

CLT FOR NESS OF A REACTION-DIFFUSION MODEL

P. GONÇALVES, M. JARA, R. MARINHO, AND O. MENEZES

ABSTRACT. We study the scaling properties of the non-equilibrium stationary states (NESS) of a reaction-diffusion model. Under a suitable smallness condition, we show that the density of particles satisfies a law of large numbers with respect to the NESS, with an explicit rate of convergence, and we also show that at mesoscopic scales the NESS is well approximated by a local equilibrium (product) measure, in the total variation distance. In addition, in dimensions $d \leq 3$ we show a central limit theorem (CLT) for the density of particles under the NESS. The corresponding Gaussian limit can be represented as an independent sum of a white noise and a massive Gaussian free field, and in particular it presents macroscopic correlations.

1. Introduction

Non-equilibrium stationary states (NESS) describe the large-time behavior of stochastic interacting systems that are kept out of equilibrium by the action of external forces. A main characteristic of NESS is the presence of *steady flows*, which can manifest themselves as energy flows, particle flows or mass flows. NESS typically appear when a closed system is kept in contact with several *reservoirs* with different thermodynamic parameters, such as temperature or chemical potential.

When stochastic interacting systems are modelled by Markov chains, the NESS have a simple probabilistic interpretation. An invariant, ergodic measure of a Markov chain is a NESS if it is not reversible with respect to the generator of the Markov chain.

In this article, we propose a general mathematical framework to describe the NESS of *driven diffusive systems*. In order to keep the technical parts at an acceptable level, we consider one of the simplest models of driven diffusive systems, the so-called *reaction-diffusion model* introduced in [4], with *quadratic* reaction term. This model has a single order parameter, the density of particles. Our main result is a description at the level of the central limit theorem (CLT) of the fluctuations of the density of particles with respect to the NESS. We show that, in dimension $d \leq 3$ and under a near-equilibrium condition, the scaling limit of these fluctuations is described by a Gaussian process, which is a mixture of a white noise and a massive Gaussian free field, and in particular it presents non-local spatial correlations. These non-local correlations are a signature of NESS, and their precise description is one of the main goals of a mathematical treatment of NESS.

At the level of the law of large numbers and the large deviations principle, the so-called *macroscopic fluctuation theory* (MFT) provides a fairly complete description of the fluctuations of the density of particles with respect to the NESS, see [2, 15]. However, at the level of the CLT, a description of the fluctuations is only available for a handful of models, [18, 14, 7, 8].

Key words and phrases. exclusion process, non-equilibrium state, fluctuations, SPDEs.

Although we prove our main result only for an example of a reaction-diffusion model, we claim that our framework can be used to derive a CLT for NESS of general driven diffusive models in dimensions $d \leq 3$ under a near-equilibrium condition. The restriction on the dimension is necessary, but technical, while the near-equilibrium condition is necessary in the following sense. For reaction-diffusion models with cubic interactions, as the one considered in [4], a phase transition appears at bifurcation points of the effective reaction function defined in (2.3). Since our methodology also applies for the model considered in [4], it is natural to expect a restriction in terms of the parameters of the model.

The proof of the CLT for NESS is based on an explicit estimate of the *relative entropy* between the NESS and a product Bernoulli measure, valid for any dimension d . Our proof uses Yau's relative entropy method [19], recently improved in [11] and that yields quantitative estimates for the convergence results. In dimension $d = 1$, the entropy estimate is uniform on the size of the system. In dimensions $d \geq 2$, the estimate is not uniform on the size of the system. As a consequence of our results we are also able to show that the fluctuations of the NESS are absolutely continuous with respect to a white noise for any $d \leq 3$.

Since our entropy estimates are explicit, they allow *quantitative* estimates on the law of large numbers for the NESS in every dimension $d \geq 1$. As far as we know, these estimates are the first example in the literature of what we call *quantitative hydrostatics*. Using the translation invariance of the NESS, we also show that in boxes of mesoscopic size, the structure of the NESS is indistinguishable from a Bernoulli product measure, a fact known in the literature as *local equilibrium*.

Outline. In Section 2 we present the reaction-diffusion model we consider here and we state our main results. The main objective of Section 3 is to present a complete proof of Theorem 2.4, which is the estimate of the relative entropy of the NESS with respect to the Bernoulli product measure $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$, where ρ_* is the unique zero in $[0, 1]$ of the function F defined in (2.3). The proof combines Yau's inequality, reviewed in Section 3.1, with the log-Sobolev inequality, reviewed in Section 3.2, and with Lemma 3.3, introduced in [11] and called *main lemma*. We present here a complete proof of the main lemma for two reasons. First, in our setting we only use translation-invariant reference measures, which makes the proof of Theorem 3.3 easier to follow in our context. And second, we need to keep track of all constants in the estimates, so that later on we can tune the parameter λ to make the constants in Lemma 3.3 small enough. With the entropy estimate, the proof of Theorems 2.3 and 2.6 can be completed. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 2.7. In order to prove it, we use the *dynamical approach* introduced in [2] and used in [6] to derive a large deviations principle for the NESS of boundary-driven diffusive systems. In dimension $d = 1$, the idea is simple. The entropy estimate of Theorem 2.4 implies tightness of the fluctuations of the density of particles around its hydrostatic limit. Moreover, any convergent subsequence satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 2.4 in [11]. From these two facts, the proof of Theorem 2.7 follows as in [8]. In dimensions $d = 2, 3$, the entropy estimate of Theorem 2.4 is not good enough to imply tightness directly. Therefore, we use a more indirect approach, based on Duhamel's formula for solutions of the SPDE (4.2).

2. Model and statement of results

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a scaling parameter and let $\mathbb{T}_n^d := \mathbb{Z}^d / n\mathbb{Z}^d$ be the discrete torus of size n and dimension d . Let $\Omega_n := \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{T}_n^d}$ be the state space of a Markov chain $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$ to be described below. The elements $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ are called *sites* and the elements $\eta = (\eta_x; x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d) \in \Omega_n$ are called *particle configurations*. We say that the configuration $\eta \in \Omega_n$ has a particle at site $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ if $\eta_x = 1$. If $\eta_x = 0$, we say that the site x is *empty*.

For $x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and $\eta \in \Omega_n$, let $\eta^{x,y} \in \Omega_n$ be given by

$$\eta_z^{x,y} := \begin{cases} \eta_y & ; z = x, \\ \eta_x & ; z = y, \\ \eta_z & ; z \neq x, y. \end{cases}$$

In other words, $\eta^{x,y}$ is the particle configuration obtained from η by exchanging the values of η_x and η_y . For $f : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let $\nabla_{x,y} f : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\nabla_{x,y} f(\eta) := f(\eta^{x,y}) - f(\eta)$$

for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$.

For $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and $\eta \in \Omega_n$, let $\eta^x \in \Omega_n$ be given by

$$\eta_z^x := \begin{cases} 1 - \eta_x & ; z = x, \\ \eta_z & ; z \neq x, \end{cases}$$

that is, η^x is the particle configuration obtained from η by changing the value of η_x . For $f : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let $\nabla_x f : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\nabla_x f(\eta) := f(\eta^x) - f(\eta)$$

for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$.

Let $x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. We say that $x \sim y$ if $|x_1 - y_1| + \dots + |x_d - y_d| = 1$. Let $a, b > 0$ and $\lambda > -a$. For each $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let $c_x = c_x(a, b, \lambda, d) : \Omega_n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be given by

$$c_x(\eta) := \left(a + \frac{\lambda}{2d} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} \eta_y \right) (1 - \eta_x) + b\eta_x \quad (2.1)$$

for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. Observe that the conditions on a, b and λ imply that $c_x(\eta) \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and every $\eta \in \Omega_n$, where $\varepsilon_0 := \min\{a, a + \lambda, b\}$. This condition makes the Markov chain defined below *irreducible*. Later on the parameter λ will be chosen smaller than some constant $\lambda_c = \lambda_c(a, b, d)$. For each $f : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $L_n f : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by¹

$$L_n f := n^2 \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} \nabla_{x,y} f + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} c_x \nabla_x f. \quad (2.2)$$

The linear operator L_n defined in this way turns out to be the generator of a Markov chain in Ω_n that we denote by $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$. The sequence of chains $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an example of what is known in the literature as a *reaction-diffusion model*.

