. Hence

$$(4.12) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\chi_{L,p}, g) = \int_S \frac{1}{2} D_p^{\text{trn}} g d\mu_0 \quad \text{for all } g \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y}}.$$

Because $\{\chi_{L,p}\}$ is an $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ -Cauchy sequence, $\{\tilde{\chi}_{L,p}\}$ is an $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ -Cauchy sequence in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ by (4.4). By (4.4) and (4.12), $\{\tilde{\chi}_{L,p}\}$ is a weak convergent sequence in the Hilbert space $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$. By (4.5) and Lemma 4.1, ψ_p is the limit of $\{\tilde{\chi}_{L,p}\}$. Hence,

$$(4.13) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y}}(\psi_p - \tilde{\chi}_{L,p}, \psi_p - \tilde{\chi}_{L,p}) = 0.$$

We write $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},1}(f) = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},1}(f, f)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 \mu_0(dy) \\ & \leq 2 \int_S \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} - D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 \right\} \mu_0(dy) \\ & = 2\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},1}(\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p} - \psi_p + \psi_p - \tilde{\chi}_{L,p}) + 2 \left\{ \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 \mu_0(dy) \right\} \\ & \leq 4\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},1}(\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p} - \psi_p) + 4\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},1}(\psi_p - \tilde{\chi}_{L,p}) + 2 \left\{ \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 \mu_0(dy) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $L \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in the last line, each term vanishes by (4.10), (4.13), and (1.36). Hence, we find that the first term in (4.11) converges to zero.

We calculate the second term in (4.11). We write $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(f) = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(f, f)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\psi_{\lambda,p}) &= \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},2}((\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p} - \psi_p) + (\psi_p - \tilde{\chi}_{L,p}) + \tilde{\chi}_{L,p}) \\ &\leq 3\{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,p} - \psi_p) + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\psi_p - \tilde{\chi}_{L,p}) + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\tilde{\chi}_{L,p})\}. \end{aligned}$$

From (4.10), (4.13), (1.36), and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\tilde{\chi}_{L,p}) = \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\chi_{L,p})$, the last line converges to zero as $L \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Hence, the second term in (4.11) converges to zero. Collecting these, we have (4.11). From $\psi_{\lambda,p} \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y}}$, we obtain the second claim. \square

4.2. Invariance principle with the vanishing of the self-diffusion matrix.

Let (X, Y) be as in Lemma 3.4. From Lemma 3.4, we deduce that (X, Y) is the diffusion associated with $(\mathcal{E}^{XY}, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY})$ on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$. We take $(X_0, Y_0) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \zeta \times \mu_0$, where ζ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d . The distribution of the second component Y of (X, Y) is independent of ζ from Lemma 3.5.

Let Y be as in Lemma 3.5. Then Y is the diffusion associated with $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^Y)$ on $L^2(\mu_0)$. If $Y_0 \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \mu_0$, then Y is a μ_0 -stationary Markov process and is equivalent in law to the second component Y in (X, Y) . See Lemma 3.5.

The Dirichlet forms $(\mathcal{E}^{XY}, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY})$ on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^Y)$ on $L^2(\mu_0)$ are quasi-regular and strongly local (see Subsection 7.2 and [3]). Indeed, the quasi-regularity of the upper Dirichlet forms $(\mathcal{E}^{XY}, \overline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY})$ on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \overline{\mathcal{Q}}^Y)$ on $L^2(\mu_0)$ were proved in [21]. Furthermore, the strong locality of these Dirichlet forms are clear from the structure of the carré du champs giving the Dirichlet forms. Hence, using the identities of the upper and lower Dirichlet forms in Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5, we obtain the quasi-regularity and the strong locality of the lower Dirichlet forms $(\mathcal{E}^{XY}, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY})$ on $L^2(dx \times \mu_0)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^Y)$ on $L^2(\mu_0)$. Once we have verified the quasi-regularity and the strong locality, we can apply the Dirichlet form theory developed in [3, 6] to the associated diffusion processes (X, Y) and Y .

Let $\psi_\lambda = (\psi_{\lambda,p})_{p=1}^d$ be the function given by (4.7). Recall that $1 \otimes \psi_\lambda \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY}$ locally and that $\psi_\lambda \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^Y$. Let $\widetilde{1 \otimes \psi_\lambda}$ and $\widetilde{\psi_\lambda}$ be quasi-continuous modifications of $1 \otimes \psi_\lambda$ and ψ_λ , respectively. We can and do take $\widetilde{1 \otimes \psi_\lambda} = 1 \otimes \widetilde{\psi_\lambda}$.

Because $(\mathcal{E}^{XY}, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY})$ and $(\mathcal{E}^Y, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^Y)$ are strongly local, $1 \otimes \widetilde{\psi_\lambda}(X_t, Y_t)$ and $\widetilde{\psi_\lambda}(Y_t)$ are continuous processes (see [3, Theorem 4.3.4]). Let $\mathcal{M}_\lambda = (\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,p})_{p=1}^d$, $\lambda > 0$, be a continuous process such that

$$(4.14) \quad \mathcal{M}_\lambda(t) = X_t - X_0 + \widetilde{\psi_\lambda}(Y_t) - \widetilde{\psi_\lambda}(Y_0) - \int_0^t \lambda \psi_\lambda(Y_u) du.$$

Recall that $(X_0, Y_0) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \zeta \times \mu_0$ and $Y_0 \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \mu_0$. It is clear that the distribution of $(1 \otimes \widetilde{\psi_\lambda})(X_t, Y_t) = \widetilde{\psi_\lambda}(Y_t)$ is independent of ζ .

Lemma 4.4. *Assume (A1)–(A4) and (A7). Let (X, Y) be as in Lemma 3.4. Let $(X_0, Y_0) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \zeta \times \mu_0$. Then, $\{\mathcal{M}_\lambda\}_{\lambda>0}$ is a sequence of continuous L^2 -martingales with stationary increments such that*

$$(4.15) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} E[|\mathcal{M}_\lambda(t)|^2] = 0 \quad \text{for each } t.$$

Proof. Note that $u_p := x_p \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \psi_{\lambda,p}$ is locally in $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY}$. Let \widetilde{u} be a quasi-continuous modification of $u := (u_p)_{p=1}^d$. Applying Fukushima's decomposition to u , we see that the additive functional $A^{[u]} = \widetilde{u}(X, Y) - \widetilde{u}(X_0, Y_0)$ satisfies the decomposition

$$(4.16) \quad A^{[u]} = M^{[u]} + N^{[u]}.$$

Here $M^{[u]}$ is the martingale part and $N^{[u]}$ is the continuous additive functional of zero energy. We refer to [3, Theorem 4.2.6] for Fukushima's decomposition.

Because $(\mathcal{E}^{XY}, \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{XY})$ is strongly local, $M^{[u]}$ is a continuous local martingale. This follows from the Beurling-Deny formula (see [3, (4.3.6)] and [6, Theorem 5.5.1]).

We next calculate $N^{[u]}$. Let $0 \leq \varphi \in \mathcal{D}_{\bullet}^{X\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\int \varphi dx \mu_0(ds) = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}^{X\mathbf{Y}}(u_p, \varphi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{S}} (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[u_p, \varphi] + \mathbb{D}[u_p, \varphi] dx \mu_0(ds) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{S}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \delta_{pq} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_q} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \delta_{pq} D_q^{\text{trn}} \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_q} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} D_q^{\text{trn}} \varphi + \mathbb{D}[\psi_{\lambda,p}, \varphi] dx \mu_0(ds) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{S}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_p} - \frac{1}{2} D_p^{\text{trn}} \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_q} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} D_q^{\text{trn}} \varphi + \mathbb{D}[\psi_{\lambda,p}, \varphi] dx \mu_0(ds) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{S}} -\frac{1}{2} D_p^{\text{trn}} \varphi + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} D_q^{\text{trn}} \varphi + \mathbb{D}[\psi_{\lambda,p}, \varphi] dx \mu_0(ds) \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{S}} \lambda \psi_{\lambda,p} \varphi dx \mu_0(ds) \quad \text{by (4.5) and (4.7)} \\
(4.17) \quad &= - \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} E \left[\int_0^t \lambda \psi_{\lambda,p}(\mathbf{Y}_u) du \right] \quad \text{for } (X_0, \mathbf{Y}_0) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \varphi dx \times \mu_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (4.16) and (4.17), we apply Theorem 5.2.4 in [6] to obtain

$$(4.18) \quad N_t^{[u]} = \int_0^t \lambda \psi_{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y}_u) du.$$

Hence from (4.14), (4.16), and (4.18), we deduce

$$(4.19) \quad M_t^{[u]} = A_t^{[u]} - N_t^{[u]} = \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}(t).$$

Recall that $u_p = x_p \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \psi_{\lambda,p}$. From (3.20) and a direct calculation similar to (4.17) with $\varphi = u_p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M^{[u_p]} \rangle_t &= 2 \int_0^t \{(\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[u_p, u_p] + \mathbb{D}[u_p, u_p]\}(X_u, \mathbf{Y}_u) du \\
&= 2 \int_0^t \{(\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[x_p \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \psi_{\lambda,p}, x_p \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \psi_{\lambda,p}] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{D}[x_p \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \psi_{\lambda,p}, x_p \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \psi_{\lambda,p}]\}(X_u, \mathbf{Y}_u) du \\
&= 2 \int_0^t \left\{ \sum_{q=1}^d \frac{1}{2} \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 + \mathbb{D}[\psi_{\lambda,p}, \psi_{\lambda,p}] \right\} (X_u, \mathbf{Y}_u) du \\
(4.20) \quad &= 2 \int_0^t \left\{ \sum_{q=1}^d \frac{1}{2} \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 + \mathbb{D}[\psi_{\lambda,p}, \psi_{\lambda,p}] \right\} (\mathbf{Y}_u) du.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $(X_0, Y_0) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \zeta \times \mu_0$ and Y is a μ_0 -stationary diffusion process by Lemma 3.5. Using these, (4.19), and (4.20), we have

$$(4.21) \quad E[|\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,p}(t)|^2] = 2t \left\{ \int_S \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \psi_{\lambda,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 d\mu_0 + \mathcal{E}^{Y,2}(\psi_{\lambda,p}, \psi_{\lambda,p}) \right\}.$$

Hence, $E[|\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,p}(t)|^2] < \infty$ by $\psi_{\lambda,p} \in \mathcal{D}^Y$. Thus, $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,p}$ is a continuous, L^2 -martingale with stationary increments. Applying Lemma 4.3 to (4.21) yields (4.15). \square

Theorem 4.1. *Assume (A1)–(A4) and (A7). Let (X, Y) be as in Lemma 3.4. Then,*

$$(4.22) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon X_{t/\epsilon^2} = 0 \quad \text{weakly in } C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ in } \mu_0\text{-measure.}$$

Proof. Using (4.14), we see that for each t

$$(4.23) \quad \epsilon X_{t/\epsilon^2} - \epsilon X_0 = \epsilon \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon^2}(t/\epsilon^2) + \epsilon \tilde{\psi}_{\epsilon^2}(Y_{t/\epsilon^2}) - \epsilon \tilde{\psi}_{\epsilon^2}(Y_0) - \epsilon \int_0^{t/\epsilon^2} \epsilon^2 \psi_{\epsilon^2}(Y_u) du.$$

From Lemma 4.4, \mathcal{M}_{ϵ^2} is a continuous, L^2 -martingale with stationarity increments. Furthermore, \mathcal{M}_{ϵ^2} satisfies (4.15). Hence, we find that

$$(4.24) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E[|\epsilon \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon^2}(t/\epsilon^2)|^2] = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E[|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon^2}(t)|^2] = 0.$$

From the μ_0 -stationarity of Y and (4.9), we deduce that

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E[|\epsilon \psi_{\epsilon^2}(Y_{t/\epsilon^2})|^2] &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E[|\epsilon \psi_{\epsilon^2}(Y_0)|^2] \quad \text{by stationarity of } Y \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon^2 \int_S |\psi_{\epsilon^2}|^2 d\mu_0 = 0 \quad \text{by (4.9).} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using the Schwartz inequality, the μ_0 -stationarity of Y , and (4.9), we obtain

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E \left[\left| \epsilon \int_0^{t/\epsilon^2} \epsilon^2 \psi_{\epsilon^2}(Y_u) du \right|^2 \right] &\leq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E \left[\epsilon^6 \frac{t}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^{t/\epsilon^2} |\psi_{\epsilon^2}(Y_u)|^2 du \right] \\ &= t^2 \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon^2 \int_S |\psi_{\epsilon^2}|^2 d\mu_0 = 0 \quad \text{by (4.9).} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E[|\epsilon X_0|^2] = 0$. Hence, putting (4.24)–(4.26) into (4.23), we obtain

$$(4.27) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E[|\epsilon X_{t/\epsilon^2}|^2] = 0 \quad \text{for all } t.$$

From (4.27), we obtain

$$(4.28) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon X_{t/\epsilon^2} = 0 \quad \text{in f.d.d. in } \mu_0\text{-measure.}$$

Set $X_t = (X_{p,t})_{p=1}^d$ and consider $A_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]}((X, Y)) = X_{p,t} - X_{p,0}$. Applying Fukushima's decomposition to $x_p \otimes 1$, we have $A_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]} = M_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]} + N_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]}$. Then

$$(4.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle M^{[x_p \otimes 1]} \rangle_t &= 2 \int_0^t \{ (\nabla - D^{\text{trn}})[x_p \otimes 1, x_p \otimes 1] + \mathbb{D}[x_p \otimes 1, x_p \otimes 1] \} (X_u, Y_u) du \\ &= t. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $M^{[x_p \otimes 1]}$ is the standard linear Brownian motion.

Applying Lyons–Zheng’s decomposition [3] to $x_p \otimes 1$, we see that $A_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]}$ satisfies

$$(4.30) \quad A_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ M_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]} - M_t^{[x_p \otimes 1]} \circ r_t \right\},$$

where r_t is the time-reversal operator on the path space on $[0, \infty)$ such that $r_t(\omega)(s) = \omega(t-s)$ if $0 \leq s \leq t$ and $r_t(\omega)(s) = \omega(0)$ if $t \leq s$. From (4.29) and (4.30), $\{\epsilon X_{t/\epsilon^2}\}$ is tight in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$. Combining this with (4.28) yields (4.22). \square

5. DUAL REDUCED PALM MEASURES AND MEAN-RIGID CONDITIONING

5.1. Dual reduced Palm measures. In Subsection 5.1, we introduce the concept of the dual reduced Palm measures. We construct the translation invariant dual reduced Palm measures in Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.7.

Let $S_m = \{s \in S; s(\mathbb{R}^d) = m\}$ for $m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ as before. Let $\tilde{\mu}_m = \check{\mu}^m \circ u^{-1}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\check{\mu}^m$ are defined by (1.16) and $u(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \delta_{x_i}$ for $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_i$. Note that $\tilde{\mu}_m$ are measures on S_m but usually not probability measures. Let $\tilde{\mu} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mu}_m$ be the measure on $\{s \in S; s(\mathbb{R}^d) < \infty\}$, where $\tilde{\mu}_0 = \delta_0$ is degenerated to the zero measure 0. Let $\mu(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} \in S_m$, be the reduced Palm measure defined by (1.17).

Recall that $S_R^m = \{s \in S; s(S_R) = m\}$. Note that $S_m \cap S_R^m \subset \pi_R(S)$ and that $s(S_R^c) = 0$ for $s \in S_m \cap S_R^m$. We repeatedly use this fact in Subsection 5.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume (A2), (A3), and (1.21). Then the following hold.*

$$(5.1) \quad \mu \circ \pi_R^{-1} \approx \tilde{\mu} \circ \pi_R^{-1},$$

$$(5.2) \quad \mu(\cdot \cap \{s(S_R) \geq m\}) \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1} \approx \mu(\cdot \| \mathbf{x}) \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1}$$

for each $\mathbf{x} \in S_m \cap S_R^m$. Here, $\cdot \approx \cdot$ means \cdot and \cdot are mutually absolutely continuous.

