

DERIVATION OF THE FRACTIONAL POROUS MEDIUM EQUATION FROM A MICROSCOPIC DYNAMICS

PEDRO CARDOSO, RENATO DE PAULA, PATRÍCIA GONÇALVES

ABSTRACT. In this article we derive the fractional porous medium equation for any power of the fractional Laplacian as the hydrodynamic limit of a microscopic dynamics of random particles with long range interactions, but the jump rate highly depends on the occupancy near the sites where the interactions take place.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rigorous mathematical derivation of the macroscopic evolution equations of classical fluid mechanics from the large-scale description of the conserved quantities in Newtonian particle systems is a long-standing problem in mathematical physics. Instead, if the deterministic dynamics is replaced by a stochastic dynamics, one can provide positive answers in this direction. Over the last three decades, there has been remarkable progress in deriving the well-known hydrodynamic limit, from stochastic interacting particle systems, by means of rigorous mathematical results. In this framework, many partial differential equations (PDEs) have been studied and derived from several underlying random dynamics. The nature of these equations highly depends on the chosen microscopic stochastic dynamics: it can be parabolic, hyperbolic, or even of fractional form. Our focus on this article is on the latter type of equations.

Inspired by the works of [8, 9] we focus on the fractional porous medium equation given for $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t, u) = [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} \rho^m](t, u), & u \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0, T], \\ \rho(0, u) = g(u), & u \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a measurable function. Equations of the form above can be seen as nonlinear versions of the linear fractional heat equation obtained for the choice $m = 1$. For simplicity of the presentation in this article we restrict to the case $m = 2$, nevertheless all our results trivially extend to the case $m \geq 2$. These equations model the so-called anomalous diffusions and they have been extensively studied in the PDE's literature. The fractional Laplacian operator above can be defined as in (2.5) and it is the infinitesimal generator of stable Lévy processes, and contrarily to the usual Laplacian operator, it is a non-local operator. Our interest is to obtain the fractional porous medium equation as the hydrodynamic limit of an interacting particle system. The fractional heat equation (corresponding to the choice $m = 1$) was obtained from an exclusion process with symmetric rates and with long jumps in [13]. There it is also derived the general fractional equation $\partial_t \rho(t, u) = [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} \Phi(\rho)](t, u)$, where the function Φ satisfies some conditions (see Section 8.1 in that article) that do not cover the polynomial case that we treat here.

We observe that by replacing the fractional Laplacian by the usual Laplacian operator in the equation above, we obtain the porous medium equation which has been studied in [16]. This last

equation (for $m \geq 2$) has been derived as the hydrodynamic limit of an interacting particle system of exclusion type, first in [10] for the equation on the torus and later in [4] for the equation on the interval $[0, 1]$ and with several boundary conditions of Dirichlet, Robin and Neumann type.

The underlying dynamics that was considered in [10] in order to derive the porous medium equation on the torus, for $m = 2$, is described as follows. First one discretizes the torus by a scaling parameter n which will be taken to infinity. The discrete space where particles will evolve is the one dimensional discrete torus $\mathbb{T}_n := \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. At each site of \mathbb{T}_n it is allowed at most one particle (the exclusion rule). After an exponential clock of rate one, particles in a bond $\{x, x+1\}$ exchange their positions with a rate $1/4$ if there is only a particle at $x-1$ or $x+2$ and with rate $1/2$ if there are particles in both sites. To derive the porous medium equation with $m > 2$ one has just to require at least m particles in a vicinity of the exchanging particles.

In this article we propose a new model, which is an extension of the one just described, but in this case particles can give long jumps in \mathbb{Z} and with a rate that decreases as the jump size increases, in a similar fashion to the case $m = 2$. More precisely, a particle jumps from a position x to $x+z$ according to a probability transition function defined on \mathbb{Z} by

$$p(z) = c_\gamma |z|^{-\gamma-1} \mathbb{1}_{z \neq 0}, \forall z \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ is fixed and c_γ is a normalizing constant that turns p into a probability. Moreover, the jump is only possible if there are at least $m = 2$ particles in the vicinity of the exchanging particles. Nevertheless, when jumps are to nearest-neighbors, particles can jump independently from the number of particles in the neighboring sites, see Remark 2.1. For a scheme on the possible jumps, see the figure below.




FIGURE 1. The fractional porous medium model.

The dynamics conserves one quantity: the number of particles in the system. From Remark 2.1, we can always perform jumps of size 1, such as the one from $y-1$ to $y-2$ in Figure 1. This is useful to avoid blocked configurations and assuring that our process is irreducible. We observe that the system just defined has degenerate rates. Our result then says that the space-time evolution of the density of particles is given by the fractional porous medium equation given in (1.1). More precisely, the empirical measure associated with the density of particles, converges to a deterministic measure, which is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and its density is the unique weak solution of the fractional porous medium equation. Our proof

follows the entropy method of [12] which gives for free existence of weak solutions, and on the way we prove uniqueness of those weak solutions.

We highlight that the study of fractional PDEs from interacting particle systems is quite recent, apart the article [13]. Recently, the fractional heat equation has been derived with several boundary conditions either on the interval $[0, 1]$ with a slow/fast boundary (see [3, 2]) or on \mathbb{Z} with a slow barrier (see [6]). But all the fractional equations are linear, as well as, the boundary conditions. The rigorous study of nonlinear versions of those equations has given many challenges from the mathematical point of view, since at the same time one has to treat the nonlinearity and the fractional diffusion. From the particle system, one has to deal with blocked configurations and degenerate rates and at the same the non locality of the exchange rate of particles.

As variations of our dynamics we note that we could also consider the analogous cases as in described above for the exclusion on the interval $[0, 1]$ with a slow/fast boundary or on \mathbb{Z} with a slow barrier. In these cases we would obtain the fractional porous medium equation with boundary conditions of Dirichlet, Robin or Neumann type. It would also be very interesting to extend the recent results of [11] to obtain the fractional porous medium equation above but for any real power $m > 0$, including the fast diffusion case i.e. when $m \in (0, 1)$. All this is left for future work.

Here follows an outline of this article. In Section 2 we introduced our model and we state our main result. In Section 3 we prove tightness of the sequence of empirical measures associated with the density of particles. From that section we know that the sequence of empirical measures has weakly converging subsequences. Section 4 deals with the characterization of those limit points. In Section 5 we prove all the technical results which allow dealing with the non-linearity at the microscopic level. In the appendices we collect all the auxiliary results that are needed along the proofs.

2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

We begin by describing the microscopic dynamics. Let \mathbb{Z} be the set of integer numbers. Our state space is the set $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and we call its elements *configurations*, which are denoted by Greek letters η, ξ . The elements of \mathbb{Z} are called sites and are denoted by Latin letters x, y, z . Given a configuration $\eta \in \Omega$ and a site $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, we say that the site x is empty if $\eta(x) = 0$, and that the site x is occupied if $\eta(x) = 1$. Our particles will move between sites in \mathbb{Z} and according to a probability measure defined in (1.2). Given an initial configuration η , after the exchange of particles between the sites x and y the new configuration will be denoted by $\eta^{x,y}$, where

$$\eta^{x,y}(z) := \begin{cases} \eta(z), & z \neq x, y, \\ \eta(y), & z = x, \\ \eta(x), & z = y. \end{cases}$$

Unless it is explicitly stated otherwise, all the discrete variables in the summations below will range over \mathbb{Z} . We say that $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *local function*, if there exists a finite $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\eta(x) = \xi(x), \forall x \in \Lambda \Rightarrow f(\eta) = f(\xi)$. Our continuous time Markov process $(\eta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is characterized by its infinitesimal generator \mathcal{L} which is given on local functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(\eta) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x,y} p(y-x) c_{x,y}(\eta) [f(\eta^{x,y}) - f(\eta)], \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$c_{x,y}(\eta) := \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta) \xi_{x,y}(\eta), \quad (2.2)$$

with

$$\tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta) := \eta(x-1) + \eta(x+1) + \eta(y-1) + \eta(y+1) \quad (2.3)$$

and $\xi_{x,y}(\eta) := \eta(x)[1-\eta(y)] + \eta(y)[1-\eta(x)]$.

Remark 2.1. Choosing $y = x + 1$ in (2.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} c_{x,x+1}(\eta) &= [\eta(x-1) + \eta(x+1) + \eta(x) + \eta(x+2)](\eta(x)[1-\eta(x+1)] + \eta(x+1)[1-\eta(x)]) \\ &= \xi_{x,x+1}(\eta)[\eta(x-1) + \eta(x+2) + 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Above we used the fact that $\eta(z) \in \{0, 1\}$ for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, our dynamics always allows jumps of size 1 avoiding blocked configurations.

2.1. Notation. Given $r \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $C^r(\mathbb{R})$ if G is r times continuously differentiable and for $r = 0$, $C^0(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the set of continuous functions in \mathbb{R} . Also, $G \in C_c^r(\mathbb{R})$ if $G \in C^r(\mathbb{R})$ and G has compact support. Moreover, we use the notation $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}) := \bigcap_{r=0}^\infty C_c^r(\mathbb{R})$.

Hereafter we fix $T > 0$ and a finite time horizon $[0, T]$. We consider the Markov process speeded up by the time scale n^γ ; in this way, we denote $\eta_t^n := \eta_{tn^\gamma}$ and observe that the infinitesimal generator of $(\eta_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is $n^\gamma \mathcal{L}$. Let us now define the empirical measure associated to this process. For $\eta \in \Omega$, this measure gives weight $1/n$ to each particle in the following way:

$$\pi^n(\eta, du) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \eta(x) \delta_{x/n}(du),$$

where δ_u is a Dirac mass on $u \in \mathbb{R}$. In order to analyse the temporal evolution of the empirical measure, we define the process of the empirical measures as $\pi_t^n(\eta, du) := \pi^n(\eta_t^n, du)$. For a test function $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote the integral of G with respect to the empirical measure π_t^n , by $\langle \pi_t^n, G \rangle$. We note that this notation should not be mixed up with the inner product in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ that we will introduce below. For $t \in [0, T]$, we observe that $\pi_t^n \in \mathcal{M}^+$, where \mathcal{M}^+ is the space of non-negative Radon measures on \mathbb{R} and equipped with the weak topology.

Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\rho : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We are interested in deriving the fractional porous medium equation given by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t, u) = [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} \rho^2](t, u), & u \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0, T], \\ \rho(0, u) = g(u), & u \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

Above, the fractional Laplacian $-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2}$ of exponent $\gamma/2$ is defined on the set of functions $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{G(u)}{(1+|u|)^{1+\gamma}} du < \infty$$

by

$$[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](u) := c_\gamma \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{|u-v| \geq \varepsilon\}} \frac{G(v) - G(u)}{|u-v|^{1+\gamma}} dv \quad (2.5)$$

provided the limit exists. Above, c_γ is the constant appearing in (1.2).

Definition 2.2. The Sobolev space $\mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2}$ in \mathbb{R} consists of all functions $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{[f(u) - f(v)]^2}{|u-v|^{1+\gamma}} dudv < \infty.$$

This is a Hilbert space for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2}}$ defined by

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2}}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f(u))^2 du + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{[f(u) - f(v)]^2}{|u - v|^{1+\gamma}} dudv.$$

Below we use the notation $\langle f, g \rangle$ to denote the inner product between two functions $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Below $N \subset L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is a metric space with norm $\|\cdot\|_N$.

Definition 2.3. The space $L^2(0, T; N)$ is the set of all measurable functions $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(s, \cdot) \in N$ for almost every s on $[0, T]$ and $\int_0^T \|f(s, \cdot)\|_N^2 ds < \infty$. Moreover, the set $P([0, T], N)$ is the space of functions $G : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that there exist $k \in \mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and $G_0, G_1, \dots, G_k \in N$ so that

$$G(t, u) = \sum_{j=0}^k t^j G_j(u), \forall (t, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.6)$$

Our space of test functions is $\mathcal{S} := P([0, T], C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$. For every $G \in \mathcal{S}$, we denote

$$b_G := \inf \left\{ \tilde{b} \geq 0 : \sup_{|u| \geq \tilde{b}} |G(s, u)| = 0, \forall s \in [0, T] \right\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Finally, for every bounded function $G : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote $\|G\|_\infty := \sup_{u \in X} |G(u)|$.

2.2. The main result. Let $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of probability measures in Ω . For $n \geq 1$, let \mathbb{P}_{μ_n} be the probability measure on the Skorokhod space $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \Omega)$ induced by the Markov process $(\eta_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and the initial measure μ_n . Let \mathbb{E}_{μ_n} be the expectation with respect to \mathbb{P}_{μ_n} . Let $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the sequence of probability measures on $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+)$ induced by $(\pi_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and \mathbb{P}_{μ_n} .

Definition 2.4. Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a measurable function and $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of probability measures in Ω . We say that $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is associated with $g(\cdot)$, if for any $G \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R})$ and any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n \left(\eta \in \Omega : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_x G\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \eta(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(u) g(u) du \right| > \delta \right) = 0.$$

Now we define the notion of weak solution of the hydrodynamic equation that we obtain.

Definition 2.5. Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a measurable function. We say that $\rho : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a weak solution of the fractional porous medium equation in \mathbb{R} with initial condition g

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t, u) = [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} \rho^2](t, u), (t, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(0, u) = g(u), u \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

if the following conditions hold:

(1) for every $t \in [0, T]$ and for every $G \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds $F(t, \rho, G, g) = 0$, where

$$F(t, \rho, G, g) := \langle \rho_t, G_t \rangle - \langle g, G_0 \rangle - \int_0^t \langle \rho_s, \partial_s G_s \rangle ds - \int_0^t \langle \rho_s^2, [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \rangle ds;$$

(2) there exists $b \in (0, 1)$ such that $\rho - b \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ and $\rho^2 - b^2 \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$.

Remark 2.6. The uniqueness of weak solutions of (2.8) is proved in Appendix C.

Definition 2.7. Given $b \in (0, 1)$, we define the measure ν_b on Ω , which is the Bernoulli product measure with marginals $\nu_b \{ \eta \in \Omega : \eta(y) = 1 \} = b$, for every $y \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 2.8. We observe that under ν_b , the random variables $(\eta(y))_{y \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are i.i.d. with Bernoulli distribution of parameter b . Moreover, it holds $\nu_b(\eta^{x,y}) = \nu_b(\eta)$, $\forall \eta \in \Omega, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Combining last identity with the symmetry of p , we can conclude that ν_b is a reversible measure with respect to $n^\gamma \mathcal{L}$.

Finally, we can state the main result of this article. Hereafter we say that $g(n) \lesssim h(n)$ if there exists $C > 0$ such that $|g(n)| \leq C|h(n)|, \forall n \geq 1$.

Theorem 2.9. Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a measurable function. Let $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of probability measures in Ω associated to the profile g such that there exists $C_b > 0$ such that $\forall n \geq 1$

$$H(\mu_n | \nu_b) \leq C_b n, \quad (2.9)$$

for some $b \in (0, 1)$. Then, for any $t \in [0, T]$, any $G \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R})$ and any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\eta^n \in \mathcal{D}([0, T], \Omega) : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_x G\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \eta_t^n(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(u) \rho(t, u) du \right| > \delta \right) = 0,$$

where $\rho(t, \cdot)$ is the unique weak solution of (2.8).

Now we describe the strategy of the proof of Theorem 2.9. We follow the entropy method of [12]. In Section 3, we prove that $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is tight with respect to the Skorokhod topology of $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+)$ and therefore it has at least one limit point \mathbb{Q} . In Subsection 4.1 (resp. Subsection 4.2) we prove that any such limit point \mathbb{Q} is concentrated on trajectories of measures satisfying the first (resp. the second) condition of weak solutions of (2.8). Combining this with the uniqueness of weak solutions of (2.8) (proved in Appendix C), we can conclude that the aforementioned limit point \mathbb{Q} is actually unique, leading to the conclusion of Theorem 2.9. Some auxiliary replacement lemmas and discrete convergences are proved in Section 5 and Appendix A, respectively, and in Appendix B we present some properties of the fractional Laplacian.

3. TIGHTNESS

In this section, our goal is to prove that the sequence of probability measures $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is tight with respect to the Skorokhod topology of $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+)$. Following Propositions 4.1.6 and 4.1.7 of [14], in order to prove tightness of $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}_T, \tau_2 \leq \omega} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\eta^n \in \mathcal{D}([0, T], \Omega) : \left| \langle \pi_{\tau_1 + \tau_2}^n, G \rangle - \langle \pi_{\tau_1}^n, G \rangle \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

for every $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ (not depending on time, but we make the presentation more general) and every $\varepsilon > 0$. Above, \mathcal{T}_T is the set of stopping times bounded by T , therefore $\tau_1 + \tau_2$ must be read as $\min\{\tau_1 + \tau_2, T\}$. In order to do this, we use Lemma A1.5.1 of [14], which gives that

$$\mathcal{M}_t^n(G) := \langle \pi_t^n, G_t \rangle - \langle \pi_0^n, G_0 \rangle - \int_0^t (\partial_s + n^\gamma \mathcal{L}) \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle ds \quad (3.2)$$

is a martingale with respect to the natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^n := \{\sigma(\eta_s^n) : s \leq t\}$, for every $n \geq 1, t \in [0, T]$ and $G \in \mathcal{S}$. Moreover, from Lemma A1.5.1 of [14] we also get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[(\mathcal{M}_{\tau_1 + \tau_2}^n(G) - \mathcal{M}_{\tau_1}^n(G))^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_1 + \tau_2} n^\gamma [\mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle^2 - 2 \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle] ds \right]. \quad (3.3)$$

From (3.2), Markov's and Chebyshev's inequalities, (3.1) can be bounded from above by

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}_T, \tau_2 \leq \omega} \left\{ \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[|\mathcal{M}_{\tau_1 + \tau_2}^n(G) - \mathcal{M}_{\tau_1}^n(G)|^2 \right] + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\left| \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_1 + \tau_2} n^\gamma \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_r^n, G_r \rangle dr \right| \right] \right\}.$$

Hence, it is enough to show that last display vanishes for every $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. First we analyse the rightmost term in last display. From the symmetry of $p(\cdot)$ and performing algebraic manipulations, we obtain next result, whose proof is left to the reader. Despite we do not need it here, we stated it for time dependent functions since it will also be needed later on, in Section 4.

Proposition 3.1. *For every $G \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds*

$$\int_0^t n^\gamma \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle ds = \int_0^t \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x n^\gamma \mathcal{K}_n G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \eta_s^n(x) [\eta_s^n(x-1) + \eta_s^n(x+1)] ds \quad (3.4)$$

$$+ \int_0^t \frac{n^\gamma}{2n} \mathcal{R}_n^G(s) ds, \quad (3.5)$$

where \mathcal{K}_n and \mathcal{R}_n are defined on functions $G \in \mathcal{S}$ as

$$\mathcal{K}_n G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) := \sum_y [G_s \left(\frac{y}{n} \right) - G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right)] p(y-x), \quad (3.6)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_n^G(s) = \sum_x \eta_s^n(x) \left[\sum_y [G_s \left(\frac{x+1}{n} \right) - G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) + G_s \left(\frac{y}{n} \right) - G_s \left(\frac{y+1}{n} \right)] \eta_s^n(y+1) p(y-x) \right]. \quad (3.7)$$

Combining the last result with Propositions A.1 and A.2, we can conclude that for every $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, there exists $C(G)$ such that $\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |n^\gamma \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle| \leq C(G)$. To finish the proof we use the next result together with (3.3).

Proposition 3.2. *Let $G \in \mathcal{S}$. Then*

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left| n^\gamma \left(\mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle^2 - 2 \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle \right) \right| \lesssim \max\{n^{\gamma-2}, n^{-1}\}. \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. After performing some algebraic manipulations, the expression on the left-hand side of (3.8) can be rewritten as

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \frac{n^\gamma}{4n^2} \sum_{x, y} [G_s \left(\frac{y}{n} \right) - G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right)]^2 p(x-y) c_{x, y}(\eta_s^n) [\eta_s^n(x) - \eta_s^n(y)]^2.$$

From the fact that $|c_{x, y}(\eta_s^n)| \leq 4$ and $[\eta_s^n(x) - \eta_s^n(y)]^2 \leq 1, \forall s \in [0, T]$ and Proposition A.3 the proof ends. \square

4. CHARACTERIZATION OF LIMIT POINTS

From the results of Section 3, we know that $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ has at least one limit point \mathbb{Q} . From [14], since every site has at most one particle, any limit point \mathbb{Q} is concentrated on trajectories of measures that are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, i.e., $\pi_t(du) = \rho(t, u) du$ for almost every t on $[0, T]$. In this section we will prove additional properties of \mathbb{Q} : it is also concentrated on trajectories such that ρ satisfies the first and second conditions of weak solutions of (2.8). We start by showing that the first condition is satisfied.