¹Here and below, $\sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}}$ indicates a sum over *unordered* pairs $x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$.

As pointed out above, under the condition $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, the chain $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$ is irreducible, and therefore it has a unique invariant measure that will be denoted by μ_{ss}^n . For $\lambda \neq 0$, the measure μ_{ss}^n is not reversible with respect to $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$. For this reason, we say that the measure μ_{ss}^n is a *non-equilibrium stationary state* (NESS). Our main goal is the description of the scaling limits of the density of particles with respect to the measures $(\mu_{ss}^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$. For the moment we will not be very specific about what we understand by the density of particles; a proper definition will be included where needed.

Notation. We will denote by $\mathbb{P}^n$ the law of $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$ on the space $\mathcal{D}([0, \infty), \Omega_n)$ of càdlàg trajectories, and we will denote by $\mathbb{E}^n$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^n$. Whenever we need to specify the initial law μ^n of the chain $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$, we will use the notations $\mathbb{P}_{\mu^n}^n, \mathbb{E}_{\mu^n}^n$. We will denote by C a finite and positive constant depending only on a, b, d , which may change from line to line.

2.1. Hydrodynamic limit and hydrostatic limit. The generator L_n combines an *exclusion dynamics*, corresponding to the operator L_n^{ex} given by

$$L_n^{\text{ex}} f := n^2 \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} \nabla_{x, y} f,$$

with a *reaction dynamics*, corresponding to the operator L_n^{r} given by

$$L_n^{\text{r}} f := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} c_x \nabla_x f.$$

Observe that the reaction rates defined in (2.1) correspond to a *contact process* with an additional creation term avoiding absorption at density zero. The reaction-diffusion model was introduced in [4] with a reaction term corresponding to a stochastic Ising model. The key observation of [4] is the following. In order that both parts of the dynamics, the exclusion part and the reaction part, have a non-trivial effect on the scaling limits of the density of particles, one must include a factor n^2 in front of the exclusion part of the dynamics, as in the definition of L_n given in (2.2). In [4] the authors derive the so-called *hydrodynamic limit* of the reaction-diffusion model, which we now describe. For $\rho \in [0, 1]$, let ν_ρ^n be the Bernoulli product measure in Ω_n of density ρ :

$$\nu_\rho^n(\eta) := \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} (\eta_x \rho + (1 - \eta_x)(1 - \rho))$$

for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. Fix $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and let $F : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$F(\rho) := \int L_n \eta_x d\nu_\rho^n \tag{2.3}$$

for every $\rho \in [0, 1]$. Since the operator L_n and the measures $(\nu_\rho^n; \rho \in [0, 1])$ are translation invariant, F does not depend on x . Observe that

$$L_n \eta_x = n^2 \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} (\eta_y - \eta_x) + c_x(\eta)(1 - 2\eta_x) = n^2 \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} (\eta_y - \eta_x) + \left(a + \frac{\lambda}{2d} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} \eta_y \right) (1 - \eta_x) - b\eta_x.$$

Therefore,

$$F(\rho) = (a + \lambda\rho)(1 - \rho) - b\rho \quad (2.4)$$

for every $\rho \in [0, 1]$. We will also need to introduce the function $G : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$G(\rho) := (a + \lambda\rho)(1 - \rho) + b\rho \quad (2.5)$$

for every $\rho \in [0, 1]$. Observe that $G(\rho) = F(\rho + 2b\rho)$, although this relation is not relevant in what follows.

Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ be the set of continuous functions $f : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let $(\pi_t^n; t \geq 0)$ be the family of measures defined by duality as

$$\pi_t^n(f) := \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \eta_x^n(t) f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$. We have that

Proposition 2.1 (Hydrodynamic limit [4, 13]). *Let $(\mu^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of probability measures in Ω_n and let $u_0 : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a given measurable function. Assume that for every $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \eta_x f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_0(x) f(x) dx$$

in probability with respect to $(\mu^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$. For every $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and every $t \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_t^n(f) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_t(x) f(x) dx$$

in probability with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\mu^n}^n$, where $(u_t; t \geq 0)$ is the solution of the hydrodynamic equation

$$\partial_t u = \Delta u + F(u) \quad (2.6)$$

with initial condition u_0 .

This result is known in the literature as the hydrodynamic limit of the reaction-diffusion model $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. The hydrodynamic equation (2.6) is an example of a *reaction-diffusion equation*. The intuition behind the definition of the function F appearing in (2.6) is the following. If we look at the dynamics on a box of size $1 \ll \ell \ll n$, the exclusion dynamics is much faster than the reaction dynamics; in fact, the exclusion dynamics takes times of order $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\ell^2}{n^2})$ in order to equilibrate the density of particles on a box of size ℓ , and the first jump of the reaction dynamics happens after times of order ℓ^{-d} . Therefore, if $\ell \ll n^{\frac{2}{2+d}}$, the exclusion dynamics equilibrates the density of particles between consecutive jumps of the reaction dynamics. Since the Bernoulli product measures are invariant under the exclusion dynamics, it is reasonable to assume that at least on boxes of size $\ell \ll n^{\frac{2}{2+d}}$, the law of the process is close to product. Therefore it makes sense to define the function F as the average reaction rate with respect to ν_ρ^n . This intuition will be made rigorous for the invariant measure μ_{ss}^n in Theorem 2.6 below. Theorem 2.6 also shows that the size ℓ of the boxes on which this product approximation is accurate is larger than $n^{\frac{2}{2+d}}$.

Observe that $F(0) = a > 0$, $F(1) = -b < 0$ and F is a polynomial of degree 2. Therefore, F has a unique zero ρ_* in $[0, 1]$, which satisfies $0 < \rho_* < 1$ and $F'(\rho_*) < 0$, from where

we conclude that ρ_* is also stable. The density ρ_* can be explicitly computed, but its exact formula plays no role in our proofs; we will only use the property

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \rho_* = \frac{a}{a+b} \in (0, 1).$$

This limit can be directly verified from the explicit formula for ρ_* or it can be deduced from the fact that $F(\rho) \rightarrow a - \rho(a+b)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

In view of the stationarity properties of the hydrodynamic equation (2.6), it is reasonable to postulate that, with respect to μ_{ss}^n , the density of particles is close to ρ_* . However, a proof of this claim requires a non-trivial exchange of limits. Such exchange of limits has been justified in [15], elaborating over an idea introduced in [16, 6]:

Proposition 2.2 (Hydrostatic limit). *For every $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \eta_x f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_* f(x) dx$$

in probability with respect to $\{\mu_{ss}^n; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Our first result is a quantitative version of Proposition 2.2. For $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $g_d(n)$ be defined as

$$g_d(n) := \begin{cases} n & ; d = 1, \\ \log n & ; d = 2, \\ 1 & ; d \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Observe that $g_d(n)$ corresponds to the order of magnitude of the Green's function at 0 of a simple symmetric random walk absorbed at the boundary of a box of size n , centered at the origin.

Theorem 2.3. *There exist $\lambda_c = \lambda_c(a, b, d)$ positive and $C = C(a, b, d)$ finite such that for every $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$,*

$$\int \left(\frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} (\eta_x - \rho_*) f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \right)^2 \mu_{ss}^n(d\eta) \leq \frac{C g_d(n)}{n^2} \cdot \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)^2.$$

For every probability measure μ in Ω_n and every density f with respect to μ , let $H(f; \mu)$ denote the relative entropy of f with respect to μ :

$$H(f; \mu) := \int f \log f d\mu.$$

Theorem 2.3 is a consequence of the following estimate:

Theorem 2.4. *Let f_{ss}^n be the density of μ_{ss}^n with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. There exist $\lambda_c = \lambda_c(a, b, d)$ positive and $C = C(a, b, d)$ finite such that*

$$H(f_{ss}^n; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) \leq C n^{d-2} g_d(n)$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$.

Remark 2.5. The value of λ_c is the same in Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, but the value of C can be different.