Proof. From (A2), we have the m -point correlation function ρ^m and the density function σ_R^m on S_R of μ such that

$$(5.3) \quad \rho^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = \sigma_R^m(\mathbf{x}_m) + \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n-m)!} \int_{(S_R)^{n-m}} \sigma_R^n((\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{y}_{n-m})) \prod_{l=1}^{n-m} dy_l,$$

where $\mathbf{y}_{n-m} = (y_1, \dots, y_{n-m}) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{n-m}$. From (A3), (1.9) and (1.7) hold. Let $\mu_{R,k,s}^n$ be the regular conditional measures given by (1.8). Hence, for μ -a.s. s , the Radon-Nikodym density $\sigma_{R,k,s}^n = d\mu_{R,k,s}^n / d\Lambda_R^n$ and the n -point correlation function $\rho_{R,k,s}^n$ of $\mu_{R,k,s}^n$ exists. Furthermore, there exists a constant $c_{5.1}(R, k, s, n) > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{x}_n = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in S_R^n$

$$c_{5.1}^{-1} \exp(-\beta \sum_{\substack{x_p, x_q \in S_R \\ p < q}} \Psi(x_p - x_q)) \leq \sigma_{R,k,s}^n(\mathbf{x}_n) \leq c_{5.1} \exp(-\beta \sum_{\substack{x_p, x_q \in S_R \\ p < q}} \Psi(x_p - x_q)).$$

Hence, (5.3) also holds for $\sigma_{R,k,s}^n$ and $\rho_{R,k,s}^n$.

From (A3), Ψ is locally bounded from below, and $\Psi(x) < \infty$ for $x \neq 0$. Using these and that $\sigma_{R,k,s}^n(\mathbf{x}_n)$ is symmetric in \mathbf{x}_n , we see for μ -a.s. s

$$\sigma_{R,k,s}^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = 0 \iff \sigma_{R,k,s}^n((\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{y}_{n-m})) = 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{y}_{n-m} \in S_R^{n-m}, n > m.$$

Hence using this and (5.3) for $\sigma_{R,k,s}^n$ and $\rho_{R,k,s}^n$, we deduce for μ -a.s. s

$$(5.4) \quad \sigma_{R,k,s}^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = 0 \iff \rho_{R,k,s}^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = 0.$$

Integrating (5.4) for \mathbf{s} with respect to μ and taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain from (1.8)

$$(5.5) \quad \sigma_R^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = 0 \iff \rho^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = 0$$

We deduce from (5.3) and (5.5) that $\mu \circ \pi_R^{-1} \approx \tilde{\mu} \circ \pi_R^{-1}$, which yields (5.1).

For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{S})$, we set $\mathbb{A}_R^c = (\pi_R^c)^{-1}(\pi_R^c(\mathbf{A}))$. Then for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}_m \cap \mathbf{S}_R^m$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathbb{A}_R^c \cap \{\mathbf{s}(S_R) \geq m\}) &= \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbf{S}_R^n} \mu(\mathbb{A}_R^c | \mathbf{t} = \pi_R(\mathbf{s})) \mu \circ \pi_R^{-1}(d\mathbf{t}) \\ &\approx \int_{\mathbf{S}_R^m} \mu(\mathbb{A}_R^c | \mathbf{t} \prec \pi_R(\mathbf{s})) \tilde{\mu} \circ \pi_R^{-1}(d\mathbf{t}) \quad \text{by (5.1)} \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{S}_R^m} \mu(\mathbb{A}_R^c + \mathbf{t} | \mathbf{t} \prec \pi_R(\mathbf{s})) \tilde{\mu} \circ \pi_R^{-1}(d\mathbf{t}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{S}_R^m} \mu(\mathbb{A}_R^c | \mathbf{t}) \tilde{\mu} \circ \pi_R^{-1}(d\mathbf{t}) \quad \text{by (1.17)} \\ &\approx \int_{\mathbf{S}_R^m} \mu(\mathbb{A}_R^c | \mathbf{x}) \mu \circ \pi_R^{-1}(d\mathbf{t}) \approx \mu(\mathbb{A}_R^c | \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{by (1.21)}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (5.2). \square

We note that \mathbf{S} is homeomorphic to a complete separable metric space. Hence, for μ -a.s. \mathbf{y} , we define a random point field $\mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}$ on S_R by the regular conditional probability such that

$$\mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\cdot) = \mu(\pi_R(\mathbf{s}) \in \cdot | \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s}) = \pi_R^c(\mathbf{y})).$$

Note that $\mathbf{A} = \pi_R(\mathbf{A}) + \pi_R^c(\mathbf{A})$ and that $\mu_{R,\mathbf{y}} = \mu_{R,\pi_R^c(\mathbf{y})}$. Then we have

$$\mu(\mathbf{A}) = \int_{(\pi_R^c)^{-1}(\pi_R^c(\mathbf{A}))} \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\pi_R(\mathbf{A})) \mu(d\mathbf{y}) = \int_{\pi_R^c(\mathbf{A})} \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{A}) \mu \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1}(d\mathbf{y}).$$

In Lemma 5.2, μ is irreducibly k -decomposable with $\{\mathbf{S}_m^\diamond\}_{m=0}^k$ in the sense of Definition 1.2. From Remark 1.3(2), $\mu(\mathbf{S}_m^\diamond) = 0$ for $m \geq 1$. Thus, it is not obvious that $\mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}$ exists for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{S}_m^\diamond$, $m \geq 1$. We resolve this in Lemma 5.2.

Let μ_m^\diamond be a random point field such that

$$(5.6) \quad \mu_m^\diamond \approx \mu(\cdot | \mathbf{x}) \text{ for some } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}_m.$$

From (1.18)–(1.21), we have

$$(5.7) \quad \mu_m^\diamond(\mathbf{S}_m^\diamond) = 1,$$

$$(5.8) \quad \mu_m^\diamond \approx \mu(\cdot | \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}_m.$$

Note that $\mathbf{S}_R^m + \pi_R(\mathbf{y}) = \{\mathbf{s} + \pi_R(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}_R^m\} \subsetneq \mathbf{S}_R^m$ if $\mathbf{y}(S_R) \geq 1$. We set

$$(5.9) \quad \mathbf{S}_0^\diamond(\mathbf{y}) = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}_0^\diamond : \mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{s}\}.$$

If μ is k -decomposable, then $\mathbf{S}_0^\diamond(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{y} \subset \mathbf{S}_m$ for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{S}_m^\diamond$ from (1.19).

Lemma 5.2. *Assume (A2), (A3), and (1.21). Let μ be irreducibly k -decomposable with $\{\mathbf{S}_m^\diamond\}_{m=0}^k$ in the sense of Definition 1.2. Then for $1 \leq m \leq k$,*

$$(5.10) \quad \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}} \text{ exists for } \mu_m^\diamond\text{-a.s. } \mathbf{y},$$

$$(5.11) \quad \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{S}_R^m + \pi_R(\mathbf{y})) = 1 \text{ for } \mu_m^\diamond\text{-a.s. } \mathbf{y}.$$

Proof. Using (5.8) and (5.2), we have for all $\mathbf{x} \in S_m$ such that $\mathbf{x}(S_R) = m$

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_m^\diamond \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1} &\approx \mu(\cdot \| \mathbf{x}) \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1} \\ &\approx \mu(\cdot \cap \{\mathbf{s}(S_R) \geq m\}) \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1} \ll \mu \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

From $\mu_{R,y} = \mu_{R,\pi_R^c(y)}$, $\mu_{R,y}$ exists for $\mu \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1}$ -a.s. y . Combining this with (5.12), we obtain (5.10). From (1.19), $S_0^\diamond(y) - y \subset S_m$ for $y \in S_m^\diamond$. Note that we condition μ on S_R^c as $\mu_{R,y} = \mu(\cdot | \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s}) = \pi_R^c(y))$. Hence, $S_0^\diamond(y) - y \subset S_R^m$ for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. $y \in S_m^\diamond$. We have thus obtained (5.11). \square

By (5.10), $\mu_{R,y}$ exists for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y for $1 \leq m \leq k$. Let $\rho_{R,y}^m$ be the m -point correlation function of $\mu_{R,y}$. Then $\rho_{R,y}^m$ exists on S_R and satisfies

$$(5.13) \quad \int_S \rho_{R,y}^m(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mu \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1}(dy) = \rho^m(x_1, \dots, x_m) \quad \text{on } S_R^m.$$

From (5.13), the m th factorial moment measure $\tilde{\mu}_{R,y}^m$ of $\mu_{R,y}$ exists on S_R for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y . Hence, the reduced Palm measure $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ of $\mu_{R,y}$ exists for $\tilde{\mu}_{R,y}^m$ -a.e. \mathbf{x} for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y . Let S_R be the configuration space over S_R . We regard S_R^m as a subset of S_R . Then by definition, for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y ,

$$\int_A \mu_{R,y}(\mathbf{B} \| \mathbf{x}) \tilde{\mu}_{R,y}^m(d\mathbf{x}) = \int_A \mu_{R,y}(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{s}) \tilde{\mu}_{R,y}^m(d\mathbf{x})$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(S_R^m)$, and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(S_R)$, and, equivalently, for $\tilde{\mu}_{R,y}^m$ -a.e. \mathbf{x} ,

$$(5.14) \quad \mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x}) = \mu_{R,y}(\cdot + \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{s}).$$

Originally, $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ is the random point field on S_R . We can regard $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ as a random point field on \mathbb{R}^d by taking

$$(5.15) \quad \mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x}) \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1} = \delta_{\pi_R^c(y)}.$$

We denote this extension by the same symbol $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$. By definition, $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ degenerates into $\pi_R^c(y)$ outside S_R . In the following, $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ is thus a random point field on \mathbb{R}^d . Let $\mathbf{S}(y) = \{\mathbf{s} \in S; y \prec \mathbf{s}\}$ and $S_0^\diamond(y) = \mathbf{S}(y) \cap S_0^\diamond$.

Lemma 5.3. *Make the same assumptions as Lemma 5.2. Then for $1 \leq m \leq k$*

$$(5.16) \quad \mu_{R,y}(S_R^m + \pi_R^c(y) \| \pi_R(y)) = 1 \quad \text{for } \mu_m^\diamond\text{-a.s. } y.$$

Proof. The reduced Palm measure $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \mathbf{x})$ satisfies for $1 \leq m \leq k$

$$(5.17) \quad \mu_{R,y}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{x} + \pi_R^c(y)) - \mathbf{x} \| \mathbf{x}) = 1 \quad \text{for } \tilde{\mu}_{R,y}^m\text{-a.e. } \mathbf{x}.$$

Similarly as (5.5), we deduce $\sigma_{R,y}^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = 0 \iff \rho_{R,y}^m(\mathbf{x}_m) = 0$. Hence,

$$(5.18) \quad \mu_{R,y} \approx \tilde{\mu}_{R,y} \quad \text{for } \mu_m^\diamond\text{-a.s. } y.$$

Here $\tilde{\mu}_{R,y} = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \tilde{\mu}_{R,y}^n$. Taking $\mathbf{x} = \pi_R(y)$ in (5.17) and using (5.17) and (5.18), we see that the reduced Palm measure $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot \| \pi_R(y))$ satisfies

$$(5.19) \quad \mu_{R,y}(\mathbf{S}(y) - \pi_R(y) \| \pi_R(y)) = 1 \quad \text{for } \mu_m^\diamond\text{-a.s. } y.$$

Using (5.14), we can replace $\mathbf{S}(y)$ in (5.19) by $S_0^\diamond(y) = \mathbf{S}(y) \cap S_0^\diamond$. Thus we obtain

$$(5.20) \quad \mu_{R,y}(S_0^\diamond(y) - \pi_R(y) \| \pi_R(y)) = 1 \quad \text{for } \mu_m^\diamond\text{-a.s. } y.$$

Note that $\mu_{R,y} = \mu_{R,\pi_R^c(y)}$. By (5.15), all removed particles of $\mu_{R,y}(\cdot|\mathbf{x}) \circ (\pi_R^c)^{-1}$ are in S_R , that is, $\mathbf{x}(S_R) = m$. Hence, from (1.19) and (5.15), we have for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y

$$(5.21) \quad S_0^\diamond(y) - y \subset S_R^m \quad \text{under } \mu_{R,y}.$$

Hence from (5.20) and (5.21), we obtain

$$1 = \mu_{R,y}(S_0^\diamond(y) - y | \pi_R(y)) \leq \mu_{R,y}(S_R^m | \pi_R(y)) \quad \text{for } \mu_m^\diamond\text{-a.s. } y.$$

This implies (5.16). \square

For $R \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in S$, let $\mathcal{I}_{R,y}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\infty,y}$ be the σ -fields such that

$$(5.22) \quad \mathcal{I}_{R,y} = \sigma[S_0^\diamond(\pi_R(y)) \vee \sigma[\pi_R^c]], \quad \mathcal{I}_{\infty,y} = \bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{I}_{R,y}.$$

Lemma 5.4. *Make the same assumptions as Lemma 5.2. Let $\mu(\cdot|\mathcal{I}_{R,y})$ be the regular conditional probability measure with respect to $\mathcal{I}_{R,y}$ for $R \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $y \in S_m^\diamond$. Then the following hold for $1 \leq m \leq k$ and μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y .*

(1) *For each $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$,*

$$(5.23) \quad \mu(B|\mathcal{I}_{\infty,y})(s) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B|\mathcal{I}_{R,y})(s) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.s. } s \text{ and in } L^1(\mu).$$

(2) *For μ -a.s. s ,*

$$(5.24) \quad \mu(B|\mathcal{I}_{\infty,y})(s) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B|\mathcal{I}_{R,y})(s) \quad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{B}(S).$$

(3) *Let $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ be such that $B \subset S_m \cap S_R^m$ for some $R \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mu(B|\mathcal{I}_{\infty,y})(s)$ is constant and $\mu(S_m + y|\mathcal{I}_{\infty,y})(s) = 1$ for μ -a.s. s .*

Proof. We easily see that $\mathcal{I}_{R,y} \supset \mathcal{I}_{R',y}$ for $R \leq R' \leq \infty$ and that $\{\mu(B|\mathcal{I}_{R,y})\}$ is bounded in $L^2(\mu)$. Hence using the martingale convergence theorem (cf. [29, I (2.4) Corollary]), we have (5.23), which implies (1).

From (1), it is easy to see that $\{\mu(\cdot|\mathcal{I}_{R,y})(s)\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight for μ -a.s. s . Hence, we denote an arbitrary convergent subsequence by the same symbol $\mu(\cdot|\mathcal{I}_{R,y})(s)$ and its limit by $\mu'(\cdot)(s)$. Note that the measurable space $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$ is countably determined, that is, any probability measures on $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$ are determined by a countable system of elements of $\mathcal{B}(S)$ (cf. [10, p.14]). Let $\{B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable system of subsets determines the probabilities on $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$. Then from (5.23), for μ -a.s. s ,

$$(5.25) \quad \mu'(B_n)(s) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n|\mathcal{I}_{R,y})(s) = \mu(B_n|\mathcal{I}_{\infty,y})(s) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence from (5.25), we deduce $\mu'(\cdot)(s) = \mu(\cdot|\mathcal{I}_{\infty,y})(s)$ for μ -a.s. s . This implies (2).