4.1. The validity of condition (1) in Definition 2.5.

Proposition 4.1. *If \mathbb{Q} is a limit point of $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ then*

$$\mathbb{Q} \left(\pi. \in \mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+) : F(t, \rho, G, g) = 0, \forall t \in [0, T], \forall G \in \mathcal{S} \right) = 1,$$

where $F(t, \rho, G, g)$ is given in Definition 2.5.

Proof. In order to prove the proposition, it is enough to verify that for any $\delta > 0$ and any $G \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(\pi \in \mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+): \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |F(t, \rho, G, g)| > \delta\right) = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

In order to simplify the notation, we will omit π from the sets where we are looking at. From the definition of F , we get $|F(t, \rho, G, g)| \leq |F(t, \rho, G, \rho_0)| + |\langle \rho_0 - g, G_0 \rangle|$, so that we can bound (4.1) from above by

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |F(t, \rho, G, \rho_0)| > \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \mathbb{Q}\left(|\langle \rho_0 - g, G_0 \rangle| > \frac{\delta}{2}\right). \quad (4.2)$$

The rightmost term in last display is equal to zero since \mathbb{Q} is a limit point of $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and \mathbb{Q}_n is induced by μ_n which is associated with g , see Definition 2.4. Now we observe that $[-(\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s]$ is not in $C_c^0(\mathbb{R})$. Nevertheless, it is in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$, and we can approximate it in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ by smooth functions of compact support. Combining this with the fact that $\rho \in [0, 1]$ we use Portmanteu's Theorem and bound the leftmost term in (4.2) from above by

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{Q}_{n_k} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |F(t, \rho, G, \rho_0)| > \frac{\delta}{8} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

plus some terms that vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Above $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is a subsequence such that \mathbb{Q}_{n_k} converges weakly to \mathbb{Q} . Relabelling the terms if necessary, we can assume, without loss of generality, that \mathbb{Q}_{n_k} converges weakly to \mathbb{Q} . Summing and subtracting $\int_0^t n^\gamma \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle ds$ to the term inside the previous absolute value, recalling (3.2) and the definition of \mathbb{Q}_n , we can rewrite (4.3) as

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \mathcal{M}_t^n(G) + \int_0^t \left[n^\gamma \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle - \langle (\rho_s)^2, [-(\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \rangle \right] ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{8} \right),$$

which is bounded from above by the sum of the next two terms

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\mathcal{M}_t^n(G)| > \frac{\delta}{16} \right), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \left[n^\gamma \mathcal{L} \langle \pi_s^n, G_s \rangle - \langle (\rho_s)^2, [-(\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \rangle \right] ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{16} \right). \quad (4.5)$$

From Doob's inequality, Lemma A1.5.1 of [14] and Proposition 3.2, we conclude that (4.4) is equal to zero. Now we treat (4.5). For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed, we define the approximations of the identity $\overleftarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u$ and $\overrightarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u$ by

$$\overleftarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u(v) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[u-\varepsilon, u]}(v), \quad \text{and} \quad \overrightarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u(v) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{(u, u+\varepsilon]}(v), \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.6)$$

Putting this together with the fact that $\pi_t(du) = \rho(t, u)du$, we get

$$\langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle = \langle \rho_s, \overleftarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{u-\varepsilon}^u \rho(s, v) dv \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle = \langle \rho_s, \overrightarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_u^{u+\varepsilon} \rho(s, v) dv.$$

Combining this with the fact that $\rho \in [0, 1]$ and Lebesgue's Differentiation Theorem, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} |\langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle - \rho(s, u)| = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} |\langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle - \rho(s, u)| = 0, \quad (4.7)$$

for almost every $u \in \mathbb{R}$. From Proposition 3.1 we bound (4.5) by the sum of the next two terms

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle \cdot \langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle - (\rho_s(u))^2] [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s](u) du ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{32} \right), \quad (4.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x n^\gamma \mathcal{K}_n G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \eta_s^n(x) [\eta_s^n(x-1) + \eta_s^n(x+1)] ds \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \int_0^t \frac{n^\gamma}{2n} \mathcal{R}_n^G(s) ds - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle \cdot \langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_\varepsilon^u \rangle] [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s](u) du ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{32} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Since $[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, from (4.7) we get that (4.8) is equal to zero. Now we claim that the same holds for (4.9). Since the error from changing the integral in the space variable by its Riemann sum is of order n^{-1} , it is enough to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x n^\gamma \mathcal{K}_n G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \eta_s^n(x) [\eta_s^n(x-1) + \eta_s^n(x+1)] + \frac{n^\gamma}{2n} \mathcal{R}_n^G(s) \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x \langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x-1}{n}} \rangle \cdot \langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x-1}{n}} \rangle [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x-1}{n} \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x \langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x}{n}} \rangle \cdot \langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x}{n}} \rangle [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \right\} ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{32} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

is equal to zero. For $\ell \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define the empirical averages on a box of size ℓ around x as

$$\overrightarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) := \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{y=1}^{\ell} \eta(x+y) \quad \text{and} \quad \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) := \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{y=-\ell}^{-1} \eta(x+y). \quad (4.11)$$

From here on we interpret εn as $[\varepsilon n]$. Observe that $|\langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x-1}{n}} \rangle \cdot \langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x}{n}} \rangle - \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)| \lesssim (\varepsilon n)^{-1}$. This together with (B.1), gives

$$\left| \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x [\langle \pi_s, \overleftarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x-1}{n}} \rangle \cdot \langle \pi_s, \overrightarrow{i}_{\varepsilon \frac{x}{n}} \rangle - \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)] [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \right| \lesssim (\varepsilon n)^{-1}.$$

Then (4.10) is equal to zero if we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x n^\gamma \mathcal{K}_n G_s \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) [\eta_s^n(x-1) \eta_s^n(x) + \eta_s^n(x) \eta_s^n(x+1)] \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{n^\gamma}{2n} \mathcal{R}_n^G(s) - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x [[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x-1}{n} \right) - [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right)] \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x-1) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x [[\overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x-1) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) + \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right)] \right\} ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{32} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Last display is bounded from above by the sum of the next three terms

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{n^\gamma}{2n} \mathcal{R}_n^G(s) \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_x \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x-1) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) [[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x-1}{n} \right) - [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right)] \right\} ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{96} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{2}{n} \sum_x |n^\gamma \mathcal{K}_n G_s(\frac{x}{n}) - [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s](\frac{x}{n})| ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{96} \right), \quad (4.13)$$

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} \sum_x ([-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s](\frac{x}{n}) + [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s](\frac{x+1}{n})) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \times [\eta_s^n(x) \eta_s^n(x+1) - \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)] ds \right| > \frac{\delta}{96} \right). \quad (4.14)$$

In (4.13), we used the fact that $|\eta_s^n(\cdot)| \leq 1, \forall s \in [0, T]$. Combining the fact that $|\eta_s^n(\cdot)| \leq 1, \forall s \in [0, T]$ with Corollary B.3, Proposition A.2 and Markov's inequality, (4.12) is equal to zero. From the fact that $|\eta_s^n(\cdot)| \leq 1, \forall s \in [0, T]$, Proposition A.1 and Markov's inequality, (4.13) is equal to zero. Finally, since $[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G(s, \cdot)] \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, from Lemma 5.1 and Markov's inequality, (4.14) is equal to zero. This ends the proof. \square

Now we prove that any limit point \mathbb{Q} of the sequence $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is concentrated on trajectories of measures $\pi_t(du) = \rho(t, u)du$ such that ρ satisfies condition (2) of Definition 2.5.

4.2. The validity of condition (2) in Definition 2.5. Similarly to [5], we begin with an important result that does not depend on the dynamics but only on (2.9).

Proposition 4.2. *It holds*

$$\mathbb{Q} \left(\pi. \in \mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+) : \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\rho^2(t, u) - b^2]^2 dudt < \infty \right) = 1.$$

Proof. From Section 5.1 of [5], we know that

$$\mathbb{Q} \left(\pi. \in \mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+) : \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\rho(t, u) - b]^2 dudt < \infty \right) = 1.$$

Since $[\rho^2(t, u) - b^2]^2 = [\rho(t, u) + b]^2 [\rho(t, u) - b]^2 \leq 4[\rho(t, u) - b]^2$ for every $(t, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$, we have the desired result. \square

The main goal now is to prove the next result.

Proposition 4.3. *For $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, the measure \mathbb{Q} is concentrated on trajectories of measures $\pi_t(du) = \rho(t, u)du$, such that*

$$\mathbb{Q} \left(\pi. \in \mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^+) : \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{[\rho^2(t, u) - \rho^2(t, v)]^2}{|u - v|^{1+\gamma}} dudvdt < \infty \right) = 1.$$

We observe that the second condition of weak solution of (2.8) is a direct consequence of the two previous results. Before we prove Proposition 4.3, we establish some estimates on the Dirichlet form which are needed in the proof of the previous proposition. We define the Dirichlet form by $\langle \sqrt{f}, -\mathcal{L} \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\nu_b}$, where $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a density with respect to ν_b and for all functions $g, h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\langle g, h \rangle_{\nu_b}$ denotes the scalar product in $L^2(\Omega, \nu_b)$. The quadratic form associated to \mathcal{L} is the operator \mathcal{D} given by

$$\mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x, y} p(x - y) I_{x, y}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b), \quad (4.15)$$

where $I_{x,y}(\sqrt{f}, v_b) := \int_{\Omega} \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta) [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x,y})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d v_b = \int_{\Omega} c_{x,y}(\eta) [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x,y})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d v_b$. Above $c_{x,y}(\eta)$ and $\tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta)$ are given, respectively, in (2.2) and (2.3). From Remark 2.1, we get

$$\mathfrak{D}(\sqrt{f}, v_b) \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{|x-y|=1} p(x-y) \int_{\Omega} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x,y})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d v_b := \mathfrak{D}_{NN}(\sqrt{f}, v_b). \quad (4.16)$$

Observe that by a change of variables it is easy to check that

$$\langle \mathcal{L} \sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f} \rangle_{v_b} = -\frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{D}(\sqrt{f}, v_b) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{D}_{NN}(\sqrt{f}, v_b). \quad (4.17)$$

Now we will prove the main result of this subsection. Recall (2.9).