Given two probability measures μ, ν in Ω_n , the relative entropy of μ with respect to ν is defined as $H(\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}; \nu)$ if μ is absolutely continuous with respect to ν and $+\infty$ otherwise. Although relative entropy is not a distance (it is not even symmetric), it is widely used in the literature as a measure of closeness between probability measures. Another popular way to measure the closeness of two probability measures is through the *total variation distance*. The total variation distance between μ and ν is defined as

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\eta \in \Omega_n} |\mu(\eta) - \nu(\eta)|.$$

Total variation and relative entropy are related by *Pinsker's inequality*:

$$2d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu)^2 \leq H\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}; \nu\right).$$

Observe that the relative entropy bound of Theorem 2.4 is not strong enough to conclude that the measures μ_{ss}^n and $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ are close. This is actually expected, since we will see in Theorem 3.4 below that the scaling limits of the density of particles are different under μ_{ss}^n and $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. Nevertheless, we will prove that the bound of Theorem 2.4 is good enough to show a strong version of what is known in the literature as *conservation of local equilibrium*, namely, that restricted to boxes of mesoscopic size, the measures μ_{ss}^n and $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ are close in total variation. In order to be precise, we need a few definitions. Let $\mathcal{P} : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^d$ be the universal cover of $\mathbb{T}_n^d$. For $R \in \mathbb{N}$, let $B_R := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d; |x_i| \leq R, i = 1, \dots, d\}$. For $n > 2R + 1$, let $\Pi_R : \Omega_n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{B_R}$ be the canonical projection: $(\Pi_R \eta)_x = \eta_{\mathcal{P}(x)}$ for every $x \in B_R$. Let $\mu_{\text{ss}}^{n,R}$ be the push-forward of μ_{ss}^n under Π_R and let $\nu_{\rho_*}^{n,R}$ be the push-forward of $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ under Π_R . We will prove the following result:

Theorem 2.6. *If*

$$\frac{R_n g_d(n)^{1/d}}{n^{2/d}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

then

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_{\text{ss}}^{n,R_n}, \nu_{\rho_*}^{n,R_n}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This theorem states that on a window of mesoscopic size R_n , the NESS μ_{ss}^n is asymptotically indistinguishable from a Bernoulli product measure of density ρ_* .

2.2. Fluctuations and CLT for NESS. Observe that Theorem 2.3 can be understood as a law of large numbers for the density of particles with respect to $(\mu_{\text{ss}}^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$. Therefore, it is natural to study the fluctuations of the density of particles around its hydrodynamic limit. The *density fluctuation field* is the function $X^n : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ defined by duality as

$$X^n(\eta, f) := \frac{1}{n^{d/2}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} (\eta_x - \rho_*) f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. Although X^n is well defined as a signed measure in $\mathbb{T}^d$, it is more convenient to think about X^n as a *random distribution*. In a probabilistic context, on which $\mathcal{L}^2$ -norms are related to variances, *Sobolev spaces* are a specially convenient

choice of topology for the image of X^n . It will be convenient to define Sobolev spaces in terms of Fourier transforms. For $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$, let $\hat{f} : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be given by

$$\hat{f}(k) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} e^{-2\pi i k x} f(x) dx \quad (2.8)$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, that is, $\hat{f}$ is the *Fourier transform* of f . For $k = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let us write $\|k\| := (k_1^2 + \dots + k_d^2)^{1/2}$. For $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^m} := \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 (1 + \|k\|^2)^m \right)^{1/2}.$$

Observe that $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^m} < +\infty$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, and observe that the space $(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^m})$ is pre-Hilbert. The so-called *Sobolev space* $\mathcal{H}^m = \mathcal{H}^m(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of order m is defined as the closure of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^m}$. All the spaces $\mathcal{H}^m$ are Hilbert spaces, and by Parseval's identity, $\mathcal{H}^0 = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Moreover, for every $m \neq 0$, the spaces $\mathcal{H}^m, \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ form a *Gelfand triple*. Observe as well that $\mathcal{H}^{m'}$ is compactly contained in $\mathcal{H}^m$ if $m < m'$. Since the Dirac δ distribution belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ for every $m > d/2$, we see that X^n is a random variable in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ for every $m > d/2$.

Let $\chi(\rho_*) := \rho_*(1 - \rho_*)$ be the *mobility* of the reaction-diffusion model. This quantity is one of the thermodynamic variables appearing in MFT [3]. Now we can state our main result:

Theorem 2.7. *Let $d \leq 3$ and let η have law μ_{ss}^n . There exists $\lambda_c = \lambda_c(a, b, d) > 0$ such that for every $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X^n = X_\infty$$

in law with respect to the topology of $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ for

$$m > \begin{cases} 1/2 & ; d = 1, \\ 3 & ; d = 2, \\ 9/2 & ; d = 3, \end{cases}$$

where X_∞ is a centered Gaussian process of variance given by

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\infty(f)^2] = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \left(\chi(\rho_*) + \frac{G(\rho_*) + 2F'(\rho_*)\chi(\rho_*)}{8\pi^2 \|k\|^2 - 2F'(\rho_*)} \right). \quad (2.9)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$.

Remark 2.8. Observe that if $\lambda = 0$, then X_∞ is a white noise of variance $\chi(\rho_*)$.

3. The relative entropy method

In this section we will prove Theorem 2.4 and we will use it to prove Theorem 2.3. We will use Yau's *relative entropy method*, introduced in [19]; see Chapter 6 of [12] for a review. We will use the approach of [11].

3.1. Yau's inequality. The *carré du champ* associated to the operator L_n is the bilinear operator Γ_n given by

$$\Gamma_n(f, g) := L_n(fg) - fL_ng - gL_nf$$

for every $f, g : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. As usual in functional analysis, we will use the notation $\Gamma_n f := \Gamma_n(f, f)$. We will also define the *carrés du champ* associated to the operators $L_n^{\text{ex}}, L_n^{\text{r}}$:

$$\Gamma_n^{\text{ex}}(f, g) := L_n^{\text{ex}}(fg) - fL_n^{\text{ex}}g - gL_n^{\text{ex}}f,$$

$$\Gamma_n^{\text{r}}(f, g) := L_n^{\text{r}}(fg) - fL_n^{\text{r}}g - gL_n^{\text{r}}f$$

for every $f, g : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Let L_n^* be the adjoint of L_n with respect to $\mathcal{L}^2(\nu_{\rho_*}^n)$. Observe that $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ is reversible under L_n^{ex} , that is, $(L_n^{\text{ex}})^* = L_n^{\text{ex}}$. Therefore, $L_n^* = L_n^{\text{ex}} + (L_n^{\text{r}})^*$. The operator $(L_n^{\text{r}})^*$ can be computed explicitly in terms of $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$:

$$(L_n^{\text{r}})^* f(\eta) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \left(c_x(\eta^x) \frac{\nu_{\rho_*}^n(\eta^x)}{\nu_{\rho_*}^n(\eta)} f(\eta^x) - c_x(\eta) f(\eta) \right). \quad (3.1)$$

A more explicit form can be obtained observing that

$$\frac{\nu_{\rho_*}^n(\eta^x)}{\nu_{\rho_*}^n(\eta)} = \frac{\eta_x(1 - \rho_*)}{\rho_*} + \frac{(1 - \eta_x)\rho_*}{1 - \rho_*}.$$

We will use this identity to compute $L_n^* \mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the constant function equal to 1.