Let $T_1 = S_1$ and $T_Q = S_Q \setminus S_{Q-1}$ for $Q \geq 2$. For m and R , let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{N}_R^m &= \{(n_Q)_{Q=1}^R; 0 \leq n_Q \leq m, \sum_{Q=1}^R n_Q = m\}, \\ \mathbf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}} &= \bigcap_{Q=1}^R \{s \in S_0^\diamond(y); s(T_Q) = y(T_Q) + n_Q\}, \quad \mathbf{n} = (n_Q)_{Q=1}^R \in \mathbf{N}_R^m, \\ \mathbf{U}_{R,y}^m &= \bigcup_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}_R^m} \mathbf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}} \cap \mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}'} = \emptyset$ for $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{n}'$. Thus, $\{\mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}}\}_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}_R^m}$ is a partition of $\mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m$. This together with $\mathsf{B} \subset \mathsf{S}_m \cap \mathsf{S}_R^m$ yields $\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} \subset \mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m$ and

$$(5.26) \quad \mu(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{R,y})(\mathsf{s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}_R^m} \mu((\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y}) \cap \mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}} | \mathscr{J}_{R,y})(\mathsf{s}).$$

Using (5.22) and $\mathsf{B} \subset \mathsf{S}_m \cap \mathsf{S}_R^m$, we have

$$(5.27) \quad \mu((\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y}) \cap \mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}} | \mathscr{J}_{R,y})(\mathsf{s}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } \mathsf{s} \in (\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y}) \cap \mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}} \\ 0 & \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } \mathsf{s} \notin (\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y}) \cap \mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}} \end{cases}.$$

From (5.26), (5.27), $\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} \subset \mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m$, and that $\{\mathsf{T}_{R,y}^{m,\mathbf{n}}\}_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}_R^m}$ is a partition of $\mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m$, we see

$$\mu(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{R,y})(\mathsf{s}) = 1 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } \mathsf{s} \in \mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m.$$

Using this, (5.24), and that $\{\mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m\}_{R=1}^\infty$ is increasing, we see

$$(5.28) \quad \mu(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{\infty,y})(\mathsf{s}) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{R,y})(\mathsf{s}) = 1 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } \mathsf{s} \in \bigcup_{R=1}^\infty \mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m.$$

From (5.28) and $\mu(\bigcup_{R=1}^\infty \mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m) = 1$, we obtain the first claim in (3). Using (5.14) and Lemma 5.3, we see for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y and any $R \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu(\mathsf{S}_m + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{R,y})(\mathsf{s}) = 1 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } \mathsf{s} \in \mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m.$$

From this, (5.28), and $\mu(\bigcup_{R=1}^\infty \mathsf{U}_{R,y}^m) = 1$, we get the second claim in (3). \square

We now construct the dual reduced Palm measure conditioned on infinite-many points $\mathsf{y} \in \mathsf{S}_m^\diamond$. For μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y and $\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{S}_m)$, let

$$(5.29) \quad \mu(\mathsf{B} | \mathsf{y}) := \mu(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{\infty,y}).$$

From Lemma 5.4(3), $\mu(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{\infty,y})(\mathsf{s})$ is constant and $\mu(\mathsf{S}_m + \mathsf{y} | \mathscr{J}_{\infty,y}) = 1$ for μ -a.s. s . Thus $\mu(\mathsf{B} | \mathsf{y})$ is independent of s and satisfies $\mu(\mathsf{S}_m | \mathsf{y}) = 1$. Hence, we extend the domain of $\mu(\cdot | \mathsf{y})$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{S})$ by $\mu(\cdot | \mathsf{y}) = \mu(\cdot \cap \mathsf{S}_m | \mathsf{y})$.

We regard (5.30) and (5.31) in Lemma 5.5 as the dual relation to $\mu(\mathsf{S}_m^\diamond | \mathsf{y}) = 1$ for $\mathsf{y} \in \mathsf{S}_m$ in (1.20) for the original reduced Palm measure. This relation is a result of decomposability of μ . We call $\mu(\cdot | \mathsf{y})$ the dual reduced Palm measure because $\mu(\cdot | \mathsf{y})$ is conditioned at an element y of the dual set S_m^\diamond to S_m and $\mu(\cdot | \mathsf{y})$ is supported on S_m such that $\mu(\mathsf{S}_m | \mathsf{y}) = 1$ for $\mathsf{y} \in \mathsf{S}_m^\diamond$.

We convert the convergence of the Palm measures in Lemma 5.4 to that of the reduced Palm measures.

Lemma 5.5. *Make the same assumptions as Lemma 5.2. Let $1 \leq m \leq k$.*

(1) *For μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y ,*

$$(5.30) \quad \mu(\mathsf{B} | \mathsf{y}) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{R,y}(\mathsf{B} | \pi_R(\mathsf{y})) \quad \text{for all } \mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{S}).$$

(2) *$\mu(\mathsf{B} | \cdot)$ is a $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{S})$ -measurable function for each $\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{S})$.*

(3) *For μ_m^\diamond -a.s. y , $\mu(\cdot | \mathsf{y})$ is a probability measure on $(\mathsf{S}, \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{S}))$ such that*

$$(5.31) \quad \mu(\mathsf{S}_m | \mathsf{y}) = 1.$$

Proof. Because $\mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{y}) = \mu(\cdot \cap \mathbf{S}_m\|\mathbf{y})$ by definition, we assume $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{S}_m$. We see

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.32) \quad \mu(\mathbf{B}\|\mathbf{y}) &= \mu(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{y}|\mathcal{I}_{\infty,\mathbf{y}}) \quad \text{by (5.29)} \\
 &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{y}|\mathcal{I}_{R,\mathbf{y}})(\mathbf{s}) \quad \text{by Lemma 5.4} \\
 &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\pi_R(\mathbf{B}) + \mathbf{y}|\mathcal{I}_{R,\mathbf{y}})(\mathbf{s}) \quad \text{by } \mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{S}_m.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the convergence takes place for μ -a.s. \mathbf{s} and in $L^1(\mu)$. From (5.22)

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.33) \quad &\mu(\pi_R(\mathbf{B}) + \mathbf{y}|\mathcal{I}_{R,\mathbf{y}})(\mathbf{s}), \quad \pi_R^c(\mathbf{s}) = \pi_R^c(\mathbf{y}), \\
 &= \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\pi_R(\mathbf{B}) + \pi_R(\mathbf{y})|\pi_R(\mathbf{y}) \prec \mathbf{s}) \\
 &= \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\pi_R(\mathbf{B})\|\pi_R(\mathbf{y}) \prec \mathbf{s}).
 \end{aligned}$$

From (5.32), (5.33), and $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{S}_m$, we see (5.30). From (5.14) and (5.30), we obtain (2). From Lemma 5.4(3) and (5.29), we have (3). \square

Lemma 5.6. *Make the same assumptions as Lemma 5.2. In addition, assume that μ and \mathbf{S}_0^\diamond are translation invariant. Then, for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. \mathbf{y} and $1 \leq m \leq k$,*

$$\mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{y}) = \mu(\cdot\|\vartheta_a(\mathbf{y})) \circ \vartheta_a^{-1} \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. Because \mathbf{S}_0^\diamond is translation invariant, we have

$$(5.34) \quad \mathbf{S}_0^\diamond(\vartheta_a(\mathbf{y})) = \vartheta_a(\mathbf{S}_0^\diamond(\mathbf{y})).$$

Then using (5.30), (5.34), and **(A1)**, we have, for μ_m^\diamond -a.s. \mathbf{y} and all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu(\cdot\|\mathbf{y}) &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\cdot\|\pi_R(\mathbf{y})) \quad \text{by (5.30)} \\
 &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{R,\mathbf{y}}(\vartheta_a^{-1}(\vartheta_a(\cdot))\|\pi_R(\vartheta_a^{-1}(\vartheta_a(\mathbf{y})))) \\
 &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{R,\vartheta_a(\mathbf{y})}(\vartheta_a(\cdot)\|\pi_R(\vartheta_a(\mathbf{y}))) \quad \text{by (5.34) and (A1)} \\
 &= \mu(\cdot\|\vartheta_a(\mathbf{y})) \circ \vartheta_a^{-1} \quad \text{by (5.30)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We have thus completed the proof of Lemma 5.6. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Assume **(A1)**–**(A3)** and **(A6)**. Then **(A5)** holds with $\{\mathbf{S}_0^\diamond, \mathbf{S}_1^\diamond\}$ such that both \mathbf{S}_0^\diamond and \mathbf{S}_1^\diamond are translation invariant.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{K}_\epsilon \subset \mathbf{S}$ be an increasing sequence of compact sets such that $\mu(\mathbf{K}_\epsilon) > 1 - \epsilon$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. We set

$$\mathbf{K}_{R,\epsilon}^* = \bigcup_{|x| \leq R} \vartheta_x(\mathbf{K}_\epsilon), \quad 0 \leq R \leq \infty, \quad \mathbf{K}_\infty^* = \bigcup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \mathbf{K}_{\infty,\epsilon}^*.$$

Note that the translation operator ϑ_x on \mathbf{S} is a homeomorphism for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and that $\mathbf{s} \mapsto \vartheta_x(\mathbf{s})$ is continuous in $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each \mathbf{s} . Hence, $(x, \mathbf{s}) \mapsto \vartheta_x(\mathbf{s})$ is continuous.

Let $R < \infty$. Because $\{|x| \leq R\} \times \mathbf{K}_\epsilon$ is compact and the map $(x, \mathbf{s}) \mapsto \vartheta_x(\mathbf{s})$ is continuous, we deduce that $\mathbf{K}_{R,\epsilon}^*$ is a compact set in \mathbf{S} . Hence, \mathbf{K}_∞^* is a Borel set because \mathbf{K}_∞^* is the increasing limit of $\mathbf{K}_{\infty,\epsilon}^*$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\infty,\epsilon}^*$ is the increasing limit of compact sets $\mathbf{K}_{R,\epsilon}^*$ as $R \uparrow \infty$.

From $\mu(\bigcup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \mathbf{K}_\epsilon) = 1$ and $\bigcup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \mathbf{K}_\epsilon \subset \mathbf{K}_\infty^*$, we see $\mu(\mathbf{K}_\infty^*) = 1$. By construction, $\mathbf{K}_{\infty,\epsilon}^*$ is translation invariant for each ϵ . Hence, \mathbf{K}_∞^* is translation invariant. Let $\mathbf{x} = \delta_x$ and $\mathbf{K}_\infty^*(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{K}_\infty^*; \mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{s}\}$. Then we have for $\tilde{\mu}_1$ -a.e. \mathbf{x}

$$(5.35) \quad \mu(\mathbf{K}_\infty^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|\mathbf{x}) = 1.$$

Recall that $S_1 = \{x = \delta_x; x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. Because μ , K_∞^* , and S_1 are translation invariant, we can refine the property above so that (5.35) holds for all $x \in S_1$. Let

$$(5.36) \quad K_\infty^{*,1} = \bigcup_{x \in S_1} \{K_\infty^*(x) - x\}.$$

Then $K_\infty^{*,1}$ is translation invariant. Because $K_\infty^*(x) - x \subset K_\infty^{*,1}$ and $\mu(K_\infty^*(x) - x | x) = 1$ for all $x \in S_1$, we obtain

$$(5.37) \quad K_\infty^{*,1} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}(S)}^{\mu(\cdot \| x)} \text{ and } \mu(K_\infty^{*,1} \| x) = 1 \text{ for all } x \in S_1$$

Let $S_1^\diamond = K_\infty^{*,1}$ and $S_0^\diamond = (K_\infty^{*,1} + S_1) \setminus K_\infty^{*,1}$. Then $S_0^\diamond \cap S_1^\diamond = \emptyset$, and thus we obtain (1.18). (1.19) follows from $S_0^\diamond = (K_\infty^{*,1} + S_1) \setminus K_\infty^{*,1} \subset K_\infty^{*,1} + S_1 = S_1^\diamond + S_1$.

From (A6)(1) and (5.37), $\mu(K_\infty^{*,1}) = 0$. From this and $\mu(K_\infty^*) = 1$, we deduce

$$(5.38) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu(S_0^\diamond) &\geq \mu(K_\infty^{*,1} + S_1) - \mu(K_\infty^{*,1}) && \text{by } S_0^\diamond = (K_\infty^{*,1} + S_1) \setminus K_\infty^{*,1} \\ &= \mu(K_\infty^{*,1} + S_1) && \text{by } \mu(K_\infty^{*,1}) = 0 \\ &= \mu\left(\bigcup_{x \in S_1} \{K_\infty^*(x) - x\} + S_1\right) && \text{by (5.36)} \\ &\geq \mu\left(\bigcup_{x \in S_1} K_\infty^*(x)\right) && \text{by } \{K_\infty^*(x) - x\} + S_1 \supset K_\infty^*(x) \\ &= \mu(K_\infty^*) = 1 && \text{by } \bigcup_{x \in S_1} K_\infty^*(x) = K_\infty^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (1.20) follows from (5.37) and (5.38). By construction, S_0^\diamond and S_1^\diamond are translation invariant. Irreducibility follows from (A6)(2), which completes the proof. \square

5.2. Mean-rigid conditioning. In Subsection 5.2, we introduce the concept of the mean-rigid σ -field \mathcal{G}_∞ . We define the functions N_R and M_R on S such that

$$(5.39) \quad N_R(s) = s(S_R), \quad M_R(s) = \sum_{s_i \in S_R} s_i.$$

Let $T_1 = S_1$ and $T_R = S_R \setminus S_{R-1}$ for $R \geq 2$. Replacing S_R by T_R in (5.39), we define N_{T_R} and M_{T_R} . For a function f , a σ -field \mathcal{F} , and a random point field μ , we say f is \mathcal{F} -measurable for μ -a.s. if a μ -version of f is \mathcal{F} -measurable.

Definition 5.1. (1) A random point field μ on \mathbb{R}^d is said to be number-rigid if, for each $R \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $N_R(s)$ (resp. N_{T_R}) is $\sigma[\pi_R^c]$ -measurable (resp. $\sigma[\pi_{T_R}^c]$ -measurable) for μ -a.s.

(2) A random point field μ on \mathbb{R}^d is said to be mean-rigid if μ is number-rigid and, for each $R \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $M_R(s)$ (resp. $M_{T_R}(s)$) is $\sigma[\pi_R^c]$ -measurable (resp. $\sigma[\pi_{T_R}^c]$ -measurable) for μ -a.s.

If μ is mean-rigid, then, by definition, for each $R \in \mathbb{N}$ and for μ -a.s. s , there exist $a = a(\pi_R^c(s))$, $b = b(\pi_R^c(s))$, $a' = a'(\pi_{T_R}^c(s))$, and $b' = b'(\pi_{T_R}^c(s))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{s \in S; M_R(s) = a(\pi_R^c(s)), N_R(s) = b(\pi_R^c(s))\}) &= 1, \\ \mu(\{s \in S; M_{T_R}(s) = a'(\pi_{T_R}^c(s)), N_{T_R}(s) = b'(\pi_{T_R}^c(s))\}) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

In [8, 2], rigidity is posed for all Borel sets with Lebesgue-negligible boundary. Our concept of number and mean rigidity is slightly weaker than that in [8, 2]. We pose rigidity only for S_R and T_R . This reduction is enough for our purpose.

Mean rigidity is a critical property for sub-diffusivity. The Ginibre random point field is number-rigid but not mean-rigid. Hence, we introduce the algorithm to transform a function on \mathbf{S} with a number-rigid random point field to a function that is measurable concerning a mean-rigid σ -field.

For $R \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{G}_R and \mathcal{H}_R be the sub σ -fields of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{S}_1^\circ)$ given by

$$(5.40) \quad \mathcal{G}_R = \sigma[\mathbf{N}_R, \mathbf{M}_R, \pi_R^c], \quad \mathcal{H}_R = \sigma[\mathbf{N}_{T_R}, \mathbf{M}_{T_R}, \pi_{T_R}^c].$$

We set the mean-rigid σ -field \mathcal{G}_∞ as follows.

$$(5.41) \quad \mathcal{G}_\infty = \bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_R.$$

Lemma 5.8. (1) $\mathcal{G}_R \supset \mathcal{G}_{R+1}$ and $\mathcal{H}_R \supset \mathcal{G}_R$ for each $R \in \mathbb{N}$.

(2) $\vartheta_a(\mathcal{G}_\infty) = \mathcal{G}_\infty$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where ϑ_a is the translation on \mathbf{S} in (1.3).

Proof. Recall that $T_{R+1} = S_{R+1} \setminus S_R$. Then we see $\pi_R^c = \pi_{T_{R+1}} + \pi_{R+1}^c$. Hence,

$$\sigma[\mathbf{N}_R, \mathbf{M}_R, \pi_R^c] = \sigma[\mathbf{N}_R, \mathbf{M}_R, \pi_{T_{R+1}}, \pi_{R+1}^c] \supset \sigma[\mathbf{N}_{R+1}, \mathbf{M}_{R+1}, \pi_{R+1}^c].$$

This together with (5.40) yields $\mathcal{G}_R \supset \mathcal{G}_{R+1}$.