Proof of Proposition 4.3. It is enough to prove that there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\int_0^T \iint_{Q_{\varepsilon}} \frac{[\rho^2(t, v) - \rho^2(t, u)]^2}{|u-v|^{1+\gamma}} dudvdt \right] \leq C_1, \quad (4.18)$$

where $Q_{\varepsilon} := \{(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |u-v| \geq \varepsilon\}$. Indeed, the desired result is a direct consequence of (4.18) and the Monotone Convergence Theorem. To prove last claim, note that from Riesz's Representation Theorem, it is enough to show that there exist $C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\sup_F \left\{ \int_0^T \iint_{Q_{\varepsilon}} \left\{ \frac{[\rho^2(t, v) - \rho^2(t, u)] F(t, u, v)}{|u-v|^{1+\gamma}} - C_2 \frac{[F(t, u, v)]^2}{|u-v|^{1+\gamma}} \right\} dudvdt \right\} \right] \leq C_3, \quad (4.19)$$

where the supremum above is carried over $F \in C_c^{0,2}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2)$; we choose this space of test functions since it is dense in the Hilbert space $L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2, d\mu_{\varepsilon})$, where μ_{ε} is the measure whose density, with respect to the Lebesgue measure, is given by $(t, u, v) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\{|u-v| \geq \varepsilon\}} |u-v|^{-1-\gamma}$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$. It is enough to prove (4.19) with the supremum outside the expectation, since we can always use Lemma 7.5 in [15] to insert this supremum inside the expectation. Therefore from here on we fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and F in $C_c^{0,2}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2)$. Since \mathbb{Q} is a limit point of $(\mathbb{Q}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, from Lebesgue's Differentiation Theorem, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\int_0^T \iint_{Q_{\varepsilon}} \left\{ \frac{[\rho^2(t, v) - \rho^2(t, u)] F(t, u, v)}{|u-v|^{1+\gamma}} - C_2 \frac{[F(t, u, v)]^2}{|u-v|^{1+\gamma}} \right\} dudvdt \right] \\ & \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\int_0^T n^{\gamma-1} \sum_{x, y: |x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [[\overleftarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(y) \overrightarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(y+1) - \overleftarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(x) \overrightarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(x+1)] F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - C_2 [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n})]^2] (c_{\gamma})^{-1} p(x-y) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $F \in C_c^{0,2}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2)$, there exists $b_F > 0$ such that $F(t, u, v) = 0$ if $|u| \geq b_F$ or $|v| \geq b_F$. Now we define $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 1} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_n(t, \frac{x}{n}) := n^{\gamma} \sum_{y: |x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) p(y-x), \forall t \in [0, T], \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We observe that $\Phi_n(t, \frac{x}{n}) = 0$ if $|x| \geq b_F$ and

$$|\Phi_n(t, \frac{x}{n})| \leq \|F\|_{\infty} n^{\gamma} \sum_{y: |x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} p(x-y) \lesssim \|F\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^{-\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_x |\Phi_n(t, \frac{x}{n})| \lesssim b_F \|F\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^{-\gamma}.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed, we see that $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies (5.1). From Lemma 5.1, we get

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\int_0^T n^{\gamma-1} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [\overleftarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(x) \overrightarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(x+1) - \eta_t^n(x) \eta_t^n(x+1)] F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) (c_\gamma)^{-1} p(x-y) dt \right] = 0.$$

In an analogous way, we get that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\int_0^T n^{\gamma-1} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [\overleftarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(y) \overrightarrow{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon_1 n}(y+1) - \eta_t^n(y) \eta_t^n(y+1)] F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) (c_\gamma)^{-1} p(x-y) dt \right] = 0.$$

Then in order to obtain (4.19), it is enough to find $C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\int_0^T n^{\gamma-1} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} \{ [\eta_t^n(y) \eta_t^n(y+1) - \eta_t^n(x) \eta_t^n(x+1)] F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) - C_2 [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n})]^2 \} p(x-y) dt \right] \leq C_3 c_\gamma. \quad (4.20)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T n^{\gamma-1} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [\eta_t^n(y) \eta_t^n(y+1) - \eta_t^n(x) \eta_t^n(x+1)] F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) p(x-y) dt \\ &= \int_0^T \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{2} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [\eta_t^n(y) - \eta_t^n(x)] \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta_t^n) F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) p(x-y) dt \\ &+ \int_0^T \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{2} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [\eta_t^n(y-1) \eta_t^n(y) - \eta_t^n(x-1) \eta_t^n(x)] [F(t, \frac{x-1}{n}, \frac{y-1}{n}) - F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n})] p(x-y) dt \\ &+ \int_0^T \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{2} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} \eta_t^n(x) \eta_t^n(y+1) [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) - F(t, \frac{x+1}{n}, \frac{y+1}{n})] p(x-y) dt \\ &+ \int_0^T \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{2} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} \eta_t^n(x) \eta_t^n(y-1) [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) - F(t, \frac{x-1}{n}, \frac{y-1}{n})] p(x-y) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε is fixed, performing some Taylor expansions on F , we conclude that the last three terms in last display vanish as n goes to infinity and only the first one remains. Then we need to study

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\int_0^T \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{2} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [\eta_t^n(y) - \eta_t^n(x)] \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta_t^n) F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) p(x-y) dt \right].$$

From entropy inequality plus (2.9), Jensen's inequality and Feynman-Kac formula (see [14]), last display is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} C_b + \int_0^T \sup_f \left\{ \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{2} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}) p(y-x) \int_{\Omega} [\eta(y) - \eta(x)] \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta) f(\eta) d\nu_b \right. \\ \left. + n^{\gamma-1} \langle \mathcal{L} \sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\nu_b} \right\} dt, \quad (4.21) \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum above is carried over all the densities f with respect to ν_b . In last inequality we also used the facts that $e^{|u|} \leq e^u + e^{-u}$ and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(a_n + b_n) = \max \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(a_n), \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(b_n) \right\}. \quad (4.22)$$

From the change of variables η to $\eta^{x,y}$ and Remark 2.8, we can rewrite the first term inside the supremum in (4.21) as

$$\frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{2} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} F\left(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n}\right) p(y-x) \int_{\Omega} \eta(y) \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta) [f(\eta) - f(\eta^{x,y})] d\nu_b. \quad (4.23)$$

Note that $f(\eta) - f(\eta^{x,y}) = [\sqrt{f(\eta)} - \sqrt{f(\eta^{x,y})}][\sqrt{f(\eta)} + \sqrt{f(\eta^{x,y})}]$. From Young's inequality, for any $A > 0$ we can bound (4.23) from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^{\gamma-1}A}{4} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n})]^2 p(y-x) \int_{\Omega} \eta(y) \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta) [\sqrt{f(\eta)} + \sqrt{f(\eta^{x,y})}]^2 d\nu_b \\ & + \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{4A} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} p(y-x) \int_{\Omega} \eta(y) \tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta) [\sqrt{f(\eta)} - \sqrt{f(\eta^{x,y})}]^2 d\nu_b. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\tilde{c}_{x,y}(\eta)| \leq 4$, $|\eta(y)| \leq 1$ and f is a density with respect to ν_b , the previous expression can be bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & 4n^{\gamma-1}A \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n})]^2 p(y-x) + \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{4A} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} p(y-x) I_{x,y}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \\ & \leq 4n^{\gamma-1}A \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n})]^2 p(y-x) + \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{A} \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, choosing $A = 2$, from (4.17) the expression inside the supremum in (4.21) is bounded from above by

$$8n^{\gamma-1} \sum_{x,y:|x-y| \geq \varepsilon n} [F(t, \frac{x}{n}, \frac{y}{n})]^2 p(y-x) \quad (4.24)$$

In particular, (4.20) holds with $C_2 = 8$ and $C_3 = \frac{C_b}{c_\gamma}$, leading to the desired result. \square

5. REPLACEMENT LEMMAS

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma 5.1, which is useful in order to produce the main results of Section 4.

Lemma 5.1. (Replacement Lemma) Assume $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 1} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_x \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n})| \leq M_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi_n\|_{\infty} := \sup_{(s,u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}} |\Phi_n(s, u)| \leq M_2, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (5.1)$$

Then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) [\eta_s(x) \eta_s(x+1) - \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x) \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)] ds \right| \right] = 0.$$

Now we describe the strategy of the proof, which is accomplished in three steps that we now describe. In the first step, Lemma 5.2, we replace $\eta(x)\eta(x+1)$ by $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x)\eta(x+1)$, with $\ell = \varepsilon n^{\gamma/2}$. In the second step, Lemma 5.4, we replace $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x)\eta(x+1)$ by $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x)\overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)$, for $\ell = \varepsilon n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$. In the third step, Lemma 5.5, we replace $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x)\overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)$ by $\overleftarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x)\overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)$, for $\ell = \varepsilon n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$. Following the procedure described above, Lemma 5.1 is a direct consequence of last results. We begin with the first step. We do not present its proof, since it is very similar to the proof of Lemma 5.3 in [4], but now, one has to take into account the fact that summations are running over \mathbb{Z} and that nearest-neighbor jumps are always possible, see Remark 2.1.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 1} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (5.1) and denote $\ell = \varepsilon n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$. Then*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) [\eta_s(x) - \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^\ell(x)] \eta_s(x+1) ds \right| \right] = 0. \quad (5.2)$$

Now we state an auxiliary lemma, which is an alternative version of Lemma 5.8 in [2]. It will be useful in the proof of Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5.