Since we already know that the density of particles under μ_{ss}^n is approximately equal to ρ_* , it is reasonable to start the chain $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$ from the initial measure $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. Let f_t^n be the density with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ of the law of $\eta^n(t)$ under $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\rho_*}^n}^n$. Let

$$H_n(t) := H(f_t^n; \nu_{\rho_*}^n)$$

be the *relative entropy* of the law of $\eta^n(t)$ under $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\rho_*}^n}^n$ with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. The so-called *Yau's inequality* [19, 11], states that

$$H_n'(t) \leq - \int \Gamma_n \sqrt{f_t^n} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + \int L_n^* \mathbf{1} f_t^n d\nu_{\rho_*}^n. \quad (3.2)$$

Since the chain $(\eta^n(t); t \geq 0)$ is irreducible and the state space Ω_n is finite, $f_t^n \rightarrow f_{\text{ss}}^n$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and in particular, since the function $x \rightarrow x \log(x)$ is continuous, we have

$$H(f_{\text{ss}}^n; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} H_n(t).$$

Therefore, a uniform bound on $H_n(t)$ implies a bound on the relative entropy of μ_{ss}^n with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. For every $\eta \in \Omega_n$ and every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let us define

$$\bar{\eta}_x := \eta_x - \rho_*.$$

From (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
L_n^* \mathbf{1} &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \left\{ \eta_x \left(\left(a + \frac{\lambda}{2d} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} \eta_y \right) \frac{1 - \rho_*}{\rho_*} - b \right) + (1 - \eta_x) \left(\frac{b\rho_*}{1 - \rho_*} - \left(a + \frac{\lambda}{2d} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} \eta_y \right) \right) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \left(\frac{\eta_x}{\rho_*} - \frac{1 - \eta_x}{1 - \rho_*} \right) \left(\left(a + \frac{\lambda}{2d} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} \eta_y \right) (1 - \rho_*) - b\rho_* \right) \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \frac{\bar{\eta}_x}{\chi(\rho_*)} \left(F(\rho_*) + \frac{\lambda}{2d} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} \bar{\eta}_y (1 - \rho_*) \right) \\
&= \frac{\lambda}{2d\rho_*} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} \bar{\eta}_x \bar{\eta}_y,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where in the last identity we used that $F(\rho_*) = 0$. Observe that $L_n^* \mathbf{1}$ is a sum of monomials of degree (at least) two in the centered variables $(\bar{\eta}_x; x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d)$. The absence of monomials of degree 1 in the expression for $L_n^* \mathbf{1}$ is fundamental in what follows.

3.2. The log-Sobolev inequality. In order to take full advantage of Yau's inequality (3.2), it would be useful to have a lower bound for the integral $\int \Gamma_n \sqrt{f_t^n} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ in terms of the relative entropy $H_n(t)$. This is exactly the content of the so-called *log-Sobolev inequality*, which we now explain. Let L be a Markov generator on Ω_n and let Γ be the *carré du champ* associated to L . The *log-Sobolev constant* of L (or Γ) with respect to a measure μ in Ω_n , is defined as

$$\alpha = \alpha(\Gamma; \mu) := \inf \frac{\int \Gamma \sqrt{f} d\mu}{H(f; \mu)}, \tag{3.4}$$

where the infimum runs over all densities f with respect to μ . It can be shown that α is always finite and that if L is irreducible, then $\alpha > 0$. If L is irreducible and μ is equal to the invariant measure of L , then α can be used to estimate the speed of convergence to μ of the law of the chain generated by L , see [5] for a review.

For the generator L_n defined in (2.2) and the measure $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$, the log-Sobolev constant is bounded from below by a positive constant that does not depend on n , a result known in the literature as the *log-Sobolev inequality*:

Lemma 3.1 (log-Sobolev inequality). *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every $\rho \in (0, 1)$, every $a, b > 0$ and every $\lambda > -a$,*

$$\alpha(\Gamma_n^r; \nu_\rho^n) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0 |1 - 2\rho|}{2\rho(1 - \rho) \left| \log \frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right|} =: \kappa(\rho)^{-1},$$

where $\varepsilon_0 := \min\{a, a + \lambda, b\}$.

Remark 3.2. By continuity, this lemma holds with right-hand side equal to ε_0 when $\rho = 1/2$.

Proof. This is a classical result in the literature, so we will only give a sketch of its proof. According to [5, Theorem A.2 and Lemma 3.2],

$$H(f; \nu_\rho^n) \leq \frac{2\rho(1-\rho)|\log \frac{\rho}{1-\rho}|}{|1-2\rho|} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \int (\nabla_x \sqrt{f})^2 d\nu_\rho^n$$

for every $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and every density f with respect to ν_ρ^n . Since $c_x(\eta) \geq \varepsilon_0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and every $\eta \in \Omega_n$,

$$\int \Gamma_n^r \sqrt{f} d\nu_\rho^n \geq \varepsilon_0 \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \int (\nabla_x \sqrt{f})^2 d\nu_\rho^n$$

for every density f with respect to ν_ρ^n , which proves the lemma. $\square$

3.3. The main lemma. In order to make an effective use of Yau's inequality as stated in (3.2), we need to estimate the integral $\int L_n^* \mathbf{1} f_t^n d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ in terms of the relative entropy $H_n(t)$ and the energy $\int \Gamma_n \sqrt{f_t^n} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. It turns out that the specific form of f_t^n as the density of a Markov chain does not play a role in this estimation procedure. Therefore, we will estimate $\int L_n^* \mathbf{1} f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ for arbitrary densities f . Moreover, it will be useful to consider $L_n^* \mathbf{1}$ as a particular instance of the sum

$$V(g) := \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \bar{\eta}_x \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i} g_x^i, \quad (3.5)$$

where $g = (g^1, \dots, g^d) : \mathbb{T}_n^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a given function and where $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ denotes the canonical basis of $\mathbb{T}_n^d$. According to (3.3), $L_n^* \mathbf{1}$ corresponds to the case $g_x^i = \frac{\lambda}{2d\rho_*}$. The so-called *main lemma*, introduced in Theorem 3.1 of [11], allows us to replace $\bar{\eta}_x \bar{\eta}_y$ by products of averages in boxes of mesoscopic size, with a cost controlled by the energy $\int \Gamma_n \sqrt{f_t^n} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. Since we need to be very precise about the dependence on λ of the constants appearing in this lemma, we will present its proof. This proof follows very closely the proof in [11] and it can be omitted in a first reading. Recall the definition of $\kappa(\rho)$ given in Lemma 3.1 and let us define $\mathcal{A}(u) := u(1+u)$ for every $u \geq 0$.

Theorem 3.3 (Main lemma). *There exists a constant $C = C(d)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \int V(g) f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int \Gamma_n^{\text{ex}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + C \kappa(\rho_*) \mathcal{A}(\|g\|_\infty) \int \Gamma_n^r \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \\ &\quad + C \mathcal{A}(\|g\|_\infty) n^{d-2} g_d(n) \end{aligned}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every $g : \mathbb{T}_n^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and every density f with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$.

Proof. For $\ell < n$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let $\mathbb{C}_x^\ell$ the cube of vertex x and side ℓ given by

$$\mathbb{C}_x^\ell := \{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d; y_i - x_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell - 1\} \text{ for every } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}.$$

Let $p^\ell : \mathbb{T}_n^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the uniform measure in $\mathbb{C}_0^\ell$, that is, $p^\ell(x) = \ell^{-d} \mathbf{1}(x \in \mathbb{C}_0^\ell)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. For $\ell < n/2$, let $q^\ell : \mathbb{T}_n^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be given by $q^\ell := p^\ell * p^\ell$, that is,

$$q^\ell(y) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} p^\ell(y - x) p^\ell(x)$$

for every $y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. Observe that q^ℓ is supported on $\mathbb{C}_0^{2\ell-1}$.

For $\eta \in \Omega_n$, $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and $\ell < n/2$, let $\bar{\eta}_x^\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\bar{\eta}_x^\ell := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} q^\ell(y) \bar{\eta}_{x+y}.$$

Let us define as well

$$\vec{\eta}_x^\ell := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} p^\ell(y) \bar{\eta}_{x+y}, \quad \overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g) := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} p^\ell(y) \bar{\eta}_{x-y} g_{x-y}^i,$$

$$V^\ell(g) := \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \bar{\eta}_x \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell g_x^i.$$

Thanks to our choice of the probability measure q^ℓ , the sum $V^\ell(g)$ can be rewritten as

$$V^\ell(g) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g) \vec{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell.$$

This identity will make the proof of Lemma 3.3 shorter. The idea is to estimate $\int (V(g) - V^\ell(g)) f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ in terms of $\int \Gamma_n^{\text{ex}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. Observe that

$$V(g) - V^\ell(g) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \bar{\eta}_x (\bar{\eta}_{x+e_i} - \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell) g_x^i.$$

Let us rewrite the difference $\bar{\eta}_x - \bar{\eta}_x^\ell$ as a linear combination of terms of the form $\bar{\eta}_z - \bar{\eta}_y$, where $y \sim z$. In order to do that, we will use *flows*.