From $T_R = S_R \setminus S_{R-1}$, we find $\pi_{T_R}^c = \pi_{R-1} + \pi_R^c$. Hence, we see

$$\sigma[\mathbf{N}_{T_R}, \mathbf{M}_{T_R}, \pi_{T_R}^c] = \sigma[\mathbf{N}_{T_R}, \mathbf{M}_{T_R}, \pi_{R-1}, \pi_R^c] \supset \sigma[\mathbf{N}_R, \mathbf{M}_R, \pi_R^c].$$

This together with (5.40) yields $\mathcal{H}_R \supset \mathcal{G}_R$. We thus obtain (1).

Without loss of generality, we set $|a| < 1$. Let $S_R(a) = \vartheta_a(S_R)$. Then,

$$(5.42) \quad S_{R-|a|} \subset S_R(a) \subset S_{R+|a|}.$$

Replacing S_R with $S_R(a)$ in (5.39), we define $\mathbf{N}_{R,a}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{R,a}$. Let $\pi_{R,a}^c = \pi_{S_R(a)^c}$. Then from (5.42), we find that

$$(5.43) \quad \mathcal{G}_{R-|a|} \supset \sigma[\mathbf{N}_{R,a}, \mathbf{M}_{R,a}, \pi_{R,a}^c] \supset \mathcal{G}_{R+|a|}.$$

From (5.40), we find that $\vartheta_a(\mathcal{G}_R) = \sigma[\mathbf{N}_{R,a}, \mathbf{M}_{R,a}, \pi_{R,a}^c]$. From this and (5.43),

$$(5.44) \quad \bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_{R-|a|} \supset \bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \vartheta_a(\mathcal{G}_R) \supset \bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_{R+|a|}.$$

Using (5.40) and (5.44) and noting $\bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \vartheta_a(\mathcal{G}_R) = \vartheta_a(\bigcap_{R=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_R)$, we obtain $\mathcal{G}_\infty \supset \vartheta_a(\mathcal{G}_\infty) \supset \mathcal{G}_\infty$, which yields (2). \square

Let μ_a be the reduced Palm measure of μ conditioned at $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as before. Let $\mu_a(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_R)$, $R \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, be the regular conditional probabilities.

Lemma 5.9. $\mu_0(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_\infty) = \mu_a(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_\infty) \circ \vartheta_a^{-1}$ for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. From the martingale convergence theorem, (5.41), and Lemma 5.8(1),

$$\mu_0(A | \mathcal{G}_\infty)(s) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu_0(A | \mathcal{G}_R)(s) \quad \text{in } L^1(\mu_0) \text{ and } \mu_0\text{-a.s. } s \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{S}).$$

Hence, the translation invariance of μ and Lemma 5.8(2) yield the claim. \square

Lemma 5.10. Assume that f is \mathcal{G}_∞ -measurable. Then $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp$ and $\mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f] = 0$.

Proof. We write $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}$ as before. Let $\Upsilon_{R,1}^m, \Upsilon_{R,2}^{m,n}, \Upsilon_{R,3}^{m,n}$ be as in Subsection 2.3. Suppose $v \in \Upsilon_{R,1}^m$. Then for $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{T}_R^m$,

$$v = \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} - \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)}, \quad s_i \in T_R.$$

We note $\mathbf{s}(T_R) = N_{T_R}(\mathbf{s})$ and $\sum_{s_i \in T_R} s_i = M_{T_R}(\mathbf{s})$. Note that f is \mathcal{G}_∞ -measurable by assumption. Then, f is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{H}_R = \sigma[N_{T_R}, M_{T_R}, \pi_{T_R}^c]$ from (5.40) and Lemma 5.8(1). Hence, we see that f is a function of $N_{T_R}(\mathbf{s})$, $M_{T_R}(\mathbf{s})$, and $\pi_{T_R}^c(\mathbf{s})$. Note that $N_{T_R}(\mathbf{s}) = m$ on \mathbb{T}_R^m . Let $f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m$ be the function defined after (1.27) for f and $A = T_R$. Then $f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m = f_{T_R, \pi_{T_R}^c(\mathbf{s})}^m$ from (1.25). Let $\tilde{f}_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m$ be the function defined on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; x = x_1 + \cdots + x_m, (x_i)_{i=1}^m \in (T_R)^m\}$ such that

$$(5.45) \quad f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m(s_1, \dots, s_m) = \tilde{f}_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m(s_1 + \cdots + s_m).$$

The vector v is perpendicular to $\partial/\partial \Gamma(T_R)$ as we see in (2.16). Hence from (5.45),

$$(5.46) \quad v f_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m(s_1, \dots, s_m) = v \tilde{f}_{T_R, \mathbf{s}}^m(s_1 + \cdots + s_m) = 0.$$

Suppose $v \in \Upsilon_{R,2}^{m,n}$. Then $\mathbf{s}(S_{R-1}) = m$ and $\mathbf{s}(S_R) = m + n$. We find

$$(5.47) \quad v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_{R-1})} - \frac{\sqrt{m}}{m+n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)}.$$

From (5.41), f is \mathcal{G}_R -measurable. Hence, f is a function of $N_R(\mathbf{s})$, $M_R(\mathbf{s})$, and $\pi_R^c(\mathbf{s})$. Note that $N_R(\mathbf{s}) = m + n$ and $M_R(\mathbf{s}) = s_1 + \cdots + s_{m+n}$ on $S_{R-1}^m \cap \mathbb{T}_R^n$. Then we have a function $\tilde{f}_{R, \mathbf{s}}^{m+n}$ on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; x = x_1 + \cdots + x_{m+n}, (x_i)_{i=1}^{m+n} \in S_R^{m+n}\}$ such that

$$(5.48) \quad f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^{m+n}(s_1, \dots, s_{m+n}) = \tilde{f}_{R, \mathbf{s}}^{m+n}(s_1 + \cdots + s_{m+n}).$$

From (2.17) and (5.47), v is perpendicular to $\partial/\partial \Gamma(S_R)$. Hence from this and (5.48),

$$(5.49) \quad v f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^{m+n}(s_1, \dots, s_{m+n}) = 0.$$

Suppose $v \in \Upsilon_{R,3}^{m,n}$. Then $\mathbf{s}(T_R) = m$ and $\mathbf{s}(S_R) = n$. Hence, we see

$$(5.50) \quad v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(T_R)} - \frac{\sqrt{m}}{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma(S_R)}.$$

From (5.41), f is \mathcal{G}_R -measurable. Hence, f is a function of $N_R(\mathbf{s})$, $M_R(\mathbf{s})$, and $\pi_R^c(\mathbf{s})$. Note that $N_R(\mathbf{s}) = n$ and $M_R(\mathbf{s}) = s_1 + \cdots + s_n$ on S_R^n . Thus, we find a function $\tilde{f}_{R, \mathbf{s}}^n$ on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; x = x_1 + \cdots + x_n, (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in S_R^n\}$ such that

$$(5.51) \quad f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^n(s_1, \dots, s_n) = \tilde{f}_{R, \mathbf{s}}^n(s_1 + \cdots + s_n).$$

From (2.17) and (5.50), v is perpendicular to $\partial/\partial \Gamma(S_R)$. Hence from this and (5.51),

$$(5.52) \quad v f_{R, \mathbf{s}}^n(s_1, \dots, s_n) = 0.$$

Putting (5.46), (5.49), and (5.52) together and recalling (2.36), we obtain

$$\mathbb{D}_v[f, f] = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in \Upsilon.$$

Hence using (2.35), we conclude $f \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp$ and $\mathbb{D}^\perp[f, f] = \sum_{v \in \Upsilon} \mathbb{D}_v[f, f] = 0$. \square

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS (THEOREMS 1.1–1.4)

In Section 6, we complete the proof of the main theorems. In Subsection 6.1, we prove Theorems 1.2–1.4. Subsections 6.2–6.5 are devoted to the preparation of the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Subsection 6.2, we present the solution $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ to the stochastic differential equation associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu)$. In Subsections 6.3 and 6.4, we prepare a sequence of lemmas concerning the convergence of $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_R$. Using these lemmas, we prove the limit points of the sequence $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_R$ are solutions of (1.1) in Proposition 6.2 in Subsection 6.5. With the uniqueness of weak solutions of (1.1), we prove that the Ginibre random point field satisfies (A4) in Proposition 6.3 and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Subsection 6.6.

6.1. Proof of Theorems 1.2–1.4. In Subsection 6.1, we prove Theorems 1.2–1.4.

Assume (A1)–(A3) and (A5). Thus, μ is translation invariant and irreducibly one-decomposable with $\{\mathbf{S}_0^\diamond, \mathbf{S}_1^\diamond\}$. Let μ_0 be the reduced Palm measure conditioned at the origin. Let μ_1^\diamond be the random point field introduced in (5.6) for $m = 1$. Because of (5.8), $\mu_1^\diamond \approx \mu_0$.

For μ_1^\diamond -a.s. $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{S}_1^\diamond$, let $\mu(\cdot|\mathbf{y})$ be the dual reduced Palm measure defined in Lemma 5.5 for $m = 1$. Using (5.31) and $\mu_1^\diamond \approx \mu_0$, we have

$$(6.1) \quad \mu(\mathbf{S}_1|\mathbf{y}) = 1 \quad \text{for } \mu_0\text{-a.s. } \mathbf{y}.$$

From (6.1) and $\mathbf{S}_1 = \{\delta_x; x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, set the probability measure $\sigma_{\mathbf{y}}$ on \mathbb{R}^d by

$$(6.2) \quad \sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\cdot) = \mu(\{\delta_x; x \in \cdot\}|\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{for } \mu_0\text{-a.s. } \mathbf{y}.$$

For $L \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\xi_L: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth non-decreasing function such that

$$(6.3) \quad 0 \leq \xi_L'(t) \leq 2, \quad \xi_L(t) = \begin{cases} L+1 & L+2 \leq t \\ t & |t| \leq L \\ -L-1 & t \leq -L-2. \end{cases}$$

Let \mathcal{G}_∞ be as in (5.41). Let $x = (x_p)_{p=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We set $\chi_L = (\chi_{L,p})_{p=1}^d$ by

$$(6.4) \quad \chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s}) = \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_L(x_p) \sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(dx) \right\} \mu_0(d\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{G}_\infty)(\mathbf{s}).$$

Here $\mu_0(\cdot|\mathcal{G}_\infty)(\mathbf{s})$ is the regular conditional probability of μ_0 concerning \mathcal{G}_∞ . We note that $\chi_{L,p}$ is \mathcal{G}_∞ -measurable by construction and that $\chi_{L,p}$ is neither a continuous nor local function on \mathbf{S} . Let D_q^{trn} be as in (1.34). Let

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}} = \bigcap_{q=1}^d \left\{ f \in L^2(\mu_0); D_q^{\text{trn}} f(\mathbf{s}) \text{ exists for } \mu_0\text{-a.s. } \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}_1^\diamond \right\}.$$

Lemma 6.1. (1) $\chi_{L,p} \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}}$ and $|D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s})| \leq 2$ for $p, q = 1, \dots, d$.

(2) $\{\chi_{L,p}\}$ is an $\mathcal{E}^{Y,1}$ -Cauchy sequence as $L \rightarrow \infty$ satisfying for $p, q = 1, \dots, d$

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s}) = \delta_{p,q} \quad \text{for } \mu_0\text{-a.s. } \mathbf{s} \text{ and in } L^2(\mu_0).$$

Proof. From (6.2) and Lemma 5.6, we have for μ_0 -a.s. \mathbf{y}

$$(6.5) \quad \sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(dx) = \sigma_{\vartheta_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{y})}(d(x - \mathbf{a})).$$

From Lemma 5.9, we deduce

$$(6.6) \quad \mu_0(d\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{G}_\infty)(\mathbf{s}) = \mu_{0-\mathbf{a}}(\vartheta_{\mathbf{a}}(\cdot) \in d\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{G}_\infty)(\vartheta_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{s})).$$

Hence using (6.4), (6.5), and (6.6), we obtain for μ_0 -a.s. \mathbf{s}

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{h} \{ \chi_{L,p}(\vartheta_{h\mathbf{e}_q}(\mathbf{s})) - \chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s}) \} \\
&= \frac{1}{h} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_L(x_p) \sigma_{\vartheta_{h\mathbf{e}_q}(y)}(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_L(x_p) \sigma_y(dx) \right\} \mu_0(dy | \mathcal{G}_\infty)(\mathbf{s}) \\
&= \frac{1}{h} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_L(x_p + h\mathbf{e}_q) \sigma_y(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_L(x_p) \sigma_y(dx) \right\} \mu_0(dy | \mathcal{G}_\infty)(\mathbf{s}) \\
(6.7) \quad &= \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{h} \left\{ \xi_L(x_p + h\mathbf{e}_q) - \xi_L(x_p) \right\} \sigma_y(dx) \mu_0(dy | \mathcal{G}_\infty)(\mathbf{s}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using (6.3), (6.4), and (6.7), we find $\chi_{L,p} \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}}$ and that for μ_0 -a.s. \mathbf{s}

$$(6.8) \quad D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s}) = \delta_{p,q} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi'_L(x_p) \sigma_y(dx) \mu_0(dy | \mathcal{G}_\infty)(\mathbf{s}).$$

Hence, $|D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p}(\mathbf{s})| \leq 2$ from (6.3) and (6.8). We have thus obtained (1).

From (6.3), (6.8), and the Lebesgue convergence theorem, we obtain (2). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp$ be as in (2.37). By (6.4), $\chi_{L,p}$ is \mathcal{G}_∞ -measurable. Hence from Lemma 5.10, we have

$$(6.9) \quad \chi_{L,p} \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^\perp, \quad \mathbb{D}^\perp[\chi_{L,p}, \chi_{L,p}] = 0.$$

From Lemma 6.1(1), we see

$$(6.10) \quad \chi_{L,p} \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{trn}}, \quad |D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p}| \leq 2.$$

From (6.9) and (6.10), we obtain $\chi_{L,p} \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y},\perp}$, where $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y},\perp}$ is as in (3.28).

By Lemma 3.5(2), $(\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},\perp}, \mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{Y},\perp}) = (\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}})$. Thus, $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ is the closure of $\mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y},\perp}$ with respect to $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},\perp}$. This implies $\chi_{L,p} \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y},\perp} \subset \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{Y}}$. Hence for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we find $\chi_{L,p,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} - D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p,\epsilon} \right|^2 d\mu_0 < \epsilon, \\
(6.11) \quad & \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\chi_{L,p} - \chi_{L,p,\epsilon}, \chi_{L,p} - \chi_{L,p,\epsilon}) < \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.1(2) and (6.9), $\{\chi_{L,p}\}$ is an $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ -Cauchy sequence such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^d \left| D_q^{\text{trn}} \chi_{L,p} - \delta_{p,q} \right|^2 d\mu_0 = 0, \\
(6.12) \quad & \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{Y},2}(\chi_{L,p}, \chi_{L,p}) = 0 \quad \text{for each } L.
\end{aligned}$$

Using $\chi_{L,p,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{\mathbf{Y}}$, (6.11), and (6.12), we see **(A7)**. Thus, we obtain (1).

From Theorem 4.1, we have $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon X_{t/\epsilon^2} = 0$ weakly in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ in μ_0 -measure. Combining this with Theorem 3.7 in [24], we obtain (2). \square

Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. We obtain Theorem 1.2 from Theorem 1.4. Theorem 1.3 follows from Theorem 1.2 and Lemma 5.7. \square

6.2. Preparation for proof of Theorem 1.1. In Subsection 6.2, we present the stochastic differential equation describing the dynamics given by $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$.