Lemma 5.3. (Moving Particle Lemma) *Fix $r \neq 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and f a density with respect to ν_b on Ω . For every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\Omega_x := \{\eta \in \Omega : \eta(x-2) = \eta(x-1) = 1\}$. Then*

$$\sum_x \int_{\Omega_x} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x, x+r})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d\nu_b \lesssim |r|^\gamma \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $r > 0$. First fix $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Our goal is to exchange particles at the bond $\{x, x+r\}$. We will do so through a variety of paths, defined using an intermediate site between x and $x+r$. There are two possibilities: there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r = 2m$ (case 1) or there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r = 2m-1$ (case 2). In the first case, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we choose $z_{1j} := x+m+j$. In the later one, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ we choose $z_{1j} := x+m-1+j$. Moreover, for every j , denote $z_{0j} := x$ and $z_{2j} := x+r$. We observe that there are no repetitions inside the set $\{|z_{1j} - z_{0j}|, |z_{2j} - z_{1j}|\}; j = 1, \dots, m\}$. Now fix $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Moreover, $\sqrt{f(\eta^{x, x+r})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)} = 0$ when $\eta(x) = \eta(x+r)$, therefore we can restrict ourselves to the configurations $\eta \in \Omega_x$ such that $\eta(x) \neq \eta(x+r)$. First we focus on the following subset of Ω_x :

$$\Omega_{j,x}^1 := \{\eta \in \Omega_x : \eta(x) = 1, \eta(z_{1j}) = 0, \eta(x+r) = 0\}.$$

Now we will illustrate the sequence of operations performed in order to go from the initial configuration $\eta_0 := \eta$ to $\eta_6 := \eta^{x, x+r}$ for the set $\Omega_{j,x}^1$.






FIGURE 2. Operations performed to exchange the particles in the bond $\{x, x+r\}$ for configurations in $\Omega_{j,x}^1$

Observe that in Figure 2, $\tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\eta_k) \geq 1$ for $k=0, 4$, $\tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\eta_k) \geq 1$ for $k=1, 5$. Moreover, $\tilde{c}_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\eta_2) \geq 1$ and $\tilde{c}_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\eta_3) \geq 1$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{k=0}^5 \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} [\sqrt{f(\eta_{k+1})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_k)}]^2 d\nu_b \tag{5.3} \\
 & \leq \sum_{k=0,4} \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\eta_k) [\sqrt{f(\eta_k^{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_k)}]^2 d\nu_b \\
 & + \sum_{k=1,5} \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\eta_k) [\sqrt{f(\eta_k^{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_k)}]^2 d\nu_b \\
 & + \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\eta_2) [\sqrt{f(\eta_2^{z_{0j}, z_{1j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_2)}]^2 d\nu_b + \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\eta_3) [\sqrt{f(\eta_3^{z_{1j}, z_{2j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_3)}]^2 d\nu_b.
 \end{aligned}$$

For every $k > 0$ we perform the transformation $\eta_k \rightarrow \eta_0$ and observe that the measure ν_b is invariant under these transformations. Then we bound (5.3) from above by

$$2 \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \tag{5.4}$$

$$+ 2 \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \tag{5.5}$$

$$+ \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}, z_{1j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b + \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^1} \tilde{c}_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{1j}, z_{2j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b. \tag{5.6}$$

Above, we performed six exchanges of particles in order to go from η to $\eta^{x, x+r}$; four auxiliary ones (dealing with the two particles originally at $x-1$ and $x-2$) and two principal ones. First we go from η to $\eta_1 := \eta^{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}$ and then from η_1 to $\eta_2 := \eta^{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}$. Now we perform the two principal exchanges, by going from η_2 to η_3 and from η_3 to η_4 . Finally, we return the two

auxiliary particles to their original positions, going from η_4 to $\eta_5 := \eta_4^{z_{0j}^{-1}, z_{1j}^{-1}}$ and from η_5 to $\eta_6 := \eta_5^{z_{0j}^{-2}, z_{1j}^{-2}}$. Observe that $\eta_6 = \eta^{x, x+r}$ as desired. Since $\eta_0 = \eta$, we can write

$$\sqrt{f(\eta^{x, x+r})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)} = \sum_{k=1}^6 [\sqrt{f(\eta_k)} - \sqrt{f(\eta_{k-1})}].$$

Now we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{j,x}^2 &:= \{\eta \in \Omega_x : \eta(x) = 0, \eta(z_{1j}) = 1, \eta(x+r) = 1\}; \\ \Omega_{j,x}^3 &:= \{\eta \in \Omega_x : \eta(x) = 0, \eta(z_{1j}) = 0, \eta(x+r) = 1\}; \\ \Omega_{j,x}^4 &:= \{\eta \in \Omega_x : \eta(x) = 1, \eta(z_{1j}) = 1, \eta(x+r) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_x} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x, x+r})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d\nu_b &= \sum_{i=1}^4 \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^i} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x, x+r})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d\nu_b \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{k=0}^5 \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^i} [\sqrt{f(\eta_{k+1})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_k)}]^2 d\nu_b. \end{aligned}$$

Then from (5.4), (5.5), (5.6) and analogous expressions in the remaining sets, we bound last display from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \sum_{i=1}^4 \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^i} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}^{-1}, z_{1j}^{-1}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \\ &+ 2 \sum_{i=1}^4 \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^i} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}^{-2}, z_{1j}^{-2}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^4 \left[\int_{\Omega_{j,x}^i} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}, z_{1j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b + \int_{\Omega_{j,x}^i} \tilde{c}_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{1j}, z_{2j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \right] \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}^{-1}, z_{1j}^{-1}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \\ &+ 2 \int_{\Omega} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}^{-2}, z_{1j}^{-2}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \tilde{c}_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{0j}, z_{1j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b + \int_{\Omega} \tilde{c}_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\eta_0) [\sqrt{f(\eta_0^{z_{1j}, z_{2j}})} - \sqrt{f(\eta_0)}]^2 d\nu_b \\ &\lesssim I_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) + I_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) + I_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) + I_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Observe that every jump has length at most $2m$. Since $[p(z_i - z_{i-1})]^{-1} \leq (2m)^{1+\gamma} \leq 8m^{1+\gamma}$, we bound the expression in (5.7) from above by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned} &m^{1+\gamma} \left[p(z_{1j} - z_{0j}) I_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) + p(z_{1j} - z_{0j}) I_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p(z_{1j} - z_{0j}) I_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) + p(z_{2j} - z_{1j}) I_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \right], \end{aligned}$$

and this holds for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Summing over $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, diving then both sides by m and then summing over $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_x \int_{\Omega_x} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x,x+r})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d\nu_b \\ & \lesssim m^\gamma \left[\sum_x \sum_{j=1}^m p(z_{1j} - z_{0j}) I_{z_{0j}-1, z_{1j}-1}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) + \sum_x \sum_{j=1}^m p(z_{1j} - z_{0j}) I_{z_{0j}-2, z_{1j}-2}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_x \sum_{j=1}^m p(z_{1j} - z_{0j}) I_{z_{0j}, z_{1j}}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) + \sum_x \sum_{j=1}^m p(z_{2j} - z_{1j}) I_{z_{1j}, z_{2j}}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We observe the the first three double sums above are equivalent and correspond to jumps with m different lengths ($m+j$ if $r=2m$ or $m-1+j$ if $r=2m-1$), therefore in each one of the first three double sums, every bond is repeated at most once. On the other hand, the last double sum corresponds to jumps with size $m-j$ (therefore there is no coincidence with the jumps in the first three double sums) and every bond is repeated at most once. Hence when we combine the four double sums every bond in \mathcal{B} is repeated at most twice, which gives

$$\sum_x \int_{\Omega_x} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{x,x+r})} - \sqrt{f(\eta)}]^2 d\nu_b \lesssim m^\gamma 3\mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \lesssim |r|^\gamma \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b),$$

since $m \leq |r|$. \square

Now we state and prove the second step described above. The strategy is similar to the one used to prove Lemma 5.7 in [4].

Lemma 5.4. *Assume $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 1} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (5.1) and denote $\ell(\varepsilon, n) := \varepsilon n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$. Then*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^\ell(x) [\eta_s(x+1) - \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)] ds \right| \right] = 0. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. By entropy's inequality, (2.9) and Jensen's inequality, we can bound the previous expectation from above by

$$\frac{C_B}{B} + \frac{1}{nB} \log \mathbb{E}_{\nu_b} \left[\exp \left(Bn \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^\ell(x) [\eta_s(x+1) - \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)] ds \right| \right) \right], \quad (5.9)$$

for every $B > 0$. Since $e^{|u|} \leq e^u + e^{-u}$ and (4.22), by Feynman-Kac's formula, we can bound last expression by

$$\frac{C_b}{B} + T \sup_f \left\{ \left| \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)] f(\eta) d\nu_b \right| + \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{B} \langle \mathcal{L} \sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\nu_b} \right\} ds, \quad (5.10)$$

where the supremum above is carried over all densities f with respect to ν_b . Since

$$\eta(x+1) - \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon n} \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)],$$

we can rewrite the leftmost term inside the supremum in (5.10) as

$$\left| \frac{1}{\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \int_{\Omega} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)] f(\eta) d\nu_b \right|. \quad (5.11)$$

Writing $f(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}f(\eta) + \frac{1}{2}f(\eta)$, making the change of variables $\eta \mapsto \tilde{\eta} := \eta^{x+1, x+1+r}$ in one of the integrals and using Remark 2.8, we get that last expression equals to

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\epsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\epsilon n} \int_{\Omega} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)] [f(\eta) - f(\eta^{x+1, x+1+r})] d\nu_b \right|. \quad (5.12)$$

We observe that $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x)$ is invariant under the change of variables $\eta \mapsto \tilde{\eta}$. To treat the last display, we note that we are in a situation similar to the one used in Lemma 5.7 of [4], in which we need to exchange the particles in the bond $\{x+1, x+1+r\}$. First, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote the set of configurations that have at least two particles in $\{x-\ell, \dots, x-1\}$ by $\Omega_1(x) := \{\eta \in \Omega : \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) \geq \frac{2}{\ell}\}$. Thus, we can bound (5.12) by

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\epsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\epsilon n} \int_{\Omega - \Omega_1(x)} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)] [f(\eta) - f(\eta^{x+1, x+1+r})] d\nu_b \right| \quad (5.13)$$

$$+ \left| \frac{1}{2\epsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\epsilon n} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)] [f(\eta) - f(\eta^{x+1, x+1+r})] d\nu_b \right|. \quad (5.14)$$

Since $\frac{1}{n} \sum_x |\Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n})|$ is bounded, $|\eta(\cdot)| \leq 1$ and f is a density with respect to ν_b , (5.13) is bounded from above by a constant times $\frac{1}{\ell}$. Due to our choice of ℓ and since $\gamma > 0$, (5.13) vanishes as n goes to infinity. It remains to examine (5.14), where we want to go from $\eta_{0,x,r} := \eta$ to $\eta^{x+1, x+1+r}$. The strategy is the following: for any configuration $\eta \in \Omega_1(x)$, denote by x_1 and x_2 the position of the particles inside the box $\{x-\ell, \dots, x-1\}$ closest to the site $x+1$. With at most 2ℓ nearest-neighbor jumps, we can move the particles at x_1 and x_2 to x and $x-1$, creating a group of at least 2 particles in consecutive sites. We denote this configuration by $\eta_{1,x,r}$. Then, we exchange the particles in the bond $\{x+1, x+1+r\}$, following the procedure described in the proof of the Moving Particle Lemma. At this point, our configuration is $\eta_{2,x,r} := (\eta_{1,x,r})^{x+1, x+1+r}$. Finally, we use nearest-neighbor jumps in order to bring the particles at x and $x-1$ back to their initial positions x_1 and x_2 , respectively. We observe that our configuration now is exactly $\eta_{3,x,r} := \eta^{x+1, x+1+r}$.