Let $\mathcal{E}_n^d := \{(x, y); x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d, x \sim y\}$ be the set of oriented edges of the periodic lattice $\mathbb{T}_n^d$. We say that a function $\phi : \mathcal{E}_n^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *flow* if $\phi(x, y) = -\phi(y, x)$ for every $(x, y) \in \mathcal{E}_n^d$. Let p, q be two probability measures in $\mathbb{T}_n^d$. We say that a flow ϕ *connects* p to q if

$$p(x) - q(x) = \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim x}} \phi(x, y)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. In other words, $p - q = \text{div } \phi$. In that case, p, q and ϕ satisfy the *divergence formula*: for every $g : \mathbb{T}_n^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} g(x) (p(x) - q(x)) = \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} \phi(x, y) (g(x) - g(y)). \quad (3.6)$$

Recall the definition of $g_d(n)$ given in (2.7). Lemma 3.2 in [11] tells us that for every $\ell < n/2$ there exists a finite $C = C(d)$ and a flow ϕ^ℓ connecting the Dirac δ at $x = 0$ to q^ℓ such that

- i) $\sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} \phi^\ell(x, y)^2 \leq C g_d(\ell),$
- ii) $\phi^\ell(x, y) = 0$ whenever $x \notin \mathbb{C}_0^{2\ell-1}$ or $y \notin \mathbb{C}_0^{2\ell-1}$.

Using the flow ϕ^ℓ given by Lemma 3.2 of [11], the translation invariance of the lattice $\mathbb{T}_n^d$ and the divergence formula (3.6), we see that

$$\bar{\eta}_x - \bar{\eta}_x^\ell = \sum_{\substack{y, z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim z}} \phi^\ell(y, z)(\bar{\eta}_{x+y} - \bar{\eta}_{x+z}),$$

from where

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \bar{\eta}_x(\bar{\eta}_{x+e_i} - \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell) g_x^i &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \sum_{\substack{y, z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim z}} \phi^\ell(y, z)(\bar{\eta}_{x+y+e_i} - \bar{\eta}_{x+z+e_i}) \bar{\eta}_x g_x^i \\ &= \sum_{\substack{y, z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim z}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \phi^\ell(y-x, z-x) \bar{\eta}_{x-e_i} g_{x-e_i}^i \right) (\bar{\eta}_y - \bar{\eta}_z) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{y, z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim z}} h_{y,z}^\ell(g; \eta) (\bar{\eta}_y - \bar{\eta}_z), \end{aligned}$$

where $h_{y,z}^\ell(g) : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$h_{y,z}^\ell(g; \eta) := \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \phi^\ell(y-x, z-x) \bar{\eta}_{x-e_i} g_{x-e_i}^i$$

for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. Observe that $h_{y,z}^\ell(g)$ does not depend on η_y, η_z . From Lemma E.2 of [11], we have that

$$\int h_{y,z}^\ell(g) (\bar{\eta}_y - \bar{\eta}_z) f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \beta_0 \int (\nabla_{y,z} \sqrt{f})^2 d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + \frac{1}{\beta_0} \int h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2 f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$$

for every $\beta_0 > 0$. Choosing $\beta_0 = \beta n^2$ and taking the sum over $y \sim z$, we see that

$$\int (V(g) - V^\ell(g)) f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \beta \int \Gamma_n^{\text{ex}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + \frac{1}{2\beta n^2} \int \sum_{\substack{y, z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim z}} h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2 f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n. \quad (3.7)$$

This estimate is exactly Lemma 3.3 of [11]. In our case, the proof is simpler due to the translation invariance of the reference measure $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. Our next task is to take advantage of the average over boxes of size ℓ in $V^\ell(g)$ in order to get a good estimate in terms of $H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n)$. The so-called *entropy inequality* says that for every function $h : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, every density f with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ and every $\gamma > 0$,

$$\int h f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \log \int e^{\gamma h} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \right). \quad (3.8)$$

In order to be able to use this estimate, we need to compute the exponential moments of the variables $h_{x,y}^\ell(g)^2$ and $\bar{\eta}_x^{\leftarrow \ell, i} (g) \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i}^{\rightarrow \ell}$ with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. Using independence and Lemma A.1,

we see that for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int e^{\theta h_{y,z}^\ell(g)} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n &\leq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \frac{\theta^2}{8} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \phi^\ell(y-x-e_i, z-x-e_i) g_x^i \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{d\theta^2}{8} \|g\|_\infty^2 \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \phi^\ell(y-x-e_i, z-x-e_i)^2 \\ &\leq C(d)\theta^2 \|g\|_\infty^2 g_d(\ell). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Therefore, by Lemma A.2,

$$\int e^{\gamma h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq (1 - C(d)\gamma \|g\|_\infty^2 g_d(\ell))^{-1/2} \quad (3.10)$$

whenever $\gamma^{-1} > C(d)\|g\|_\infty^2 g_d(\ell)$.

Observe that $h_{y,z}^\ell(g)$ and $h_{y',z'}^\ell(g)$ are independent whenever $|y+z-y'-z'| > 4\ell$. Therefore, the set $\mathcal{E}_n^d$ can be divided into $C(d)\ell^d$ disjoint sets $\{A^i; i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ such that the terms in the sums

$$\sum_{(y,z) \in A^i} h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2$$

are mutually independent. Therefore, for $\gamma > 0$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \sum_{\substack{y,z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim z}} h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2 f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \int \sum_{(y,z) \in A^i} h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2 f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \log \int e^{\gamma \sum_{(y,z) \in A^i} h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \sum_{(y,z) \in A^i} \log \int e^{\gamma h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \right) \\ &\leq \gamma^{-1} C(d)\ell^d H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \gamma^{-1} n^d \log(1 - \gamma C(d)\|g\|_\infty^2 g_d(\ell))^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we used (3.10). Taking $\gamma^{-1} = 2C(d)\|g\|_\infty^2 g_d(\ell)$ we conclude that

$$\int \sum_{\substack{y,z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ y \sim z}} h_{y,z}^\ell(g)^2 f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq C(d)\|g\|_\infty^2 \ell^d g_d(\ell) \left(H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \frac{n^d}{\ell^d} \right). \quad (3.11)$$

Repeating the arguments in (3.9) for the random variables $\overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g)$ and $\overrightarrow{\eta}_x^\ell$ for each $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we see that for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\log \int e^{\theta \overrightarrow{\eta}_x^\ell} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \frac{1}{8} p^\ell(y)^2 \theta^2 \leq \frac{\theta^2}{8\ell^d}$$

and

$$\log \int e^{\theta \overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g)} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \frac{\|g\|_\infty^2 \theta^2}{8\ell^d}.$$

Since $\overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g)$ and $\overrightarrow{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell$ are independent under $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$, using Lemma A.2 we obtain the bound

$$\int e^{\gamma \overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g) \overrightarrow{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \int \exp \left\{ \frac{\|g\|_\infty^2 \gamma^2}{8\ell^d} (\overrightarrow{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell)^2 \right\} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2 \|g\|_\infty^2}{16\ell^{2d}} \right)^{-1/2}$$

for every $\gamma < 4\ell^d \|g\|_\infty^{-1}$. Observe that for $\gamma = \frac{2\ell^d}{\|g\|_\infty}$, we obtain the bound

$$\int e^{\gamma \overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g) \overrightarrow{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}.$$

Observe that the random variables $\overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g) \overrightarrow{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell$ and $\overleftarrow{\eta}_y^{\ell,j}(g) \overrightarrow{\eta}_{y+e_j}^\ell$ are independent under $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ as soon as $\|y - x\| > 2\ell$. Dividing the set $\mathcal{E}_n^d$ as above, we obtain the estimate

$$\int \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \sum_{i=1}^d \overleftarrow{\eta}_x^{\ell,i}(g) \overrightarrow{\eta}_{x+e_i}^\ell f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq C(d) \|g\|_\infty \left(H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \frac{n^d}{\ell^d} \right). \quad (3.12)$$

Putting estimates (3.7), (3.11) and (3.12) together, we conclude that for every $\beta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{\eta}_x \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i} g_x^i f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n &\leq \beta \int \Gamma_n^{\text{ex}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \\ &+ C(d) \left(\|g\|_\infty + \frac{\|g\|_\infty^2 \ell^d g_d(\ell)}{\beta n^2} \right) \left(H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \frac{n^d}{\ell^d} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Choosing in this estimate $\beta = \frac{1}{4}$ and

$$\ell = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{4} & ; d = 1, \\ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{\log n}} & ; d = 2, \\ n^{d-2} & ; d \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

we see that

$$\int \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{\eta}_x \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i} g_x^i f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \frac{1}{4} \int \Gamma_n^{\text{ex}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + C(d) \mathcal{A}(\|g\|_\infty) (H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + n^{d-2} g_d(n)). \quad (3.14)$$