Let $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ be the Dirichlet form defined in Lemma 2.7 for $\mu = \mu_{\text{Gin}}$. The carré du champ of the Dirichlet form is then given by \mathbb{D}_R^\perp . From (2.28),

$$(6.13) \quad \mathbb{D}_R^\perp[f, f](s) = \mathbb{D}_R[f, f](s) - \mathbb{U}_R^\gamma[f, f](s).$$

Let $\mathfrak{l} = (\mathfrak{l}^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the label on $S_{s,i}$ such that $|\mathfrak{l}^i(s)| \leq |\mathfrak{l}^{i+1}(s)|$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ as defined before Theorem 1.1. We consider the stochastic differential equation describing the labeled dynamics $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ given by $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$. We take $\mathbf{X}_0^{R,\perp} = \mathfrak{l}(s)$.

Let $\mathbf{b} = (1/2)d\mu_{\text{Gin}}$ be the drift coefficient of ISDE (1.1) given by

$$(6.14) \quad \mathbf{b}(x, s) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|x - s_i| < R} \frac{x - s_i}{|x - s_i|^2} \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]}), \quad 1 \leq p < 2.$$

Formula (6.14) follows from Theorem 61 in [22]. Recall that μ_{Gin} is tail trivial. Hence, $d\mu_{\text{Gin}}$ satisfies (1.30) not only for $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\text{ob}}$ but also for $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\bullet, \text{b}}$. Then for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\bullet, \text{b}}$ satisfying the Neumann boundary condition on $\partial S_R \times S$, it holds that

$$\int_{S_R \times S} d^\mu(x, s) \varphi(x, s) \mu_{\text{Gin}, R, y}^{[1]}(dx ds) = - \int_{S_R \times S} \nabla_x \varphi(x, s) \mu_{\text{Gin}, R, y}^{[1]}(dx ds),$$

where $\mu_{\text{Gin}, R, y}^{[1]}$ is the one-Campbell measure of $\mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot | \pi_R^c(s) = \pi_R^c(y))$. From this and (6.13), the stochastic differential equation of $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ is given by

$$(6.15) \quad \begin{aligned} dX_t^{R,\perp,i} &= dB_t^i + \mathbf{b}(X_t^{R,\perp,i}, \mathbf{X}_t^{R,\perp,i\circ})dt + \mathbf{n}^R(X_t^{R,\perp,i})dL_t^{R,\perp,i} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} dB_t^k - \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{b}(X_t^{R,\perp,k}, \mathbf{X}_t^{R,\perp,k\circ})dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{n}^R(X_t^{R,\perp,k})dL_t^{R,\perp,k}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s(\overline{S}_R), \\ dL_t^{R,\perp,i} &= 1_{\partial S_R}(X_t^{R,\perp,i})dL_t^{R,\perp,i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s(\overline{S}_R), \\ X_t^{R,\perp,i} &= X_0^{R,\perp,i}, \quad s(\overline{S}_R) < i < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\mathbf{X}_t^{R,\perp,i\circ} = \sum_{j \neq i}^\infty \delta_{X_t^{R,\perp,j}}$, $L_t^{R,\perp,i}$ are non-negative increasing processes, and \mathbf{n}^R is the inner normal vector on ∂S_R . Then, $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ is frozen outside \overline{S}_R .

Let $\varphi \mu_{\text{Gin}}(\cdot) = \int \varphi(x) \mu_{\text{Gin}}(dx)$, where $\varphi \in L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$, $\varphi \geq 0$, $\int_S \varphi d\mu_{\text{Gin}} = 1$ and $c_{6.1} = \sup_{x \in S} |\varphi(x)| < \infty$. We assume

$$(6.16) \quad \mathbf{X}_0^{R,\perp} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} (\varphi \mu_{\text{Gin}}) \circ \Gamma^{-1}.$$

We prove that $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}$ converges to the solution of (1.1) in Proposition 6.2.

6.3. The main terms of perpendicular SDEs. The goal of Subsection 6.3 is to prove the convergence of the main terms of coefficients of the stochastic differential equations (6.15) (see Proposition 6.1).

Let $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp} = (X^{R,\perp,i})_{i=1}^\infty$, $\mathbf{X}_0^{R,\perp} = \mathfrak{l}(s)$, be the solution of (6.15) with initial distribution (6.16). From Lyons–Zheng’s decomposition [3, p.284], $X^{R,\perp,i}$ can be

written as the sum of the martingale additive functionals of the diffusion associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$. For $1 \leq i \leq s(\overline{S}_R)$,

$$(6.17) \quad X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} - M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} \circ r_t \right\},$$

where r_t is the time-reversal operator on the path space on $[0, \infty)$ such that $r_t(\omega)(s) = \omega(t-s)$ if $0 \leq s \leq t$ and $r_t(\omega)(s) = \omega(0)$ if $t \leq s$. We see

$$(6.18) \quad M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} = B_t^i - \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} B_t^k.$$

We write $x_i = (x_{i,p})_{p=1,2}$ and $M^{[x_i \otimes 1]} = (M^{[x_{i,p} \otimes 1]})_{p=1,2}$. Because $(B^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the standard Brownian motion in $(\mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(6.19) \quad \langle M^{[x_{i,p} \otimes 1]}, M^{[x_{i,q} \otimes 1]} \rangle_t = \left(1 - \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)}\right) \delta_{p,q} t.$$

We note that $X_t^{R,\perp,i} = X_0^{R,\perp,i} = \mathfrak{l}^i(s)$, $0 \leq t < \infty$, for each $i > s(\overline{S}_R)$.

Lemma 6.2. *There exists a positive constant $c_{6.2} > 0$ satisfying the following.*

$$(6.20) \quad \sup_{R,i \in \mathbb{N}} E[|X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_u^{R,\perp,i}|^4] \leq c_{6.2} |t - u|^2, \quad 0 \leq t, u < \infty,$$

$$(6.21) \quad \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_t^{R,\perp,i}| \leq a\right) = 1 \quad \text{for each } n, T \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$(6.22) \quad \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{R \in \mathbb{N}} P(I_{r,T}(\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}) \leq l) = 1 \quad \text{for each } r, T \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Here $I_{r,T}$ is as in (3.18).

Proof. From (6.17)–(6.19) and the martingale inequality, we obtain Lemma 6.2. (see Lemma 4.2 in [12] for detail). \square

In general, a family of probability measures $\{m_a\}$ in a Polish space is compact under the topology of weak convergence if and only if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set K such that $\inf_a m_a(K) \geq 1 - \epsilon$. We call $\{m_a\}$ tight in this case. The tightness of probability measures on a countable product of Polish spaces under the product topology follows from the tightness of the distributions of each component. We say a family of random variables is tight if the family of their distributions is tight.

We equip $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$ with the metric given by (7.8). Hence, the tightness in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$ for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$ is equivalent to the tightness in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$. Let \mathbf{u}_{path} be the map from $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$ to the space of measure valued paths such that

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w})_t := \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{w}(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{w^i(t)} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{w} = (w^i)_{i=1}^{\infty}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}) \not\subset C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S})$. We endow $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S})$ with the metric ρ_{upath} defined by (7.10). Then $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S})$ becomes a complete separable metric space. For $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp} = (X^{R,\perp,i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$, we set

$$\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp} = \mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}), \quad \mathbf{X}^{R,\perp,i\diamond} = \sum_{j \neq i}^{\infty} \delta_{X^{R,\perp,j}}.$$

Lemma 6.3. (1) $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$.
 (2) $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp,i\diamond}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ are tight in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S})$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Using (6.16) and (6.20), we see that $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$. We have thus obtained (1). Let

$$\mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J} = \{\mathbf{w} \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}; I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w}) < \infty \text{ for each } R, T \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

From Lemma 7.3, $\mathbf{u}_{\text{path}} : \mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J} \rightarrow C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S})$ is continuous. From (6.22), $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ takes value in $\mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J}$. Hence using (1) and the continuity of \mathbf{u}_{path} on $\mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J}$, we see $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S})$. Note that

$$\mathbf{X}_t^{R,\perp,i\diamond} = \mathbf{X}_t^{R,\perp} - \delta_{X_t^{R,\perp,i}}.$$

Hence, the tightness of $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp,i\diamond}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ follows from the tightness of $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$. This completes the proof of (2). \square

Using Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 6.3, we characterize the limit points of $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ in terms of the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$.

Lemma 6.4. Let \mathbf{X}^\perp be an arbitrary limit point of $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ under the convergence in law in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbf{X}^\perp = \mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X}^\perp)$. Then the following hold.

(1) \mathbf{X}^\perp is associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$ and

$$(6.23) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{R,\perp} = \mathbf{X}^\perp \quad \text{weakly in } C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S}).$$

(2) \mathbf{X}^\perp is unique in law in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$ and

$$(6.24) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{R,\perp} = \mathbf{X}^\perp \quad \text{weakly in } C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.7, $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ is the increasing limit of $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$. Hence, the distribution of $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ converges in finite-dimensional distributions to that of \mathbf{X}^\perp associated with $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$. From this and Lemma 6.3(2), we obtain (6.23), which yields (1).

Note that $\mathbf{X}^\perp = \mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X}^\perp)$. From this and (1), \mathbf{X}^\perp is unique in law. From Lemma 6.3(1), $\{\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$. Hence, (6.24) holds. \square

We use the cut-off functions $\chi_n = \chi_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, r)}$ defined by (11.14) in [28, p.1228] with $m = 1$. To simplify the notation, we set $\lim_n = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \infty}$. The parametrization $\mathbf{n} = (r, s, \mathbf{p})$ comes from the construction of χ_n .

Lemma 6.5 ([28]). Let \mathbf{b} be as in (6.14). There exist $\mathbf{b}_n \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S})$ such that

$$(6.25) \quad \lim_n \|1_{S_Q}(x)(\mathbf{b}(x, y) - \mathbf{b}_n(x, y))\|_{L^p(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]})} = 0, \quad 1 \leq p < 2, Q \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. By construction, $0 \leq \chi_n \leq 1$, $\lim_n \chi_n = 1$ on the support of χ_n , and $\chi_n \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S})$. Let $\mathbf{b}_n = (1/2)\chi_n \mathbf{d}^{\mu_{\text{Gin}}}$. Then we obtain (6.25) using the Lebesgue convergence theorem. $\mathbf{b}_n \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S})$ follows from the construction of χ_n . \square

Lemma 6.6. Let $\mathbf{b}^{R,\perp}$ and $\mathbf{b}^\perp \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$(6.26) \quad \mathbf{b}^{R,\perp} = \left(\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, X_u^{R,\perp,i\diamond}) du \right)_{i=1}^\infty, \quad \mathbf{b}^\perp = \left(\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{b}(X_u^{\perp,i}, X_u^{\perp,i\diamond}) du \right)_{i=1}^\infty.$$

Then we have, weakly in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N} \times C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$,

$$(6.27) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}, \mathbf{b}^{R,\perp}) = (\mathbf{X}^\perp, \mathbf{b}^\perp).$$

Proof. Using Lemma 3.1 for μ_{Gin} , we see $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_\bullet^{[1],\perp})$ is closable on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]})$. Let $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_R^{[1],\perp})$ be its closure on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]})$. Let $(X^{R,\perp}, Y^{R,\perp})$ be the diffusion associated with $(\mathcal{E}_R^{[1],\perp}, \mathcal{D}_R^{[1],\perp})$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]})$. Recall that $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp} = (X^{R,\perp,i})_{i=1}^\infty$ is a solution to (6.15). Then each one-labeled process $(X^{R,\perp,i}, X^{R,\perp,i\circ})$ is equivalent in law to the diffusion $(X^{R,\perp}, Y^{R,\perp})$ with the same initial distribution as $(X^{R,\perp,i}, X^{R,\perp,i\circ})$.

From (6.16), $\mathbf{X}_0^{R,\perp} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} (\varphi\mu_{\text{Gin}}) \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1}$. Hence,

$$(6.28) \quad (X_0^{R,\perp}, Y_0^{R,\perp}) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \varphi\mu_{\text{Gin}} \circ (\mathfrak{l}^i(\mathbf{s}), \sum_{j \neq i}^\infty \delta_{\mathfrak{l}^j(\mathbf{s})})^{-1}.$$

From these, we have for all $0 \leq u < \infty$

$$(6.29) \quad \begin{aligned} E[1_{S_Q}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) | (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_n)(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, X_u^{R,\perp,i\circ})] &= E[1_{S_Q}(X_u^{R,\perp}) | (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_n)(X_u^{R,\perp}, Y_u^{R,\perp})] \\ &\leq c_{6.1} \int_{S_Q \times \mathbf{S}} |(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_n)(x, y)| \mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]}(dxdy) \quad \text{by (6.28)} \\ &\leq c_{6.1} c_{6.3} \|1_{S_Q}(x)(\mathbf{b}(x, y) - \mathbf{b}_n(x, y))\|_{L^p(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]})}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $c_{6.1} = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{S}} |\varphi(x)|$ and $c_{6.3} = \mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]}(S_Q \times \mathbf{S})^{\frac{p-1}{p}}$. From (6.29) and (6.25),

$$(6.30) \quad \begin{aligned} &\lim_n \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\int_0^t 1_{S_Q}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) |(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_n)(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, X_u^{R,\perp,i\circ})| du \right] \\ &\leq t c_{6.1} c_{6.3} \lim_n \|1_{S_Q}(x)(\mathbf{b}(x, y) - \mathbf{b}_n(x, y))\|_{L^p(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]})} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the same fashion as (6.30), we have from (6.25)

$$(6.31) \quad \lim_n E \left[\int_0^t 1_{S_r}(X_u^{\perp,i}) |(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_n)(X_u^{\perp,i}, X_u^{\perp,i\circ})| du \right] = 0.$$

We set

$$\mathbf{b}_n^{R,\perp} = \left(\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{b}_n(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, X_u^{R,\perp,i\circ}) du \right)_{i=1}^\infty, \quad \mathbf{b}_n^\perp = \left(\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{b}_n(X_u^{\perp,i}, X_u^{\perp,i\circ}) du \right)_{i=1}^\infty.$$

Using Lemma 6.4 and $\mathbf{b}_n \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbf{S})$, we deduce

$$(6.32) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}, \mathbf{b}_n^{R,\perp}) = (\mathbf{X}^\perp, \mathbf{b}_n^\perp)$$

weakly in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N} \times C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$. From (6.30)–(6.32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}, \mathbf{b}^{R,\perp}) &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}, \mathbf{b}_n^{R,\perp} + (\mathbf{b}^{R,\perp} - \mathbf{b}_n^{R,\perp})) \\ &= \lim_n \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}, \mathbf{b}_n^{R,\perp}) \quad \text{by (6.30)} \\ &= \lim_n (\mathbf{X}^\perp, \mathbf{b}_n^\perp) \quad \text{by (6.32)} \\ &= (\mathbf{X}^\perp, \mathbf{b}^\perp) \quad \text{by (6.31)} \end{aligned}$$

weakly in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N} \times C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$. This implies Lemma 6.6. \square

Lemma 6.7. For each $i, T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(6.33) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} \right| \geq \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

Proof. Using (6.17), (6.19), and the martingale inequality, we deduce for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i}| \geq h\right) \\
 & \leq P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]}| \geq \frac{h}{2}\right) + P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} \circ r_t| \geq \frac{h}{2}\right) \\
 (6.34) \quad & = 2P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]}| \geq \frac{h}{2}\right) \leq c_{6.4} \int_{\frac{h}{2}}^{\infty} e^{-t^2/c_{6.5}} dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here $c_{6.4}, c_{6.5} > 0$ are constants independent of $R, i, h \in \mathbb{N}$. $L_u^{R,\perp,i}$ increases only when $X_u^{R,\perp,i}$ is on the boundary ∂S_R . Hence, (6.33) follows from (6.34). \square

Proposition 6.1. *Weakly in $(C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^{\mathbb{N}})^3$,*

$$(6.35) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}, \mathbf{b}^{R,\perp}, \left(\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} \right)_{i=1}^\infty \right) = \left(\mathbf{X}^\perp, \mathbf{b}^\perp, \mathbf{0} \right).$$

Proof. (6.35) follows from (6.27) and (6.33) immediately. \square

6.4. Vanishing of the γ -coefficient terms. In Subsection 6.3, we proved the convergence of the main terms of stochastic differential equations (6.15). The goal of Subsection 6.4 is to prove the remainder terms certainly vanish. To simplify (6.15), we set

$$(6.36) \quad \mathcal{B}_t^R := -\frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} B_t^k,$$

$$(6.37) \quad \mathcal{K}_t^R := -\int_0^t \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,k}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,k \diamond}) du,$$

$$(6.38) \quad \mathcal{L}_t^R := -\int_0^t \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,k}) dL_u^{R,\perp,k}.$$

Using these notations, we rewrite the first equation in (6.15) as

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i} &= B_t^i + \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,i \diamond}) du \\
 (6.39) \quad &+ \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} + \mathcal{B}_t^R + \mathcal{K}_t^R + \mathcal{L}_t^R, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s(\overline{S}_R).
 \end{aligned}$$

The sum of the last three terms comes from $-\mathbb{U}_R^\gamma$ in (6.13), and is called the γ -coefficient term. We shall prove that the last three terms vanish as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 6.8. *For $\mathbf{s} = \sum_i \delta_{s_i}$, we set $\mathbf{s}_i^\diamond = \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{s_j}$. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$.*

$$(6.40) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\overline{S}_R|}{s(\overline{S}_R)} = \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{gin}}^1} = \pi \quad \text{in } L^p(\mu_{\text{Gin}}) \text{ and for } \mu\text{-a.s. } \mathbf{s},$$

$$(6.41) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{s_i \in \overline{S}_R} \mathbf{b}(s_i, \mathbf{s}_i^\diamond) \right| \mu_{\text{Gin}}(ds) = 0.$$

Proof. μ_{Gin} is tail trivial [17, 25]. Hence, μ_{Gin} is ergodic under the translation $\{\vartheta_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2}$, where ϑ_x is as in (1.3). From the ergodic theorem, we obtain (6.40).