FIGURE 3. Strategy used to exchange particles at the bond $\{x, x+1+r\}$

Hence, we can write

$$f(\eta) - f(\eta^{x+1, x+1+r}) = \sum_{k=0}^2 [f(\eta_{k, x, r}) - f(\eta_{k+1, x, r})].$$

Then we can bound (5.14) from above by the sum of

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)] [f(\eta) - f(\eta_{1, x, r})] d\nu_b \right|, \quad (5.15)$$

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)] [f(\eta_{2, x, r}) - f(\eta_{3, x, r})] d\nu_b \right|, \quad (5.16)$$

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)] [f(\eta_{1, x, r}) - f(\eta_{2, x, r})] d\nu_b \right|. \quad (5.17)$$

We observe that both (5.15) and (5.16) deal with nearest-neighbor jumps and we can estimate both expressions in the same way. Let us examine (5.15). We can write

$$f(\eta) - f(\eta_{1, x, r}) = \sum_{i \in I_{1, x}^{NN}} [f(\eta^{(i-1)}) - f(\eta^{(i)})],$$

where $I_{1, x}^{NN}$ are the set of bonds in which we use nearest-neighbor jumps. Note that for two nonnegative numbers x and y , it holds $x - y = (\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y})(\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y})$. Thus, combining this identity with Young's inequality, we can bound (5.15) from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{4\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \sum_{i \in I_{1, x}^{NN}} \frac{1}{A_{NN}} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x)^2 [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)]^2 [\sqrt{f(\eta^{(i-1)})} + \sqrt{f(\eta^{(i)})}]^2 d\nu_b \right| \\ & + \left| \frac{1}{4\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{i \in I_{1, x}^{NN}} A_{NN} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{(i-1)})} - \sqrt{f(\eta^{(i)})}]^2 d\nu_b \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4\varepsilon n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x |\Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n})| \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \frac{8\ell}{A_{NN}} + \frac{A_{NN} \|\Phi_n\|_\infty}{4n} \int_\Omega \sum_x \sum_{i \in I_{1, x}^{exc}} [\sqrt{f(\eta^{(i-1)})} - \sqrt{f(\eta^{(i)})}]^2 d\nu_b, \end{aligned}$$

for any $A_{NN} > 0$. Above we used the fact that $I_{1, x}^{NN}$ has at most 2ℓ bonds, $\eta(x) \leq 1$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, and f is a density with respect to ν_b . We observe that in the double summation inside the integral over Ω above, every bond appears at most 2ℓ times. From (4.16) and (5.1) we can bound (5.15) from above by a constant times

$$\frac{\ell M_1}{A_{NN}} + \frac{A_{NN} M_2}{n} \ell \mathcal{D}_{NN}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b), \quad \forall A_{NN} > 0. \quad (5.18)$$

With the same reasoning, we can bound (5.16) from above by a constant times

$$\frac{\ell M_1}{A_{NN}} + \frac{A_{NN} M_2}{n} \ell \mathcal{D}_{NN}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b). \quad (5.19)$$

We observe that (5.17) deals mostly with long jumps. With a similar reasoning as we did with (5.15), we can bound (5.17) from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{4\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \frac{1}{A} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} [\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x)]^2 [\eta(x+1) - \eta(x+1+r)]^2 [\sqrt{f(\eta_{1,x,r})} + \sqrt{f(\eta_{2,x,r})}]^2 d\nu_b \right| \\ & + \left| \frac{A}{4\varepsilon n^2} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \int_{\Omega_1(x)} [\sqrt{f(\eta_{1,x,r})} - \sqrt{f((\eta_{1,x,r})^{x+1,x+1+r})}]^2 d\nu_b \right| \\ & \leq \frac{M_1}{A} + \frac{AM_2}{4\varepsilon n^2} \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} \sum_x \int_{\Omega_1(x)} [\sqrt{f(\eta_{1,x,r})} - \sqrt{f((\eta_{1,x,r})^{x+1,x+1+r})}]^2 d\nu_b, \end{aligned}$$

for every $A > 0$. Above we made use of (5.1) and Remark 2.8. From the Moving Particle Lemma, we can bound (5.17) from above by a constant times

$$\frac{M_1}{A} + \frac{AM_2}{4\varepsilon n^2} \sum_{r=1}^{\varepsilon n} r^\gamma \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \leq \frac{M_1}{A} + AM_2 \varepsilon^\gamma n^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b), \forall A > 0. \quad (5.20)$$

Therefore, taking $A_{NN} = \frac{n^\gamma}{4BM_2\ell}$ in (5.18) and (5.19), $A = \frac{1}{2BM_2\varepsilon^\gamma}$ in (5.20), from Lemma 4.17 we conclude that (5.10) is bounded from above by a constant, times

$$\frac{1}{B} + TBM_1M_2 \left(\frac{\ell^2}{n^\gamma} + \varepsilon^\gamma \right).$$

Choosing $B = \varepsilon^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}$, due to our choice for ℓ , the previous expression vanishes for any $\gamma < 2$ when we take first $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. \square

Finally we state and prove the third step. The strategy is similar to the one used to prove Lemma 5.8 in [4].

Lemma 5.5. *Assume $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 1} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (5.1) and denote $\ell(\varepsilon, n) := \varepsilon n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$. Then*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) [\overleftarrow{\eta}_s^\ell(x) - \overleftarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x)] \overrightarrow{\eta}_s^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) ds \right| \right] = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

Proof. After similar steps to the one ones performed in the beginning of the proof of Lemma 5.4 we can bound the previous expectation by

$$\frac{C_b}{B} + T \sup_f \left\{ \left| \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) [\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) - \overleftarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) f(\eta) d\nu_b \right| + \frac{n^{\gamma-1}}{B} \langle \mathcal{L} \sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\nu_b} \right\} ds, \quad (5.22)$$

where the supremum above is carried over all densities f with respect to ν_b . In the same way it was done in the proof of Lemma 5.8 in [4], we write $\varepsilon n = m\ell$ and observe that

$$\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) - \overleftarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x) = \frac{1}{m\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)], \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then we can rewrite the leftmost term in the supremum in (5.22) as

$$\left| \frac{1}{m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} \int_{\Omega} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) f(\eta) d\nu_b \right|.$$

Writing $f(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}f(\eta) + \frac{1}{2}f(\eta)$, making the change of variables $\eta \mapsto \tilde{\eta} := \eta^{z, z-j\ell}$ in one of the integrals and using Remark 2.8, last expression is equal to

$$\left| \frac{1}{2m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} \int_{\Omega} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) [f(\eta) - f(\eta^{z, z-j\ell})] d\nu_b \right|. \quad (5.23)$$

Above we observe that $\overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)$ is invariant under the change of variables $\eta \mapsto \tilde{\eta}$, since $z \leq x-1$. Now we need to examine (5.23). Our goal is to exchange the particles in the bond $\{z, z-j\ell\}$. For every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $j \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, we denote

$$\Omega_2^j(x) := \left\{ \eta \in \Omega : \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) \geq \frac{2}{\ell} \right\} \cup \left\{ \eta \in \Omega : \overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x-j\ell) \geq \frac{2}{\ell} \right\}.$$

Thus, we can bound (5.23) by

$$\left| \frac{1}{2m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} \int_{\Omega - \Omega_2^j(x)} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) [f(\eta) - f(\eta^{z, z-j\ell})] d\nu_b \right| \quad (5.24)$$

$$+ \left| \frac{1}{2m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} \int_{\Omega_2^j(x)} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) [f(\eta) - f(\eta^{z, z-j\ell})] d\nu_b \right|. \quad (5.25)$$

Since $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |\Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n})|$ is bounded, $|\eta(\cdot)| \leq 1$ and f is a density with respect to ν_b , (5.24) is bounded from above by a constant times $\frac{1}{\ell}$. Due to our choice of ℓ and since $\gamma > 0$, (5.24) vanishes as n goes to infinity. It remains to deal with (5.25), where we want to go from $\eta_{0,x,j,z} := \eta$ to $\eta^{z, z-j\ell}$. If $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) \geq \frac{2}{\ell}$, the strategy is the following: for any configuration $\eta \in \Omega_1(x)$, denote by x_1 and x_2 the position of the particles inside the box $\{x-\ell, \dots, x-1\}$ closest to z . With at most 2ℓ nearest-neighbor jumps, we can move the particles at x_1 and x_2 to $z-1$ and $z-2$. On the other hand, if $\eta \in \Omega_2^j$ and $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x) \leq \frac{1}{\ell}$ then necessarily we have $\overleftarrow{\eta}^\ell(x-j\ell) \geq \frac{2}{\ell}$; in this case, denote by x_1 and x_2 the position of the particles inside the box $\{x-j\ell-\ell, \dots, x-j\ell-1\}$ closest to $z-j\ell$. With at most 2ℓ nearest-neighbor jumps, we can move the particles at x_1 and x_2 to $z-j\ell-1$ and $z-j\ell-2$. In both cases, we denote the configuration with the group of at least two particles in consecutive sites next to z (resp. $z-j\ell$) by $\eta_{1,x,j,z}$. Then, we exchange the particles in the bond $\{z, z-j\ell\}$, following the procedure described in the proof of the Moving Particle Lemma. At this point, our configuration is $\eta_{2,x,j,z} := (\eta_{1,x,j,z})^{z, z-j\ell}$. Finally, we use nearest-neighbor jumps in order to bring the two auxiliary particles back to their initial positions x_1 and x_2 . We observe that our configuration now is exactly $\eta_{3,x,j,z} := \eta^{z, z-j\ell}$. Hence, we can write

$$f(\eta) - f(\eta^{z, z-j\ell}) = \sum_{k=0}^2 [f(\eta_{k,x,j,z}) - f(\eta_{k+1,x,j,z})].$$