By the definition in (3.4) and Lemma 3.1,

$$H(f; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) \leq \kappa(\rho_*) \int \Gamma_n^{\text{r}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$$

for every density f . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{\eta}_x \bar{\eta}_{x+e_i} g_x^i f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int \Gamma_n^{\text{ex}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + C\kappa(\rho_*) \mathcal{A}(\|g\|_\infty) \int \Gamma_n^{\text{r}} \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \\ &+ C\mathcal{A}(\|g\|_\infty) n^{d-2} g_d(n), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma. $\square$

3.4. Proof of Theorem 2.4. Using Theorem 3.3, it is not difficult to carry out the proof of Theorem 2.4. If we take $g_x^i = \frac{\lambda}{2d\rho_*}$ for every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and every $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, if we take $f = f_t^n$ in Theorem 3.3 and if we put the resulting estimate into (3.2), then we see that

$$H'_n(t) \leq -\frac{3}{4} \int \Gamma_n^{\text{ex}} \sqrt{f_t^n} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + (C\kappa(\rho_*)\mathcal{A}\left(\frac{|\lambda|}{d\rho_*}\right) - 1) \int \Gamma_n^{\text{r}} \sqrt{f_t^n} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + C\mathcal{A}\left(\frac{|\lambda|}{d\rho_*}\right) n^{d-2} g_d(n).$$

Observe that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon_0 = \min\{a, b\}, \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \rho_* = \frac{a}{a+b} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \kappa(\rho_*) = \frac{|b^2 - a^2| \min\{a, b\}}{2ab |\log \frac{b}{a}|}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} (C\kappa(\rho_*)\mathcal{A}\left(\frac{|\lambda|}{d\rho_*}\right) - 1) = -1$$

and there exists $\lambda_c > 0$ such that

$$C\kappa(\rho_*)\mathcal{A}\left(\frac{\lambda}{d\rho_*}\right) < \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}\left(\frac{\lambda}{d\rho_*}\right) \leq 1 \quad (3.15)$$

for every $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$. Using Lemma 3.1, we see that for $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$,

$$\begin{aligned} H'_n(t) &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \int \Gamma_n^{\text{r}} \sqrt{f_t^n} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n + C\mathcal{A}\left(\frac{|\lambda|}{d\rho_*}\right) n^{d-2} g_d(n) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2\kappa(\rho_*)} H_n(t) + Cn^{d-2} g_d(n). \end{aligned}$$

Using $e^{\frac{t}{2\kappa(\rho_*)}}$ as an integrating factor, since $H_n(0) = 0$ we conclude that

$$H(f_t^n; \nu_{\rho_*}^n) = H_n(t) \leq Cn^{d-2} g_d(n)$$

for every $t \geq 0$. Taking $t \rightarrow \infty$, Theorem 2.4 is proved.

3.5. Quantitative hydrostatics. In this section we prove Theorem 2.3 as a corollary of Theorem 2.4. It will be useful to prove a more general version of Theorem 2.3. Recall the definitions introduced before Theorem 2.6. We say that a function $\psi : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has *support in B_R* if $\psi(\eta^x) = \psi(\eta)$ for every $x \notin \mathcal{P}(B_R)$ and every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. For $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ and $\eta \in \Omega_n$, let $\tau_x \eta \in \Omega_n$ be the translation of η by x , that is, $(\tau_x \eta)_z = \eta_{z+x}$ for every $z \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. For $g : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let $\tau_x g : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the translation of g by x , that is, $\tau_x g(\eta) := g(\tau_x \eta)$ for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. For ψ with support in B_R and $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let us write $\psi_x := \tau_x \psi$. Define $\langle \psi \rangle_{\rho_*} := \int \psi d\nu_{\rho_*}^n$. For each $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, let $\Psi^n(f) : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\Psi^n(f; \eta) := \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} (\psi_x(\eta) - \langle \psi \rangle_{\rho_*}) f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \quad (3.16)$$

for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. Theorem 2.3 is a particular case of the following estimate:

Theorem 3.4. *There exists a finite constant $C = C(\psi; \rho_*)$ such that*

$$\int \Psi^n(f)^2 d\mu_{\text{ss}}^n \leq \frac{C \|f\|_{\ell_n^2}^2 g_d(n)}{n^2}$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, where

$$\|f\|_{\ell_n^2}^2 := \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)^2.$$

Proof. Let $\text{Osc}(\psi) := \sup_{\eta} \psi(\eta) - \inf_{\eta} \psi(\eta)$. By Hoeffding's Lemma, for every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$ we have that

$$\log \int e^{\theta(\psi_x - \langle \psi \rangle_{\rho_*})} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \frac{\theta^2 \text{Osc}(\psi)^2}{8}.$$

Since B_R is a cube of side $2R+1$, ψ_x and ψ_y are independent as soon as $\|y-x\|_{\infty} > 2R+1$. Therefore, $\mathbb{T}_n^d$ can be split into disjoint sets $(A^i; i \in \mathcal{I}_R)$ such that the cardinality of $\mathcal{I}_R$ is at most $C(d)(2R+1)^d$ and such that the terms in the sums

$$\frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in A^i} (\psi_x - \langle \psi \rangle_{\rho_*}) f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$$

are all independent. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int e^{\theta \Psi^n(f)} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n &\leq \frac{C(d)}{(2R+1)^d} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_R} \log \int \exp \left\{ \frac{\theta C(d)(2R+1)^d}{n^d} \sum_{x \in A^i} (\psi_x - \langle \psi \rangle_{\rho_*}) f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \right\} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \\ &\leq \frac{C(d)}{(2R+1)^d} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_R} \sum_{x \in A^i} \frac{\theta^2 C(d)(2R+1)^{2d} \text{Osc}(\psi)^2}{8n^{2d}} f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\theta^2 C(d)(2R+1)^d \text{Osc}(\psi)^2 \|f\|_{\ell_n^2}^2}{n^d}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.2 we see that

$$\int e^{\theta \Psi^n(f)^2} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq \sqrt{2}$$

for

$$\theta = \frac{8n^d}{C(d)(2R+1)^d \|f\|_{\ell_n^2}^2 \text{Osc}(\psi)^2}.$$

Using the entropy inequality (3.8), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \Psi^n(f)^2 d\mu_{\text{ss}}^n &\leq \theta^{-1} \left(H(\mu_{\text{ss}}^n | \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \log \int e^{\theta \Psi^n(f)^2} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C(d)(2R+1)^d \|f\|_{\ell_n^2}^2 \text{Osc}(\psi)^2}{n^d} (Cn^{d-2} g_d(n) + \log \sqrt{2}) \\ &\leq \frac{C(\psi, \rho_*, d) \|f\|_{\ell_n^2}^2 g_d(n)}{n^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

as we wanted to show. $\square$

Observe that Theorem 2.3 corresponds to Theorem 3.4 in the particular case $\psi(\eta) = \eta_0$. It turns out that Theorem 3.4 can also be used to prove Theorem 2.6.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. In general, the bound on the relative entropy given by Theorem 2.4 is not enough to derive a result as strong as Theorem 2.6. However, in our particular setting, we can take advantage of the translation invariance of the dynamics in order to improve the bounds. Observe that the generator of $(\eta(t); t \geq 0)$ satisfies

$$\tau_x(L_n f) = L_n(\tau_x f)$$

for every $f : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. In particular, if the law of $\eta(0)$ is translation invariant, then the law of $\eta(t)$ is translation invariant for every $t \geq 0$. Taking $t \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce that μ_{ss}^n is translation invariant.