Let $\mathbb{I} = [0, 1]^2$ and $F(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{s_i \in \mathbb{I}} \mathbf{b}(s_i, \mathbf{s}_i^\diamond)$. Recall that $\mathbf{b} \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mu_{\text{Gin}}^{[1]})$, $1 \leq p < 2$, by (6.14) and that μ_{Gin} is reflection and translation invariant in \mathbb{R}^2 . Hence, we see

$$(6.42) \quad \int_S |F(\mathbf{s})|^p \mu_{\text{Gin}}(d\mathbf{s}) < \infty, \quad \int_S F(\mathbf{s}) \mu_{\text{Gin}}(d\mathbf{s}) = 0.$$

Note that $\vartheta_x(\mathbb{I}) \cap \vartheta_y(\mathbb{I}) = \emptyset$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $x \neq y$. Let

$$I_R = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2; \vartheta_z(\mathbb{I}) \subset \overline{S}_R\}, \quad J_R = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2; \vartheta_z(\mathbb{I}) \not\subset \overline{S}_R, \vartheta_z(\mathbb{I}) \cap \partial \overline{S}_R \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We then have

$$(6.43) \quad \sum_{s_i \in \overline{S}_R} \mathbf{b}(s_i, \mathbf{s}_i^\diamond) = \sum_{z \in I_R} F(\vartheta_z(\mathbf{s})) + \sum_{z \in J_R} \sum_{s_i \in \vartheta_z(\mathbb{I}) \cap \overline{S}_R} \mathbf{b}(s_i, \mathbf{s}_i^\diamond).$$

For a set A , we denote the volume by $|A|$. Note that

$$(6.44) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{z \in I_R} |\vartheta_z(\mathbb{I})|}{|\overline{S}_R|} = 1, \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{z \in J_R} |\vartheta_z(\mathbb{I})|}{|\overline{S}_R|} = 0.$$

Using the ergodic theorem, we obtain from (6.40), (6.43), and (6.44)

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{s_i \in \overline{S}_R} \mathbf{b}(s_i, \mathbf{s}_i^\diamond) = \pi \int_S F(\mathbf{s}) \mu_{\text{Gin}}(d\mathbf{s}) \quad \text{in } L^1(\mu_{\text{Gin}}).$$

Combining this with the equality in (6.42), we obtain (6.41). \square

Lemma 6.9. *For each $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have the following.*

$$(6.45) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{B}_t^R| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0,$$

$$(6.46) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{K}_t^R| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0,$$

$$(6.47) \quad \lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^{\perp, k}, \mathbf{X}_u^{\perp, k\circ}) du \right| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0,$$

$$(6.48) \quad \lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \left(X_t^{\perp, k} - X_0^{\perp, k} \right) \right| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0.$$

Proof. From the ergodic theorem, $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} s(\overline{S}_R)/|\overline{S}_R| = \rho_{\text{Gin}}^1 = 1/\pi$ for μ_{Gin} -a.s. and in $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$. Recall that B^k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, in (6.36) are independent Brownian motions. Then, we see that for each $T > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{B}_t^R| \geq \epsilon\right) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} B_t^k \right| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0.$$

This implies (6.45).

We note that $\mathbf{X}^{R, \perp}$ is the diffusion process associated with $(\mathcal{E}_R^\perp, \mathcal{D}_R^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$ with initial distribution $\varphi \mu_{\text{Gin}}$. Let $E_{\mu_{\text{Gin}}}^{R, \perp}$ be the expectation of $\mathbf{X}^{R, \perp}$ with initial

distribution μ_{Gin} (instead of $\varphi\mu_{\text{Gin}}$). For each $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{K}_t^R| \geq \epsilon\right) &= P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,k}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,k\diamond}) du \right| \geq \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq P\left(\int_0^T \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,k}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,k\diamond}) \right| du \geq \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} E\left[\int_0^T \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,k}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,k\diamond}) \right| du\right] \\
&\leq \frac{c_{6.1}T}{\epsilon} E_{\mu_{\text{Gin}}}^{R,\perp} \left[\left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{b}(X_0^{\perp,k}, \mathbf{X}_0^{\perp,k\diamond}) \right| \right] \\
&= \frac{c_{6.1}T}{\epsilon} \int_S \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_R)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_R)} \mathbf{b}(s_k, \mathbf{s}_k^\diamond) \right| \mu_{\text{Gin}}(ds).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ is μ_{Gin} -symmetric and $0 \leq \varphi \leq c_{6.1}$ for the forth line. Hence applying (6.41) to the last line, we obtain (6.46).

From Lemma 6.4(1), \mathbf{X}^\perp is a μ_{Gin} -reversible Markov process associated with $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$ such that $\mathbf{X}_0^\perp \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \varphi\mu_{\text{Gin}}$. Hence, we deduce from (6.41)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} E\left[\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \mathbf{b}(X_u^{\perp,k}, \mathbf{X}_u^{\perp,k\diamond}) du \right| \right] \\
(6.49) \quad &\leq \lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} c_{6.1}T \int_S \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \sum_{k=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \mathbf{b}(s_k, \mathbf{s}_k^\diamond) \right| \mu_{\text{Gin}}(ds) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Chebyshev's inequality and (6.49), we obtain (6.47).

From (6.17)–(6.19) and (6.45), for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \leq s(\overline{S}_Q)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
X_t^{\perp,k} - X_0^{\perp,k} &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (X_t^{R,\perp,k} - X_0^{R,\perp,k}) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} (M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} - M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} \circ r_t) \\
(6.50) \quad &= \frac{1}{2} (B_t^k - B_t^k \circ r_t).
\end{aligned}$$

From (6.45) and (6.50), we obtain (6.48). \square

Lemma 6.10. *For each $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, the following hold.*

$$(6.51) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{L}_t^R| \geq 6\epsilon\right) = 0.$$

Proof. Using (6.39), we deduce for each $1 \leq i \leq s(\overline{S}_R)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_t^R &= X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i} - B_t^i - \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,i\diamond}) du \\
(6.52) \quad &- \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} - \mathcal{B}_t^R - \mathcal{K}_t^R.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the left-hand side of (6.52) is independent of $1 \leq i \leq s(\overline{S}_R)$. We fix Q and sum over $1 \leq i \leq \overline{S}_Q$. Note that $\mathcal{B}_t^Q = (1/s(\overline{S}_Q)) \sum_{i=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} B_t^i$. Then, for any

$Q \leq R$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_t^R &= \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i} - B_t^i - \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,i\diamond}) du \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} - \mathcal{B}_t^R - \mathcal{K}_t^R \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \sum_{i=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \left(X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i} \right) - \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \sum_{i=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,i\diamond}) du \\
(6.53) \quad &\quad - \mathcal{B}_t^Q - \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} - \mathcal{B}_t^R - \mathcal{K}_t^R.
\end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 6.1, Lemma 6.7, and (6.46), the last three terms in (6.53) vanish as R goes to infinity. Hence, we deduce for each $Q \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{L}_t^R| \geq 6\epsilon\right) &\leq P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} X_t^{\perp,i} - X_0^{\perp,i} \right\} \right| \geq \epsilon\right) \\
&+ P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \sum_{i=1}^{s(\overline{S}_Q)} \left\{ \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^{\perp,i}, \mathbf{X}_u^{\perp,i\diamond}) du \right\} \right| \geq \epsilon\right) + P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{B}_t^Q| \geq \epsilon\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $Q \rightarrow \infty$ and applying (6.48), (6.45), and (6.47), we obtain (6.51). \square

6.5. Identification of the ISDE for \mathbf{X}^\perp . Let $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ be the solution of (6.15). We take the initial distribution of $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ as (6.16). In Proposition 6.1, we proved that $\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}$ converge to the continuous process \mathbf{X}^\perp . In Subsection 6.5, we identify the ISDE that the limit point \mathbf{X}^\perp satisfies. Indeed, in Proposition 6.2, we shall prove that \mathbf{X}^\perp satisfies (1.1).

Proposition 6.2. \mathbf{X}^\perp is a weak solution of ISDE (1.1) with initial distribution $\varphi\mu_{\text{Gin}} \circ \Gamma^{-1}$ satisfying

$$(6.54) \quad P(\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{X}_t^\perp) \in \cdot) \ll \mu \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

$$(6.55) \quad P(I_{R,T}(\mathbf{X}^\perp) < \infty) = 1 \quad \text{for each } R, T \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$(6.56) \quad P(\mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X}^\perp) \in W_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{s,i}})) = 1.$$

Proof. Using (6.15) and (6.36)–(6.38), we deduce for each $i \leq s(\overline{S}_R)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i} - \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^{R,\perp,i}, \mathbf{X}_u^{R,\perp,i\diamond}) du \\
&= B_t^i + \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} + (\mathcal{B}^R + \mathcal{K}^R + \mathcal{L}^R)(t)
\end{aligned}$$

and $X_t^{R,\perp,i} = X_0^{R,\perp,i}$, $0 \leq t < \infty$, for $i > s(\overline{S}_R)$. Let

$$\mathcal{R}^{R,i}(t) = \begin{cases} \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} + (\mathcal{B}^R + \mathcal{K}^R + \mathcal{L}^R)(t) & i \leq s(\overline{S}_R) \\ 0 & i > s(\overline{S}_R) \end{cases}.$$

We set $\mathcal{R}^R(t) = (\mathcal{R}^{R,i}(t))_{i=1}^\infty$. Let $\mathbf{B} = (B^i)$ be the $(\mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$ -Brownian motion. Then,

$$(6.57) \quad \mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}(t) - \mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}(0) - \mathbf{b}^{R,\perp}(t) = \mathbf{B}(t) + \mathcal{R}^R(t),$$

Using Proposition 6.1, we have, in law in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$,

$$(6.58) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}(t) - \mathbf{X}^{R,\perp}(0) - \mathbf{b}^{R,\perp}(t)) = \mathbf{X}^\perp(t) - \mathbf{X}^\perp(0) - \mathbf{b}^\perp(t).$$

From Lemma 6.7, (6.45), (6.46), and Lemma 6.10, for each $i, T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \mathbf{n}^R(X_u^{R,\perp,i}) dL_u^{R,\perp,i} \right| \geq \epsilon\right) &= 0, \\ \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |(\mathcal{B}^R + \mathcal{K}^R + \mathcal{L}^R)(t)| \geq \epsilon\right) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for each $i, T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\mathcal{R}^{R,i}(t)| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0.$$

From this, we obtain

$$(6.59) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{B}(t) + \mathcal{R}^R(t)) = \mathbf{B}(t) \quad \text{in law in } C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}.$$

From (6.57)–(6.59), we obtain in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)^\mathbb{N}$

$$(6.60) \quad \mathbf{X}^\perp(t) - \mathbf{X}^\perp(0) - \mathbf{b}^\perp(t) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \mathbf{B}(t).$$

From (6.14), (6.26), and (6.60), we see that \mathbf{X}^\perp is a weak solution of ISDE (1.1).

By Lemma 6.4, the unlabeled dynamics \mathbf{X}^\perp is associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$ and $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{X}_0^\perp) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \varphi d\mu_{\text{Gin}}$. Hence, (6.54) is obvious.

Let $i \leq s(\overline{S}_R)$. From (6.17)

$$X_t^{R,\perp,i} - X_0^{R,\perp,i} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} - M_t^{[x_i \otimes 1]} \circ r_t \right\} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

Taking $R \rightarrow \infty$ and using (6.45), we have for each $T \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(6.61) \quad X_t^{\perp,i} - X_0^{\perp,i} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ B_t^i - B_t^i \circ r_t \right\} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

Here r_T is the time reversal on $[0, \infty)$. Using (6.61), we obtain (6.55).

Let $\mathbf{S}_s = \{s \in \mathbf{S}; s(\{x\}) \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$. From [13, Proposition 5.1],

$$(6.62) \quad P(\mathbf{X}_t^\perp \in \mathbf{S}_s \text{ for all } t \in [0, \infty)) = 1.$$

From (6.23), we see $\mathbf{X}^\perp \in C([0, \infty); \mathbf{S})$. From this and (6.62), we obtain (6.56). \square

6.6. Proof of Theorem 1.1. In Subsection 6.6, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. We begin by quoting a uniqueness result of weak solutions of ISDEs.

We need the IFC condition (**IFC**) to state the uniqueness result. Because this condition requires further preparation to state, we present (**IFC**) in Subsection 7.3. For the reader's convenience, we give a full version of Lemma 6.11 and related concepts in Subsection 7.3. Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X})$ and

(**AC**) $P \circ \mathbf{X}_t^{-1}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ for all $0 < t < \infty$.

(**SIN**) $P(\mathbf{X} \in W_{\text{NE}}(\mathbf{S}_{s,i})) = 1$.

(**NBJ**) $P(I_{R,T}(\mathbf{X}) < \infty) = 1$ for each $R, T \in \mathbb{N}$.

Here $W_{\text{NE}}(\mathbf{S}_{s,i})$ and $I_{R,T}$ are as in (1.11) and (3.18), respectively.

Lemma 6.11 ([28, Corollary 3.2, p.1158]). *Assume that μ is tail trivial. Then the uniqueness in law of weak solutions \mathbf{X} of (1.31) with initial distribution $\nu = \varphi d\mu \circ \mathbf{l}^{-1}$ holds under the constraints of (**IFC**), (**AC**), (**SIN**), and (**NBJ**).*

Proposition 6.3. *The Ginibre random point field satisfies (**A4**).*

Proof. From Proposition 6.2, \mathbf{X}^\perp is a weak solution of (1.1) with initial distribution $\nu = \varphi d\mu \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1}$ satisfying **(AC)**, **(SIN)**, and **(NBJ)**. Using [13, Theorems 3.2, 3.3], we see that \mathbf{X}^\perp satisfies **(IFC)** for (1.1).

Let $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ be the diffusion associated with $(\mathcal{E}^{\mu_{\text{Gin}}}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mu_{\text{Gin}}})$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$. Let $\overline{\mathbf{X}} = \mathfrak{l}_{\text{path}}(\overline{\mathbf{X}})$ be the associated labeled process with initial distribution $\nu = \varphi d\mu \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1}$. Then $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ is a weak solution of (1.31) satisfying **(IFC)**, **(AC)**, **(SIN)**, and **(NBJ)** [28].