In this way, we can bound (5.25) from above by the sum of

$$\left| \frac{1}{2m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \int_{\Omega_2^j(x)} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) [f(\eta) - f(\eta_{1,x,j,z})] d\nu_b \right|, \quad (5.26)$$

$$\left| \frac{1}{2m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \int_{\Omega_2^j(x)} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) [f(\eta_{2,x,j,z}) - f(\eta_{3,x,j,z})] d\nu_b \right|, \quad (5.27)$$

$$\left| \frac{1}{2m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \int_{\Omega_2^j(x)} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)] \overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1) [f(\eta_{1,x,j,z}) - f(\eta_{2,x,j,z})] d\nu_b \right|. \quad (5.28)$$

We observe that both (5.26) and (5.27) deal with nearest-neighbor jumps and we can estimate both expressions in the same way. With an analogous procedure used to estimate (5.15), from (4.16) and (5.1) we can bound both (5.26) and (5.27) from above by a constant times

$$\frac{\ell M_1}{A_{NN}} + \frac{A_{NN} M_2}{n} \ell \mathcal{D}_{NN}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b), \forall A_{NN} > 0. \quad (5.29)$$

We observe that (5.28) deals with mostly with long jumps. With a similar reasoning as we did with (5.17), we can bound (5.28) from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{4m\ell n A} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} \int_{\Omega_2^j(x)} [\eta(z) - \eta(z-j\ell)]^2 [\sqrt{f(\eta_{1,x,j,z})} + \sqrt{f(\eta_{2,x,j,z})}]^2 d\nu_b \right| \\ & + \left| \frac{A}{4m\ell n} \sum_x \Phi_n(s, \frac{x}{n}) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \int_{\Omega_2^j(x)} \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} [\overrightarrow{\eta}^{\varepsilon n}(x+1)]^2 [\sqrt{f(\eta_{1,x,j,z})} - \sqrt{f((\eta_{1,x,j,z})^{z,z-j\ell})}]^2 d\nu_b \right| \\ & \leq \frac{M_1}{A} + \frac{A M_2}{4\varepsilon n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_x \sum_{z=x-\ell}^{x-1} \int_{\Omega_2^j(x)} [\sqrt{f(\eta_{1,x,j,z})} - \sqrt{f((\eta_{1,x,j,z})^{z,z-j\ell})}]^2 d\nu_b, \end{aligned}$$

for every $A > 0$. Above we used (5.1) and Remark 2.8. From the Moving Particle Lemma, we can bound (5.28) by a constant times

$$\frac{M_1}{A} + \frac{A M_2}{4\varepsilon n^2} \ell \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (j\ell)^\gamma \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b) \leq \frac{M_1}{A} + A M_2 \varepsilon^\gamma n^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_b), \forall A > 0. \quad (5.30)$$

Therefore, choosing $A_{NN} = \frac{n^\gamma}{4B M_2 \ell}$ in (5.29) and $A = \frac{1}{4B M_2 \varepsilon^\gamma}$ in (5.30), from (4.17) we conclude that (5.22) is bounded from above by a constant, times

$$\frac{1}{B} + T B M_1 M_2 \left(\frac{\ell^2}{n^\gamma} + \varepsilon^\gamma \right).$$

Choosing $B = \varepsilon^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}$, due to our choice for ℓ , the previous expression vanishes for any $\gamma < 2$ when we take first $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. \square

APPENDIX A. DISCRETE CONVERGENCES

In this section we present several results that were used along the article to treat the components of the integral term of Dynkin's martingale in Proposition 3.1. The first result below is Proposition A.1 of [6], and it is useful to treat (3.4) and motivates the choice n^γ for the time scale.

Proposition A.1. *For every $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ and $G \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |n^\gamma \mathcal{K}_n G_s(\frac{x}{n}) - [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s](\frac{x}{n})| = 0.$$

The next result we present is useful to treat (3.5), see also the argument below (4.13).

Proposition A.2. Recall (3.7). For every $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ and $G \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \frac{n^\gamma}{2n} \mathcal{R}_n^G(s) ds \right| \right] = 0.$$

Proof. Since $|\eta_s^n(\cdot)| \leq 1$, the proof ends if we show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x, y} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} n^\gamma |G(s, \frac{x+1}{n}) - G(s, \frac{x}{n}) + G(s, \frac{y}{n}) - G(s, \frac{y+1}{n})| p(y-x) = 0.$$

Performing two Taylor expansions of second order on G around $(s, \frac{x}{n})$ and $(s, \frac{y}{n})$, we can bound the double summation above by

$$n^{\gamma-3} \sum_x \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\Delta G(s, \chi_x)| \sum_y p(y-x) + n^{\gamma-3} \sum_y \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\Delta G(s, \chi_y)| \sum_x p(y-x) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$+ n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{x, y} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\partial_u G(s, \frac{x}{n}) - \partial_u G(s, \frac{y}{n})| p(y-x), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\chi_x \in (\frac{x}{n}, \frac{x+1}{n})$ for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\chi_y \in (\frac{y}{n}, \frac{y+1}{n})$ for every $y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |G(s, u)| = 0$ if $|u| \geq b_G$, (A.1) can be bounded by $2(2b_G + 3) \|\Delta G\|_\infty n^{\gamma-2}$, which vanishes as n goes to infinity, since $\gamma < 2$. Now we rewrite (A.2) as

$$n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{|x| > 2b_G n} \sum_{|y| \leq b_G n} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\partial_u G(s, \frac{x}{n}) - \partial_u G(s, \frac{y}{n})| p(y-x) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$+ n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \sum_y \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\partial_u G(s, \frac{x}{n}) - \partial_u G(s, \frac{y}{n})| p(y-x). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We can bound (A.3) by

$$n^{\gamma-2} 2 \|\partial_u G\|_\infty \sum_{|x| > 2b_G n} \sum_{|y| \leq b_G n} p(y-x) \lesssim n^{-1} \int_{|v| \leq b_G} \int_{|u| \geq 2b_G} |u-v|^{-1-\gamma} du dv \lesssim n^{-1} (b_G)^{1-\gamma},$$

which vanishes as n goes to infinity. It remains to treat (A.4). We bound it from above by

$$n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \sum_{|y| > 3b_G n} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\partial_u G(s, \frac{x}{n}) - \partial_u G(s, \frac{y}{n})| p(y-x) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$+ n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \sum_{|y| \leq 3b_G n} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\partial_u G(s, \frac{x}{n}) - \partial_u G(s, \frac{y}{n})| p(y-x). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We bound (A.5) from above by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \sum_{y > 3b_G n} \|\partial_u G\|_\infty (y-x)^{-\gamma-1} &\lesssim n^{-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{y=3b_G n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{y-x}{n}\right)^{-\gamma-1} \\ &\lesssim n^{-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \left(3b_G - \frac{x}{n}\right)^{-\gamma} \leq n^{-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} (b_G)^{-\gamma} \lesssim n^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, observe that functions in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ are globally Lipschitz and therefore δ -Hölder on the compact space $[-3b_G, 3b_G]$ for every $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Since $G \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ we can always choose $\delta \in [0, 1] \cap (\gamma-1, \gamma)$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\partial_u G(s, \frac{x}{n}) - \partial_u G(s, \frac{y}{n})| \leq C_{G, \delta} |x-y|^\delta n^{-\delta}, \forall x, y \in [-3b_G n, 3b_G n].$$

for some $C_{G,\delta} > 0$ (for example, we can choose $\delta = 0$ for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\delta = 1/2$ for $\gamma = 1$ and $\delta = 1$ for $\gamma \in (1, 2)$). Then we can bound (A.6) by

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \sum_{|y| \leq 2b_G n} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} C_{G,\delta} |x-y|^\delta n^{-\delta} p(y-x) \\ & \lesssim n^{\gamma-2-\delta} \sum_{|x| \leq 2b_G n} \sum_{z \neq 0} |z|^{\delta-\gamma-1} = 2(2b_G+1)n^{\gamma-1-\delta} \sum_{z=1}^{\infty} z^{\delta-\gamma-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta < \gamma$, the summation over z in the last line is convergent and the expression in last display is of order $n^{\gamma-1-\delta}$, going to zero as n goes to infinity (since $\delta > \gamma - 1$). This leads ends the proof. \square

We end this section recalling Proposition A.10 of [6].

Proposition A.3. *Let $G \in \mathcal{S}$. Then we have*

$$n^{\gamma-2} \sum_{x,y} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} [G_s(\frac{y}{n}) - G_s(\frac{x}{n})]^2 p(y-x) \lesssim \max\{n^{\gamma-2}, n^{-1}\}.$$

APPENDIX B. PROPERTIES OF THE FRACTIONAL LAPLACIAN

Here we state some results regarding the fractional Laplacian which we used earlier. Recall (2.6). Then for $G \in \mathcal{S}$ we have

$$[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](t, u) = \sum_{j=0}^k t^j [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_j](u), \forall (t, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We begin with a classical result which is stated and proved in Section 2.2.1 of [7]. In this Section $G^{(k)}$ denotes the k -th derivative of $G \in C^k(\mathbb{R})$.

Proposition B.1. *We have $([-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G]^{(k)}) = [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G^{(k)}]$, for every $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and every $k \geq 1$. In particular, for $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, it holds $[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](s, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, for every $s \in [0, T]$.*

Now we state another result which is classical but we did not find its proof in the literature, therefore, we prove it here for the convenience of the reader.