Recall the definition of Π_R given before Theorem 2.6. For $R < \frac{n-1}{2}$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, let Π_R^x be the canonical projection onto the box of size R and center x , that is, $\Pi_R^x \eta := \Pi_R(\tau_x \eta)$ for every $\eta \in \Omega_n$. Observe that for every $\psi : \{0, 1\}^{B_R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and every $x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$,

$$\int \psi(\Pi_R^x \eta) d\mu_{ss}^n = \int \psi(\Pi_R^y \eta) d\mu_{ss}^n.$$

Therefore,

$$\int \psi d\mu_{ss}^{n,R} = \int \psi(\Pi_R^x \eta) d\mu_{ss}^n$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. Recall the definition of Ψ^n given in (3.16). Applying estimate (3.17) to the constant function $\mathbf{1}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int \psi d\mu_{ss}^{n,R} - \int \psi d\nu_{\rho_*}^{n,R} \right|^2 &= \left| \int \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} (\psi_x - \langle \psi \rangle_{\rho_*}) d\mu_{ss}^n \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \int \Psi^n(\mathbf{1}) d\mu_{ss}^n \right|^2 \leq \frac{C(2R+1)^d g_d(n) \text{Osc}(\psi)^2}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1$ implies $\text{Osc}(\psi) \leq 2$. Taking the supremum over $\|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1$ in this estimate and recalling the definition of $g_d(n)$, Theorem 2.6 is proved. $\square$

4. Density fluctuations

4.1. Case $d = 1$. In this section we prove Theorem 2.7 in the case $d = 1$. In that case the proof is simpler, due to the fact that the estimate in Theorem 2.4 is uniform in n . This will allow us to explain better the ideas behind the proof, which will be used for $d = 2, 3$ afterwards. Some of the computations are not dimension dependent; in those cases we will keep the dependence on d in the notation.

By Theorem 2.3, for every $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$,

$$\int X^n(f)^2 d\mu_{ss}^n \leq C \|f\|_{\ell_n^2}^2.$$

Recall definition (2.8). For $f(x) = \cos(2\pi kx)$ or $f = \sin(2\pi kx)$, $\|f\|_{\ell_n^2} \leq 1$. Therefore, for $m < -1/2$,

$$\int \|X^n\|_{\mathcal{H}^m}^2 d\mu_{ss}^n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + k^2)^m \int |\hat{X}^n(k)|^2 d\mu_{ss}^n \leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + k^2)^m \leq C(m) < +\infty.$$

Recall that the inclusion $\mathcal{H}^{m'} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^m$ is compact if $m < m'$, and therefore balls in $\mathcal{H}^{-m'}$ are compact in $\mathcal{H}^m$. Therefore, for $m' \in (m, -1/2)$ the set $\{\|X\|_{\mathcal{H}^{m'}} \leq M\}$ is compact in $\mathcal{H}^m$. From the previous estimate we see that

$$\mu_{\text{ss}}^n(\|X^n\|_{\mathcal{H}^{m'}} > M) \leq \frac{C(m')}{M^2}.$$

Taking $M \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that the sequence $\{X^n; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}^m$.

The idea is to prove a limit theorem for the *dynamical* fluctuation field, and to derive Theorem 2.7 from such result. Let $(X_t^n; t \geq 0)$ be the process given by

$$X_t^n(f) := X^n(\eta^n(t), f) = \frac{1}{n^{d/2}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} (\eta_x^n(t) - \rho_*) f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \quad (4.1)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$. The following result is a version of [11, Theorem 2.4] for the model considered here, and it holds for dimensions $d \leq 3$:

Proposition 4.1. *Let $(\mu_0^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of probability measures on Ω_n such that:*

- i) $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} H\left(\frac{d\mu_0^n}{d\nu_{\rho_*}^n}; \nu_{\rho_*}^n\right) < +\infty$,
- ii) $X^n \rightarrow X_0$ in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ in law with respect to μ_0^n for some $m > d/2$.

For $d \leq 3$, the sequence $(X_t^n; t \geq 0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions to the process $(X_t; t \geq 0)$, solution of the equation

$$\partial_t X_t = \Delta X_t + F'(\rho_*) X_t + \sqrt{2\chi(\rho_*)} \nabla \cdot \dot{W}^1 + \sqrt{G(\rho_*)} \dot{W}^2, \quad (4.2)$$

with initial condition X_0 , where $\dot{W}^1$ is an $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued white noise, $\dot{W}^2$ is a real-valued white noise and $\dot{W}^i$, $i = 1, 2$ are independent.

We start proving a lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *For every dimension $d \geq 1$ and every $m > d/2$, the equation (4.2) has a unique stationary solution supported in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$.*

Proof. Let $(P_t; t \geq 0)$ be the semigroup generated by the operator $\Delta + F'(\rho_*)$. For every $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and every $t \geq 0$,

$$X_t(f) = X_0(P_t f) + \int_0^t \sqrt{2\chi(\rho_*)} d\mathcal{W}_s^1(P_{t-s} \nabla f) + \int_0^t \sqrt{G(\rho_*)} d\mathcal{W}_s^2(P_{t-s} f). \quad (4.3)$$

Since $F'(\rho_*) < 0$, we see that $P_t f \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ exponentially fast in $\mathcal{H}^m$ for every $m \in \mathbb{R}$. In consequence, the random family $(X_\infty(f); f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}))$ given by

$$X_\infty(f) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t(f)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ is well defined in law. Moreover, X_∞ is a well-defined, $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ -valued random variable for m large enough, and it satisfies the identity

$$X_\infty(f) = \int_0^\infty \left(\sqrt{2\chi(\rho_*)} d\mathcal{W}_t^1(P_t \nabla f) + \sqrt{G(\rho_*)} d\mathcal{W}_t^2(P_t f) \right), \quad (4.4)$$

where this identity is understood as an identity in law for $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ -valued random variables. We claim that X_∞ is the unique stationary state of (4.2). In fact, if there is another stationary

state Y_∞ , the solution of (4.2) with initial condition Y on one hand satisfies $X_t = Y$ in law for every $t \geq 0$ and on the other hand it converges to X_∞ .

The right-hand side of (4.4) is a centered Gaussian process. Therefore, it is characterized by its covariance operator. Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\infty(f)^2] = 2\chi(\rho_*) \int_0^\infty \|P_t \nabla f\|_{L^2}^2 dt + G(\rho_*) \int_0^\infty \|P_t f\|_{L^2}^2 dt.$$

In Fourier space,

$$\widehat{P_t f}(k) = e^{-4\pi^2 \|k\|^2 t + F'(\rho_*) t} \hat{f}(k).$$

Therefore, by Parseval's identity,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\infty(f)^2] = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \left(\frac{4\pi^2 \|k\|^2 \chi(\rho_*)}{4\pi^2 \|k\|^2 - F'(\rho_*)} + \frac{G(\rho_*)}{8\pi^2 \|k\|^2 - 2F'(\rho_*)} \right), \quad (4.5)$$

which is equal to the expression given in (2.9) for the limit process X . Observe that

$$\lim_{\|k\| \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{4\pi^2 \|k\|^2 \chi(\rho_*)}{4\pi^2 \|k\|^2 - F'(\rho_*)} + \frac{G(\rho_*)}{8\pi^2 \|k\|^2 - 2F'(\rho_*)} \right) = \chi(\rho_*), \quad (4.6)$$

and in particular the coefficients in (4.5) are bounded in k . Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[\|X_\infty\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2] < +\infty$ for every $m > d/2$ and in particular X_∞ is a well-defined random variable in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ for every $m > d/2$. $\square$

Let us go back to the proof of Theorem 2.7. We have already proved that the sequence $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ with respect to μ_{ss}^n , for $m > 1/2$. Let n' be a subsequence for which $X^{n'}$ converges in law with respect to the topology of $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ to a random variable $\tilde{X}$. By Theorem 2.4, the measures $\mu_{ss}^{n'}$ satisfy the conditions of Proposition 4.1. Since $\mu_{ss}^{n'}$ is stationary, $\tilde{X}$ is a stationary solution of (4.2). By Lemma 4.2, $\tilde{X} = X_\infty$. We have just showed that $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ is relatively compact and it has a unique accumulation point X_∞ . We conclude that X^n converges to X_∞ , as we wanted to show.