We have thus seen that \mathbf{X}^\perp and $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ are weak solutions of (1.1) with initial distribution $\nu = \varphi d\mu \circ \mathfrak{l}^{-1}$ satisfying **(IFC)**, **(AC)**, **(SIN)**, and **(NBJ)**. It is known that μ_{Gin} is tail trivial [25, 17]. Hence using Lemma 6.11, we deduce

$$(6.63) \quad \mathbf{X}^\perp = \overline{\mathbf{X}} \text{ in law in } C([0, \infty); (\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}).$$

From (6.63), **(NBJ)**, and Lemma 7.3, we obtain

$$(6.64) \quad \mathfrak{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X}^\perp) = \mathfrak{u}_{\text{path}}(\overline{\mathbf{X}}) \text{ in law in } C([0, \infty); \mathbb{S})$$

for any initial distributions $\varphi d\mu$ such that $\varphi \in L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$, $\varphi \geq 0$, and $\int \varphi d\mu = 1$.

From Lemma 6.4 and [22, 28], $\mathfrak{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{X}^\perp)$ and $\mathfrak{u}_{\text{path}}(\overline{\mathbf{X}})$ are associated with the Dirichlet forms $(\mathcal{E}^\perp, \mathcal{D}^\perp)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^{\mu_{\text{Gin}}}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\mu_{\text{Gin}}})$ on $L^2(\mu_{\text{Gin}})$, respectively. Thus, we deduce **(A4)** from (6.64). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It is well known that μ_{Gin} satisfies **(A1)** and **(A2)**. **(A3)** was proved in [23, Theorem 2.3]. **(A4)** follows from Proposition 6.3. **(A6)** follows from Lemma 1.1. Thus, the Ginibre random point field satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, which yields Theorem 1.1. \square

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Proof of (1.10).

Lemma 7.1. *Each $\mathbf{w} = \{\mathbf{w}_t\} \in W(\mathbb{S}_{\text{s,i}})$ can be written as (1.10).*

Proof. Let $S_{x,\epsilon} = \{s \in \mathbb{R}^d; |s - x| < \epsilon\}$. Set $\epsilon(t, x) = \sup\{\epsilon > 0; \mathbf{w}_t(S_{x,\epsilon}) = 1\}$. Let (τ_0, x_0) be such that $\mathbf{w}_{\tau_0}(\{x_0\}) = 1$. Then $\epsilon_0 := \epsilon(\tau_0, x_0) > 0$ because $\mathbf{w}_{\tau_0} \in \mathbb{S}_{\text{s,i}}$. Let

$$\tau_1 = \sup\{t \geq \tau_0; \mathbf{w}_t(S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}) = 1\}.$$

We see $\mathbf{w}_{\tau_0}(\partial S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\tau_0}(S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}) = 1$. Hence from the continuity of \mathbf{w}_t at τ_0 under the vague topology, we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_0} \mathbf{w}_t(S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}) = \mathbf{w}_{\tau_0}(S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}) = 1.$$

We thus obtain $\tau_1 > \tau_0$ because $\mathbf{w}_t(\cdot)$ is an integer valued measure.

For each $t \in [\tau_0, \tau_1)$, there exists a unique $w(t) \in S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}$ such that

$$(7.1) \quad \mathbf{w}_t(\{w(t)\}) = 1.$$

Thus, $w(t)$ is a function defined on $[\tau_0, \tau_1)$ such that $\mathbf{w}_t(\cdot \cap S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}) = \delta_{w(t)}$.

Because \mathbf{w} is an \mathbb{S} -valued continuous process under the vague topology, $w(t)$ is a continuous function in $t \in [\tau_0, \tau_1)$. Indeed, if $w(t)$ is not continuous at $t_* \in [\tau_0, \tau_1)$, then there exists a sequence $\{t_n\} \subset [\tau_0, \tau_1)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = t_*$ and that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(t_n) = x_\infty \neq w(t_*).$$

Let $w(t_*) = x_*$ and $\epsilon_* = |x_\infty - x_*|$. Then $\epsilon_* < \epsilon_0$ because $x_\infty, x_* \in \overline{S}_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}$

From $\epsilon_*/2 < \epsilon_0/2$ and $t_* < \tau_1$, we see $w_{t_*}(\partial S_{x_*, \epsilon_*/2}) = 0$. Hence,

$$(7.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_{t_n}(S_{x_*, \epsilon_*/2}) = w_{t_*}(S_{x_*, \epsilon_*/2}) = 1.$$

From $w_{t_n}(\{w(t_n)\}) = 1$, $w(t_n) \in S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}$, and $w_{t_n}(S_{x_0, \epsilon_0/2}) = 1$, we see

$$(7.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_{t_n}(S_{x_*, \epsilon_*/2}) = 0.$$

Combining (7.2) and (7.3) yields contradiction. Thus, $w(t)$ is continuous on $[\tau_0, \tau_1]$.

Suppose $\tau_1 < \infty$. Then the limit points of $w(t)$ as $t \uparrow \tau_1$ is single. Indeed, if there exist limit points $z(1) \neq z(2)$, then for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(7.4) \quad \overline{S}_{z(1), \epsilon} \cap \overline{S}_{z(2), \epsilon} = \emptyset, \quad w_{\tau_1}(\overline{S}_{z(i), \epsilon} \setminus \{z(i)\}) = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Because $\overline{S}_{z(1), \epsilon}$ and $\overline{S}_{z(2), \epsilon}$ are closed sets, we have

$$(7.5) \quad 1 \leq \limsup_{t \uparrow \tau_1} w_t(\overline{S}_{z(i), \epsilon}) \leq w_{\tau_1}(\overline{S}_{z(i), \epsilon}) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Let $S_s = \{s \in S; s(\{x\}) \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. Because w_{τ_1} is S_s -valued and (7.5) holds for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, we deduce from (7.4)

$$(7.6) \quad w_{\tau_1}(\{z(i)\}) = 1, i = 1, 2.$$

We take $\epsilon > 0$ such that $S_{z(1), \epsilon} \cup S_{z(2), \epsilon} \subset S_{x_0, \epsilon_0}$. For $\epsilon > 0$, we set

$$\tau_\epsilon^* = \inf\{t \leq \tau_1; w_t(S_{z(i), \epsilon}) = 1, i = 1, 2\}.$$

Similarly as the proof of $\tau_1 > \tau_0$, we can prove $\tau_\epsilon^* < \tau_1$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Using $\tau_\epsilon^* < \tau_1$ and the fact that $S_{z(1), \epsilon} \cup S_{z(2), \epsilon}$ is an open set, we obtain

$$(7.7) \quad 1 \geq \liminf_{t \uparrow \tau_1} w_t(S_{z(1), \epsilon} \cup S_{z(2), \epsilon}) \geq w_{\tau_1}(S_{z(1), \epsilon} \cup S_{z(2), \epsilon}).$$

Combining (7.6) and (7.7) yields contradiction. Hence, the function $w(t)$ on $[\tau_0, \tau_1]$ can be extended to the continuous function on $[\tau_0, \tau_1]$ such that $w(\tau_1) = \lim_{t \uparrow \tau_1} w(t)$.

We set $x_1 := w(\tau_1)$. Then $w_{\tau_1}(\{x_1\}) = 1$. Applying the same method to (τ_1, x_1) , we find (τ_2, x_2) such that $w(t)$ can be extended to $w \in C([\tau_0, \tau_2]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ while keeping (7.1). In addition, if $\tau_2 < \infty$, then we can extend to $w(t)$ to $w \in C([\tau_0, \tau_2]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $x_2 := w(\tau_2)$ satisfies $w_{\tau_2}(\{x_2\}) = 1$. Repeating this procedure, we have an increasing sequence $\{\tau_k\}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, such that $w(t)$ can be extended to $w \in C([\tau_0, \tau_\infty]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ while keeping (7.1), where $\tau_\infty := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau_k$.

For (τ, x) such that $w_\tau(\{x\}) = 1$, we denote by $(I(\tau, x), w^{(\tau, x)})$ the pair of the rectangle $[\tau_0, \tau_\infty)$ and the element w of $C([\tau_0, \tau_\infty]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ constructed as above.

Two such pairs $(I(\tau, x), w^{(\tau, x)})$ and $(I(\tau', x'), w^{(\tau', x')})$ satisfy that one of each is an extension of another one, or that the graphs given by the pairs are disjoint, that is,

$$\{(t, w^{(\tau, x)}(t)); t \in [\tau, \tau_\infty)\} \cap \{(t, w^{(\tau', x')}(t)); t \in [\tau', \tau'_\infty)\} = \emptyset.$$

Hence, we set the equivalence relation \sim such that $(\tau, x) \sim (\tau', x')$ if the former holds.

For $(\tau, x)/\sim$, we assign the pair (I, w) such that $I = [a, b)$, where $a = \inf\{\tau'; (\tau', x') \sim (\tau, x)\}$ and $b = \tau_\infty$. Here, if $(\tau, x) \sim (\tau', x')$, then $\tau_\infty = \tau'_\infty$.

Note that $w^{(\tau', x')}(\tau') = x'$ by construction. If $\tau = 0$ or

$$\liminf_{\tau' \rightarrow 0} \{|x'|; (\tau, x) \sim (\tau', x')\} < \infty,$$

we retake $I = [0, b)$ instead of $I = (0, b)$. Let $w \in C(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the extension of all $w^{(\tau', x')}(t)$ such that $(\tau', x') \sim (\tau, x)$. Using (I, w) thus constructed for each equivalence class, we obtain the representation (1.10). \square

Lemma 7.2. *For a label \mathbf{l} , we have a unique $\mathbf{l}_{\text{path}} : W_{\text{NE}}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{l}}) \rightarrow C([0, \infty); (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}})$ such that $\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{w}_0) = \mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w})_0$.*

Proof. For $\mathbf{w} \in W_{\text{NE}}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{l}})$, let $(w^i, [0, \infty))$ be as in (1.11). Then from Lemma 7.1, the set $\{(w^i, [0, \infty)), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is unique. Hence, we take the unique bijection $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $(w_0^{\sigma(i)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{w}_0)$. We set $\mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w}) = (w^{\sigma(i)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Because $w^{\sigma(i)} \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ is endowed with the product topology, the map $t \mapsto \mathbf{l}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w})_t = (w^{\sigma(i)}(t))_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ is continuous. \square

Let $\|v - w\|_T = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |v(t) - w(t)|$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v^i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$. We set

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{path}}(v, w) &= \sum_{T=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^T} (1 \wedge \|v - w\|_T), \\ \rho_{\mathbf{l}\text{path}}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (1 \wedge \rho_{\text{path}}(v^i, w^i)). \end{aligned}$$

We endow $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\rho_{\mathbf{l}\text{path}}$. $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a complete separable metric space under $\rho_{\mathbf{l}\text{path}}$. Let ρ_{Proho} be the Proholov metric on \mathbf{S} :

$$\rho_{\text{Proho}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}') = \inf\{\epsilon > 0; \mathbf{s}(B) \leq \mathbf{s}'(B^\epsilon) + \epsilon, \mathbf{s}'(B) \leq \mathbf{s}(B^\epsilon) + \epsilon\}.$$

Here B^ϵ is the open ϵ -neighborhood of B . Let $f_R \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $0 \leq f_R \leq 1$, $f_R(x) = 1$ on S_R , and $f_{R+1}(x) = 0$ on S_{R+1}^c . We set the measure $f\mathbf{s}$ by $f\mathbf{s} = \sum_i f(s_i)\delta_{s_i}$. Then the vague topology on \mathbf{S} is given by the separable, complete metric defined by

$$(7.9) \quad \rho_{\text{vague}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}') = \sum_{R=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^R} \left(1 \wedge \rho_{\text{Proho}}(f_R \mathbf{s}, f_R \mathbf{s}')\right).$$

We refer to [11] for these metrics. We set

$$(7.10) \quad \rho_{\text{upath}}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}') = \sum_{T=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^T} \left(1 \wedge \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \rho_{\text{vague}}(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{w}'_t)\right).$$

Then $C([0, \infty); \mathbf{S})$ is a complete separable metric space under ρ_{upath} .

We set $\mathbf{w} = (w^i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and $w^i = \{w^i(t)\}$. For $\mathbf{w} \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$, let

$$I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w}) = \sup\{i \in \mathbb{N}; \min_{t \in [0, T]} |w^i(t)| \leq R\},$$

$$\mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J} = \{\mathbf{w} \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}; I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w}) < \infty \text{ for each } R, T \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

For $\mathbf{w} = (w^i)$, we set $\mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}$, where \mathbf{w} is such that $\mathbf{w}_t = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{w^i(t)}$.

Lemma 7.3. (1) $\mathbf{u}_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w}) \in C([0, \infty); \mathbf{S})$ for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J}$.

(2) $\mathbf{u}_{\text{path}} : \mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J} \rightarrow C([0, \infty); \mathbf{S})$ is continuous.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\varphi(x) = 0$ for $x \notin S_R$. From $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J}$, we have $I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w}) < \infty$. Let $t \in [0, T)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{u \rightarrow t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \mathbf{w}_u(dx) &= \lim_{u \rightarrow t} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi(w^i(u)) = \lim_{u \rightarrow t} \sum_{i=1}^{I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w})} \varphi(w^i(u)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{I_{R,T}(\mathbf{w})} \varphi(w^i(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi(w^i(t)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \mathbf{w}_t(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{w} = \{\mathbf{w}_t\}$ is continuous at t , this implies (1).

Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\text{path}}(\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}) = 0$. Then

$$(7.11) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_n^i - w^i\|_T = 0 \quad \text{for all } i, T \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \rho_{\text{vague}}(\mathbf{w}_n(t), \mathbf{w}(t)) &= \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{R=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^R} \left(1 \wedge \rho_{\text{Proho}}(f_R \mathbf{w}_n(t), f_R \mathbf{w}(t)) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{R=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^R} \left(1 \wedge \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \rho_{\text{Proho}}(f_R \mathbf{w}_n(t), f_R \mathbf{w}(t)) \right) \\ (7.12) \quad &\leq \sum_{R=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^R} \left(1 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^{I_{R+1,T}(\mathbf{w}_n) \vee I_{R+1,T}(\mathbf{w})} \|w_n^i - w^i\|_T \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (7.11) and $\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{NB}\mathcal{J}$, we deduce for each $R, T \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(7.13) \quad \sup_n \{I_{R+1,T}(\mathbf{w}_n) \vee I_{R+1,T}(\mathbf{w})\} < \infty.$$

From (7.11)–(7.13), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \rho_{\text{vague}}(\mathbf{w}_n(t), \mathbf{w}(t)) = 0$ for each $T \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies (2). \square

7.2. Strongly local, quasi-regular Dirichlet forms. In Subsection 7.2, we recall the concept of strong local, quasi-regular Dirichlet forms following [3]. Let \mathcal{O} be the family of all open subsets of S . For $A \in \mathcal{O}$, let $\mathcal{L}_{A,1} = \{f \in \mathcal{D}; f \geq 1 \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. on } A\}$. We set $\mathcal{O}_0 = \{A \in \mathcal{O}; \mathcal{L}_{A,1} \neq \emptyset\}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1 = \mathcal{E} + (\cdot, *)_{L^2(\mu)}$. For an open set $A \in \mathcal{O}$, we set

$$\text{Cap}(A) = \begin{cases} \inf\{\mathcal{E}_1(f, f); f \in \mathcal{L}_{A,1}\}, & A \in \mathcal{O}_0 \\ \infty, & A \notin \mathcal{O}_0. \end{cases}$$

For any set $B \subset S$, we set $\text{Cap}(B) = \inf\{\text{Cap}(A); A \in \mathcal{O}, A \supset B\}$. The quantity $\text{Cap}(B)$ is called one-capacity.

An increasing sequence of closed sets $\{F_k\}$ is called an \mathcal{E} -nest if, for any compact set K , $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cap}(K \setminus F_k) = 0$. A function f is called \mathcal{E} -quasi-continuous if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an open set \mathcal{O} with $\text{Cap}(\mathcal{O}) < \epsilon$ such that $f|_{S \setminus \mathcal{O}}$ is finite and continuous. We call a subset $\mathfrak{N} \subset S$ an \mathcal{E} -polar set if there exists an \mathcal{E} -nest $\{F_k\}$ such that $\mathfrak{N} \subset \cap_k (S \setminus F_k)$.

A Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ on $L^2(S, \mu)$ is called quasi-regular if:

- (1) there exists an \mathcal{E} -nest $\{F_k, k \geq 1\}$ consisting of compact sets;
- (2) there exists $\mathcal{E} + (\cdot, *)_{L^2(S, \mu)}$ -dense subset of \mathcal{D} whose elements have \mathcal{E} -quasi-continuous μ -version;
- (3) there exists $\{f_k, k \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ having \mathcal{E} -quasi-continuous μ -versions $\{\tilde{f}_k, k \geq 1\}$

$1\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ and an \mathcal{E} -polar set $\mathfrak{N} \subset S$ such that $\{\tilde{f}_k, k \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ separates the points on $S \setminus \mathfrak{N}$.

A Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ on $L^2(S, \mu)$ is called strongly local if $\mathcal{E}(f, g) = 0$ for any $f, g \in \mathcal{D}$ such that f is constant on a neighborhood of the support of g . A diffusion process is a family of Markov processes with continuous sample path and has the strong Markov property. We say a diffusion process is conservative if it has an infinite lifetime.

7.3. IFC condition and the uniqueness of weak solutions of ISDEs. In Subsection 7.3, we quote the IFC condition and the result of the uniqueness of weak solutions of ISDE from [28].

Let $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ -valued continuous process. For \mathbf{X} and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{X}^{i\circ}$ as $\mathbf{X}_t = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{X_t^i}$ and $\mathbf{X}_t^{i\circ} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}, j \neq i} \delta_{X_t^j}$.

Let S_{sde} be a Borel subset of S such that $S_{\text{sde}} \subset S_{s,i}$. Let $\mathbf{u}^{[1]}$ be the map on $\mathbb{R}^d \times S$ such that $\mathbf{u}^{[1]}(x, s) = \delta_x + s$. Let $S_{\text{sde}} \subset (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $S_{\text{sde}}^{[1]} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times S$ be such that $S_{\text{sde}} = \mathbf{u}^{-1}(S_{\text{sde}})$ and $S_{\text{sde}}^{[1]} = (\mathbf{u}^{[1]})^{-1}(S_{\text{sde}})$.

Let $\sigma : S_{\text{sde}}^{[1]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ and $\mathbf{b} : S_{\text{sde}}^{[1]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel measurable functions. We consider coefficients σ and \mathbf{b} defined only on a suitable subset $S_{\text{sde}}^{[1]}$ of $\mathbb{R}^d \times S$. We consider an ISDE to $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with state space S_{sde} such that

$$(7.14) \quad dX_t^i = \sigma(X_t^i, \mathbf{X}_t^{i\circ}) dB_t^i + \mathbf{b}(X_t^i, \mathbf{X}_t^{i\circ}) dt \quad (i \in \mathbb{N}), \quad \mathbf{X}_t \in S_{\text{sde}}, \forall t \in [0, \infty).$$

Definition 7.1 (weak solution). By a weak solution of ISDE (7.14), we mean an $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}} \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ -valued stochastic process (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{B}) defined on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with a reference family $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ such that

- (i) $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is an $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, S_{sde} -valued continuous process.
- (ii) $\mathbf{B} = (B^i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is an $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ -valued $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -Brownian motion with $\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{0}$,
- (iii) the family of measurable $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes Φ and Ψ defined by

$$\Phi^i(t, \omega) = \sigma(X_t^i(\omega), \mathbf{X}_t^{i\circ}(\omega)), \quad \Psi^i(t, \omega) = \mathbf{b}(X_t^i(\omega), \mathbf{X}_t^{i\circ}(\omega))$$

belong to \mathcal{L}^2 and \mathcal{L}^1 , respectively. Here \mathcal{L}^p is the set of all measurable $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted processes α such that $E[\int_0^T |\alpha(t, \omega)|^p dt] < \infty$ for all T . Here we can and do take a predictable version of Φ^i and Ψ^i (see pp 45-46 in [10]).

(iv) with probability one, the process (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{B}) satisfies for all t

$$X_t^i - X_0^i = \int_0^t \sigma(X_u^i, \mathbf{X}_u^{i\circ}) dB_u^i + \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(X_u^i, \mathbf{X}_u^{i\circ}) du \quad (i \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Let $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a weak solution to (7.14) starting at $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s})$. Here $\mathbf{l} : S_{s,i} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ is the label introduced in Section 1. For \mathbf{X} , we introduce the family of finite-dimensional stochastic differential equations as follows.

Define $\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}^m : [0, \infty) \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{X}}^m : [0, \infty) \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that, for $(u, \mathbf{v}) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^m$ and $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \delta_{v_i} \in S$, where $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{m-1}$,

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}^m(t, (u, \mathbf{v})) = \sigma(u, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{X}_t^{m*}), \quad \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{X}}^m(t, (u, \mathbf{v})) = \mathbf{b}(u, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{X}_t^{m*}).$$

Here $\mathbf{X}_t^{m*} = \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{X_t^i}$. We write $\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}) = (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{s}_m^* = \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{s_i}$. Recall that $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s})$. We have $\mathbf{X}_0^{m*} = \mathbf{s}_m^*$ by construction. The coefficients $\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}^m$ and $\mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{X}}^m$ depend on both unlabeled path \mathbf{X}^{m*} and the label \mathbf{l} . Let

$$S_{\text{sde}}^m(t, \mathbf{w}) = \{\mathbf{s}^m = (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^m; \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{s}^m) + \mathbf{w}_t^{m*} \in S_{\text{sde}}\},$$

where $\mathbf{w}_t^{m*} = \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{w_t^i}$ for $\mathbf{w}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{w_t^i}$. By definition, $\mathbf{S}_{\text{sde}}^m(t, \mathbf{w})$ is a time-dependent domain in $(\mathbb{R}^d)^m$ given by \mathbf{w}_t^{m*} .

We set $\mathbf{Y}^m = (Y^{m,i})_{i=1}^m$, $\mathbf{Y}^{m,i\circ} = (Y^{m,j})_{j \neq i}^m$, and $\mathbf{Y}_t^{m,i\circ} = \sum_{j \neq i}^m \delta_{Y_t^{m,j}}$.

We consider the stochastic differential equation to \mathbf{Y}^m with random environment \mathbf{X} defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_s, \{\mathcal{F}_t\})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^{m,i} &= \sigma_X^m(t, (Y_t^{m,i}, \mathbf{Y}_t^{m,i\circ})) dB_t^i + b_X^m(t, (Y_t^{m,i}, \mathbf{Y}_t^{m,i\circ})) dt, \\ \mathbf{Y}_t^m &\in \mathbf{S}_{\text{sde}}^m(t, \mathbf{X}) \quad \text{for all } t, \\ (7.15) \quad \mathbf{Y}_0^m &= \mathbf{s}^m, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{s}^m = (s_1, \dots, s_m) \text{ for } \mathbf{s} = (s_i) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{X} = (X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, let $\mathbf{X}^{m*} = (0, \dots, 0, X^{m+1}, X^{m+2}, \dots)$. The first m components of \mathbf{X}^{m*} are constant paths 0. A triplet $(\mathbf{Y}^m, \mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})$ of continuous processes on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_s, \{\mathcal{F}_t\})$ satisfying (7.15) is called a weak solution.

Let $\tilde{P}^m = P_s \circ (\mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})^{-1}$ be the distribution of $(\mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})$. Let $W^{\mathbb{N}} = C([0, \infty); (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}})$ and $W_0^m = \{\mathbf{w} \in W^{\mathbb{N}}; \mathbf{w}(0) = \mathbf{0}\}$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_t^m &:= \mathcal{B}_t^m(W_0^m) = \sigma[\mathbf{w}(s); 0 \leq s \leq t], \\ \mathcal{B}_t(W_0^m \times W^{\mathbb{N}}) &= \sigma[(\mathbf{v}(s), \mathbf{w}(s)); 0 \leq s \leq t], \\ \mathcal{C}_t^m &= \overline{\mathcal{B}_t(W_0^m \times W^{\mathbb{N}})}^{\tilde{P}^m}, \quad \mathcal{C}^m = \overline{\mathcal{B}(W_0^m \times W^{\mathbb{N}})}^{\tilde{P}^m}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 7.2. (1) \mathbf{Y}^m is called a strong solution of (7.15) for (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{B}) under P_s if $(\mathbf{Y}^m, \mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})$ satisfies (7.15) and there exists a \mathcal{C}^m -measurable function $F_s^m: W_0^m \times W^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow W_0^m$ such that F_s^m is $\mathcal{C}_t^m/\mathcal{B}_t^m$ -measurable for each t , and F_s^m satisfies $\mathbf{Y}^m = F_s^m(\mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})$ P_s -a.s.

(2) The SDE (7.15) is said to have a unique strong solution for (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{B}) under P_s if there exists a function F_s^m satisfying the conditions in Definition 7.2(1) and, for any weak solution $(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^m, \mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})$ of (7.15) under P_s , $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^m = F_s^m(\mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})$ for P_s -a.s.

The function F_s^m in Definition 7.2(1) is called a strong solution starting at \mathbf{s}^m . (7.15) is said to have a unique strong solution F_s^m if F_s^m satisfies the condition in Definition 7.2(2). The function F_s^m is unique for \tilde{P}^m -a.s.

We introduce the IFC condition of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{B}) defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\mathcal{F}_t\})$:

(IFC) The SDE (7.15) has a unique strong solution $F_s^m(\mathbf{B}^m, \mathbf{X}^{m*})$ for (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{B}) under P_s for $P \circ \mathbf{X}_0^{-1}$ -a.s. \mathbf{s} for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $P_s = P(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{s})$.

We say that the uniqueness in law of weak solutions for (7.14) with ν holds if the laws of the processes \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{X}' in $W^{\mathbb{N}} = C([0, \infty); (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}})$ coincide for any weak solutions \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{X}' with initial distributions ν .

Lemma 7.4 (Corollary 3.2, p.1158). *Assume that μ is tail trivial. Then the uniqueness in law of weak solutions of (7.14) with initial distribution ν holds under the constraints of (IFC), (AC), (SIN), and (NBJ).*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Shota Osada for his comment on dual reduced Palm measures and Stuart Jenkinson, PhD, from Edanz (<https://jp.edanz.com/ac>) for editing a draft of this manuscript. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP16H06338, JP20K20885, JP21H04432, and JP21K13812.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andreanov, A., Biroli, G., Lefevre, A., *Dynamical field theory for glass-forming liquids, self-consistent resummations and time-reversal symmetry*, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, **2006** July 2006, P07008
- [2] Bufetov, A., *Rigidity of determinantal point processes with the Airy, the Bessel and the Gamma kernel*, Bull. Math. Sci. (2016) 6:163–172. DOI 10.1007/s13373-015-0080-z
- [3] Chen, Z.-Q., Fukushima, M. *Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory*, Princeton 2012.
- [4] De Masi, A., Ferrari, P.A., Goldstein, S., Wick, W.D., *An invariance principle for reversible Markov processes. Applications to random motions in random environments*, J. Stat. Phys, **55** Nos. 3/4 (1989) 787–855
- [5] Fritz, J., *Gradient dynamics of infinite point systems*, Ann. Prob. **15** (1987) 478–514.
- [6] Fukushima, M., Oshima, Y., Takeda M., *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, 2nd ed., Walter de Gruyter (2011).
- [7] Ghosh, S., Peres, Y., *Rigidity and Tolerance in point processes: Gaussian zeroes and Ginibre eigenvalues*, Duke Mathematical Journal, **166** (10): 1789–1858 (15 July 2017). DOI: 10.1215/00127094-2017-0002.
- [8] Guo, M.Z., Papanicolaou, G.C. *Self-Diffusion of interacting Brownian particles*, in “Probabilistic Method in Mathematical Physics”, Proc. Taniguchi International Sympo. at Katata and Kyoto (1985), eds. K. Ito and N. Ikeda, 113–152, (1987) Kinokuniya.
- [9] Harris, T.E., *Diffusions with collision between particles*, J. Appl. Prob. **2** 323–338 (1965)
- [10] Ikeda, N., Watanabe, S., *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, 2nd ed. North-Holland (1989)
- [11] Kallenberg, O., *Random measures, theory and applications*, Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling **77** Springer, Cham (2017)
- [12] Kawamoto, Y., Osada, H., Tanemura H., *Uniqueness of Dirichlet forms related to infinite systems of interacting Brownian motions*, Potential Anal 55, 639–676 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11118-020-09872-2>
- [13] Kawamoto, Y., Osada, H., Tanemura H., *Infinite-dimensional stochastic differential equations and tail σ -fields II: the IFC condition*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 74 (2022), no. 1, 79–128.
- [14] Kipnis, C. and Varadhan, S.R.S., *Central limit theorems for additive functional of reversible Markov process and applications to simple exclusions*, Commun. Math. Phys. **104** (1986) 1–19.
- [15] Lang, R., *Unendlich-dimensionale Wienerprozesse mit Wechselwirkung I*, Z. Wahrschverw. Gebiete **38** (1977) 55–72.
- [16] Lang, R., *Unendlich-dimensionale Wienerprozesse mit Wechselwirkung II*, Z. Wahrschverw. Gebiete **39** (1977) 277–299.
- [17] Lyons, R., *A note on Tail Triviality for Determinantal Point Processes*, Electron. Commun. Probab. **23**, (2018), paper no. 72, 1–3 ISSN: 1083–589X
- [18] Osada, H., *Dirichlet form approach to infinite-dimensional Wiener processes with singular interactions*, Commun. Math. Phys. **176** 117–131 (1996).
- [19] Osada, H., *An invariance principle for Markov processes and Brownian particles with singular interaction*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré **34** n° 2 (1998), 217–248.
- [20] Osada, H., *Positivity of the self-diffusion matrix of interacting Brownian particles with hard core*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, **112** (1998), 53–90.
- [21] Osada, H., *Tagged particle processes and their non-explosion criteria*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, **62** No. 3 (2010), 867–894.
- [22] Osada, H., *Infinite-dimensional stochastic differential equations related to random matrices*, Probability Theory and Related Fields, Vol **153** (2012) pp 471–509.
- [23] Osada, H., *Interacting Brownian motions in infinite dimensions with logarithmic interaction potentials*, Annals of Probability, Vol **41** (2013) pp 1–49.
- [24] Osada, H., *Self-diffusion constants of non-colliding interacting Brownian motions in one spatial dimension*, RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu **B59** (2016), 253–272. Correction: arXiv:1605.04413v2 [math.PR].
- [25] Osada, H., Osada, S., *Discrete approximations of determinantal point processes on continuous spaces: tree representations and tail triviality*, J. Stat. Phys. **170** (2018), no. 2, 421–435.

- [26] Osada, H., Saitoh, T., *An invariance principle for non-symmetric Markov processes and reflecting diffusions in random domains*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **101** 45–63 (1995)
- [27] Osada, H., Shirai, T., *Absolute continuity and singularity of Palm measures of the Ginibre point process*, Probability Theory and Related Fields, **165** (3-4), (2016) 725–770. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-015-0644-6>
- [28] Osada, H., Tanemura, H., *Infinite-dimensional stochastic differential equations and tail σ -fields*, Probability Theory and Related Fields (2020) **177** 1137–1242, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-020-00981-y>.
- [29] Revuz, D., Yor, M., *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, 3rd ed., Springer-Verlag (1999).
- [30] Ruelle D., *Superstable interactions in classical statistical mechanics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **18** 127–159 (1970)
- [31] Spohn, H., *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles*, Springer-Verlag, (1991).
- [32] Spohn, H., *Tracer dynamics in Dyson’s model of interacting Brownian particles*, J Stat. Phys., **47** 669–679 (1987).
- [33] Shirai, T., *Large deviations for the Fermion point process associated with the exponential kernel* J. Stat. Phys. **123** (2006), 615–629.
- [34] Tanemura, H., *Central limit theorem for a random walk with random obstacles in \mathbf{R}^d* , Annals of Probability, **21** (1993) 936–960.
- [35] Tanemura, H., *A system of infinitely many mutually reflecting Brownian balls in \mathbb{R}^d* , Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **104** (1996) 399–426.