Proposition B.2. *The fractional Laplacian maps $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ into $L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. In particular,*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_x \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s](\frac{x}{n})| < \infty, \forall G \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proof. Fix $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and recall the definition of b_G in (2.7). Now define $H^G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$H^G(u) := \begin{cases} c_\gamma \int_{-u-b_G}^{-u+b_G} \frac{\|G\|_\infty}{w^{\gamma+1}} dw, & \text{if } u < -2b_G; \\ c_\gamma \int_0^{3b_G} \frac{\|\Delta G\|_\infty}{w^{\gamma-1}} dw, & \text{if } -2b_G \leq u \leq 2b_G; \\ c_\gamma \int_{u-b_G}^{u+b_G} \frac{\|G\|_\infty}{w^{\gamma+1}} dw, & \text{if } u > 2b_G. \end{cases}$$

From simple computations, we conclude that $H^G \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Then, it is enough to prove that $|[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](u)| \leq H^G(u), \forall u \in \mathbb{R}$. We rewrite the fractional Laplacian as

$$[-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](u) = c_\gamma \int_0^\infty \frac{G(u+w) + G(u-w) - 2G(u)}{w^{\gamma+1}} dw.$$

There are three possibilities to analyse: $u > 2b_G$, $u < -2b_G$ and $-2b \leq u \leq 2b_G$. First assume $u > 2b_G$. Since $G(y) = 0$ when $u \geq b_G$, we get

$$\left| [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](u) \right| = c_\gamma \left| \int_0^\infty \frac{G(u-w)}{w^{\gamma+1}} dw \right| = c_\gamma \left| \int_{u-b_G}^{u+b_G} \frac{G(u-w)}{w^{\gamma+1}} dw \right| \leq H^G(u).$$

The case $u < -2b_G$ is similar. It remains to deal with the case $|u| \leq 2b_G$. In this case, we get $0 = G(u+w) = G(u-3w), \forall w > 3b_G$. This leads to

$$[(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](u) = c_\gamma \int_0^{3b_G} \frac{[G(u+w) - G(u)] + [G(u-w) - G(u)]}{w^{\gamma+1}} dw.$$

Since $G \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$, performing two Taylor expansions of second order on G , we get

$$\left| [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](u) \right| \leq c_\gamma \int_0^{3b_G} \frac{\|\Delta G\|_\infty}{w^{\gamma-1}} dw = H^G(u),$$

ending the proof. \square

Finally, we state a result which is a consequence of the two previous ones.

Corollary B.3. *Let $G \in \mathcal{S}$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left| [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x-1}{n} \right) - [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \right| = 0.$$

Proof. From Proposition B.2, it holds

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|x| \geq Mn} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left| [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x-1}{n} \right) - [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \right| = 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

From Propositions B.1 and B.2, there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(s, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}} \left| \left([(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \right)^{(1)}(u) \right| \leq K.$$

Then a Taylor expansion of first order leads to

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|x| < Mn} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left| [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x-1}{n} \right) - [(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_s] \left(\frac{x}{n} \right) \right| \leq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2MK}{n} = 0. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The proof ends combining (B.2) and (B.3). \square

APPENDIX C. UNIQUENESS OF WEAK SOLUTIONS

In this section we prove the uniqueness of the weak solutions of (2.8) for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \geq 2$. First we observe that from Theorem 7.38 in [1], we know that $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2}$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2}}$. Moreover, from Proposition 23.2 (d) in [17], we also know that $P([0, T], \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$ is dense in $L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$. As a corollary of these results we obtain that \mathcal{S} is dense in $L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$. We recall that weak solutions of (2.8) deal with \mathcal{S} as the space of test functions and the uniqueness of the weak solutions of (2.8) is equivalent to the following result. Recall the definition of $F(t, \rho, G, g)$ given in Definition 2.5.

Proposition C.1. *Let ρ_1, ρ_2 be such that $\rho_1 - b, \rho_2 - b \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ and $\rho_1^m - b^m, \rho_2^m - b^m \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$, for some $b \in (0, 1)$. If $F(t, \rho_1, G, g) = 0 = F(t, \rho_2, G, g), \forall t \in [0, T], \forall G \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ almost everywhere in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Denote $\rho_3 := \rho_1 - \rho_2 = [\rho_1 - b] - [\rho_2 - b]$. Then $\rho_3 \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}))$. Moreover, denote $\rho_4 := \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \rho_1^k \rho_2^{m-1-k}$ and $\rho_5 := \rho_3 \cdot \rho_4$. Then $\rho_5 = [\rho_1^m - b^m] - [\rho_2^m - b^m]$, $\rho_5 \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$ and $\rho_5(s, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2}$, for almost every $s \in [0, T]$. For every $t \in [0, T]$, for every $G \in \mathcal{S}$ we get that $0 = F(t, \rho_1, G, g) - F(t, \rho_2, G, g)$ is equivalent to

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_3(t, u) G(t, u) du - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_3(s, u) \partial_s G(s, u) duds - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_5(s, u) [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G](s, u) duds. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Since $\rho_5 \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$, there exists $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$ in \mathcal{S} such that $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$ converges to ρ_5 with respect to the norm of $L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$. Define $G_k(t, u) := \int_t^T H_k(s, u) ds, \forall (t, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}, \forall k \geq 1$. In particular, $G_k(T, u) = 0, \forall u \in \mathbb{R}, \forall k \geq 1$. Taking $t = T$ and $G = G_k$ in (C.1), we get

$$0 = - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_3(s, u) \partial_s G_k(s, u) duds - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_5(s, u) [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_k](s, u) duds, \forall k \geq 1. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

To treat the rightmost term in last display, we can use Lemma B.9 of [6], that says that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_5(s, u) [-(-\Delta)^{\gamma/2} G_k](s, u) duds = - \frac{c_\gamma}{4} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{[\int_0^T \rho_5(r, u) dr - \int_0^T \rho_5(s, v) ds]^2}{|u - v|^{1+\gamma}} dudv. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

In order to treat the leftmost term we claim that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_3(s, u) \partial_s G_k(s, u) duds = - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\rho_3(s, u)]^2 \rho_4(s, u) duds. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Indeed, from the definition of $(G_k)_{k \geq 1}$, we get $\partial_s G_k(s, u) = -H_k(s, u)$ for all $s \in [0, T]$, for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $k \geq 1$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_3(s, u) \partial_s G_k(s, u) duds + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\rho_3(s, u)]^2 \rho_4(s, u) duds \right| \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_3(s, u) [\rho_5(s, u) - H_k(s, u)] duds \right| \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\rho_3(s, u)]^2 duds} \sqrt{\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\rho_5(s, u) - H_k(s, u)]^2 duds} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Above we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the fact that $\rho_3 \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ and that $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$ converges to ρ_5 in $L^2(0, T; \mathcal{H}^{\gamma/2})$. From last results, taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (C.2), we obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\rho_3(s, u)]^2 \rho_4(s, u) duds + \frac{c_\gamma}{4} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{[\int_0^T \rho_5(r, u) dr - \int_0^T \rho_5(s, v) ds]^2}{|u - v|^{1+\gamma}} dudv = 0.$$

Since $[\rho_3]^2 \rho_4 \geq 0$ on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$, we have $[\rho_3]^2 = [\rho_1 - \rho_2]^2 = 0$ or $\rho_4 = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \rho_1^k \rho_2^{m-1-k} = 0$, and both imply $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ almost everywhere in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$. \square

Acknowledgements: PC. and R.P. thank FCT/Portugal for financial support through the project Lisbon Mathematics Ph.D. (LisMath). PC. and P.G. thank FCT/Portugal for financial support through CAMGSD, IST-ID, projects UIDB/04459/2020 and UIDP/04459/2020. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovative programme (grant agreement n. 715734).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Adams. Sobolev spaces. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 65. Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1975.
- [2] C. Bernardin, P. Cardoso, P. Gonçalves, and S. Scotta. Hydrodynamic limit for a boundary driven super-diffusive symmetric exclusion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01621, 2021.
- [3] C. Bernardin, P. Gonçalves, and B. Jiménez-Oviedo. A microscopic model for a one parameter class of fractional Laplacians with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 239(1):1–48, 2021.
- [4] L. Bonorino, R. de Paula, P. Gonçalves, and A. Neumann. Hydrodynamics of porous medium model with slow reservoirs. J. Stat. Phys., 179(3):748–788, 2020.
- [5] P. Cardoso, P. Gonçalves, and B. Jiménez-Oviedo. Hydrodynamic behavior of long-range symmetric exclusion with a slow barrier: diffusive regime. arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02868 and submitted for publication, 2021.
- [6] P. Cardoso, P. Gonçalves, and B. Jiménez-Oviedo. Hydrodynamics behavior of long-range symmetric exclusion with a slow barrier: superdiffusive behavior. at arxiv and submitted for publication, 2022+.
- [7] M. Daoud and E. H. Laamri. Fractional Laplacians: a short survey. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S, 15(1):95–116, 2022.
- [8] A. De Pablo, F. Quirós, A. Rodríguez, and J.L. Vázquez. A fractional porous medium equation. Adv. Math., 226(2):1378–1409, 2011.
- [9] A. De Pablo, F. Quirós, A. Rodríguez, and J.L. Vázquez. A general fractional porous medium equation. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 65(9):1242–1284, 2012.
- [10] P. Gonçalves, C. Landim, and C. Toninelli. Hydrodynamic limit for a particle system with degenerate rates. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., 45(4):887–909, 2009.
- [11] P. Gonçalves, G. Nahum, and M. Simon. From exclusion to slow and fast diffusion. in preparation, 2022.
- [12] M. Z. Guo, G. C. Papanicolaou, and S. R. S. Varadhan. Nonlinear diffusion limit for a system with nearest neighbor interactions. Comm. Math. Phys., 118(1):31–59, 1988.
- [13] M. Jara. Hydrodynamic limit of particle systems with long jumps. arXiv preprint arXiv:0805.1326, 2008.
- [14] C. Kipnis and C. Landim. Scaling limits of interacting particle systems, volume 320. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [15] C. Kipnis, C. Landim, and S. Olla. Hydrodynamical limit for a nongradient system: the generalized symmetric exclusion process. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 47(11):1475–1545, 1994.
- [16] J. Vazquez. The porous medium equation - mathematical theory. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2007.
- [17] E. Zeidler. Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. II/A. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990. Linear monotone operators, Translated from the German by the author and Leo F. Boron.