4.2. Case $d = 2, 3$. In this section we prove Theorem 2.7 in the case $d = 2, 3$. In this case, the proof of Theorem 2.7 presented in the previous section does not work, because the entropy bound of Theorem 2.4 is not strong enough to derive tightness of the sequence $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ with respect to $(\mu_{ss}^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$. The idea is to adapt the proof of Lemma 4.2, *directly* to the process $(X_t^n; t \geq 0)$ defined in (4.1). In order to do that, let us introduce the Dynkin's martingales associated to $(X_t^n; t \geq 0)$. For every $T > 0$ and every $g \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\infty}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, the process $(\mathcal{M}_t^n(g); t \in [0, T])$ given by

$$\mathcal{M}_t^n(g) := X_t^n(g_t) - X_0^n(g_0) - \int_0^t (\partial_s + L_n) X_s^n(g_s) ds \quad (4.7)$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$, is a martingale of quadratic variation

$$\langle \mathcal{M}^n(g) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_n X_s^n(g) ds. \quad (4.8)$$

Our aim is to choose g_s in such a way that equations (4.7), (4.8) are approximate versions of (4.3). After some explicit computations, we see that

$$(\partial_s + L_n)X^n(g_s) = X^n((\partial_s + \mathbb{L}_n)g_s) + \frac{1}{n^{d/2}}V(\vec{g}_s) \quad (4.9)$$

where the linear operator $\mathbb{L}_n$ is defined as

$$\mathbb{L}_n f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) := \left(n^2 + \frac{\lambda(1 - \rho_*)}{2d}\right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} \left(f\left(\frac{y}{n}\right) - f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)\right) + F'(\rho_*)f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$, where V was defined in (3.5) and where $\vec{g}_s$ is defined as

$$g_{x,s}^i := -\frac{\lambda}{2d} \left(g_s\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) + g_s\left(\frac{x+e_i}{n}\right)\right)$$

for every $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and every $x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d$. We also see that

$$\Gamma_n X^n(g_s) = \frac{1}{2n^d} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} (\eta_y - \eta_x)^2 n^2 \left(g_s\left(\frac{y}{n}\right) - g_s\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)\right)^2 + \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} c_x(\eta) g_s\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)^2. \quad (4.10)$$

Observe that $\mathbb{L}_n$ is a discrete approximation of the operator $\mathbb{L} := \Delta + F'(\rho_*)$ used in the proof of Lemma 4.2. For $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and $T > 0$, let $(g_{t,T}; T > 0, t \in [0, T])$ be given by $g_{t,T} := P_{T-t}f$ for every $T > 0$ and every $t \in [0, T]$, where $(P_t; t \geq 0)$ is the semigroup generated by $\Delta + F'(\rho_*)$. For $T > 0$ and $t \in [0, T]$, let $\mathcal{M}_{t,T}^n(f) := \mathcal{M}_t^n(g_{t,T})$. Observe that $(\mathcal{M}_{t,T}^n(f); t \in [0, T])$ is a martingale and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} X_T^n(f) &= X_0^n(g_{0,T}) + \int_0^T (\partial_t + L_n)X_t^n(g_{t,T})dt + \mathcal{M}_{T,T}^n(f) \\ &= X_0^n(g_{0,T}) + \int_0^T X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})dt + I_T^n(V; f) + \mathcal{M}_{T,T}^n(f), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where

$$I_T^n(V; f) := \int_0^T \frac{1}{n^{d/2}} V(\vec{g}_{t,T}) dt.$$

Assuming that X_0^n has law μ_{ss}^n , this equation is the discrete version of (3.5) we are aiming for. The proof of Theorem 2.7 will follow from a careful analysis of equation (4.11). This analysis will be divided into three parts. In Section 4.3 we will derived various estimates that will then be used in Section 4.4 to prove tightness of the field X^n and in Section 4.5 to prove convergence of finite-dimensional laws of X^n .

4.3. Estimates. Our aim is to prove estimates in $L^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n)$ of each of the terms appearing in (4.11), except $I_T^n(V; f)$, which we can only estimate in $L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n)$. Since $F'(\rho_*) < 0$, the semigroup $(P_t; t \geq 0)$ converges to 0 with respect to the uniform norm with exponential rate

$-F'(\rho_*)$. We start estimating the second moment of $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[X_0^n(g_{0,T})]$. From Theorem 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[X_0^n(g_{0,T})^2] &\leq \frac{Cg_d(n)}{n^2} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} P_T f\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)^2 \\ &\leq Cg_d(n)n^{d-2}\|f\|_\infty^2 e^{2F'(\rho_*)T}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.12}$$

In order to estimate the second moment of $\int_0^T X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})dt$, observe that $(\partial_t + \mathbb{L})g_{t,T} = 0$. Therefore, by Taylor's formula,

$$|(\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)| = |(\mathbb{L}_n - \mathbb{L})g_{t,T}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)| \leq \frac{1}{12n^2}(6\lambda(1 - \rho_*)\|D^2g_{t,T}\|_\infty + d\|D^4g_{t,T}\|_\infty).$$

Since the differential operator D commutes with $\mathbb{L}$, we obtain the bound

$$|(\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)| \leq \frac{C}{12n^2}(\|D^2f\|_\infty + \|D^4f\|_\infty)e^{F'(\rho_*)(T-t)}.$$

Combining this bound with Theorem 2.3 and the invariance of μ_{ss}^n , we see that for every $\delta \in (0, -F'(\rho_*))$ and every $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}\left[\left|\int_0^T X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})dt\right|^2\right] &\leq \int_0^T e^{-2\delta t}dt \int_0^T e^{2\delta t}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[|X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})|^2]dt \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2\delta} \int_0^T g_d(n)n^{d-6}(\|D^2f\|_\infty^2 + \|D^4f\|_\infty^2)e^{2(\delta+F'(\rho_*))t}dt \\ &\leq Cg_d(n)n^{d-6}(\|D^2f\|_\infty^2 + \|D^4f\|_\infty^2).\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

The martingale term is easy to estimate. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[\mathcal{M}_{T,T}^n(f)^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}\left[\int_0^T \Gamma_n X_t^n(g_{t,T})dt\right] \leq \int_0^T C(\|Dg_{t,T}\|_\infty^2 + \|g_{t,T}\|_\infty^2)dt \\ &\leq C(\|Df\|_\infty^2 + \|f\|_\infty^2).\end{aligned}\tag{4.14}$$

The expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[|I_T^n(V; f)|]$ is the most difficult to estimate. In fact, we are only able to obtain a first-moment estimate. By the entropy inequality (3.8) and $H(\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n | \mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\rho_*}^n}^n) = H(\mu_{ss}^n | \nu_{\rho_*}^n)$ (which is a consequence of Markov's property) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[|I_T^n(V; f)|] \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \left(H(\mu_{ss}^n | \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \log \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\rho_*}^n} [\exp \{ \theta |I_T^n(V; f)| \}] \right).\tag{4.15}$$

Using the elementary bounds $\exp|x| \leq \exp(x) + \exp(-x)$, $\log(a+b) \leq \log 2 + \max\{\log a, \log b\}$ and for the choice

$$\theta := \frac{\lambda_c n^{d/2}}{2d\rho_* \sup_{t,T} \|\vec{g}_{t,T}\|_\infty},$$

we see that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[|I_T^n(V; f)|] \leq \frac{2d\rho_* \|\vec{g}\|_\infty}{\lambda_c n^{d/2}} \left(H(\mu_{ss}^n | \nu_{\rho_*}^n) + \log 2 + \max_{\pm} \log \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\rho_*}^n} [\exp \{ \pm \theta I_T^n(V; f) \}] \right).\tag{4.16}$$

To estimate the rightmost term in last display we use the following result.

Proposition 4.3. *For every $T > 0$ and every $W : [0, T] \times \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\rho_*}^n} \left[\exp \left\{ \int_0^T W_t(\eta(t)) dt \right\} \right] \leq \int_0^T \sup_f \left\{ \int \left(W_t + \frac{1}{2} L_n^* \mathbf{1} \right) f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n - \int \Gamma_n \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \right\} dt,$$

where the supremum is taken over all densities f with respect to $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$.

This proposition corresponds to Lemma A.1.7.2 of [12] in the case in which the measure $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ is reversible with respect to L_n (and therefore $L_n^* \mathbf{1} = 0$). It was observed in [1, p.78] that this estimate is also valid if the measure $\nu_{\rho_*}^n$ is invariant but not reversible. A complete proof of Proposition 4.3 can be found in [17, Lemma 3.3] or [10, Lemma 9.1].

The idea is to take $W_t = \theta n^{-d/2} V(\vec{g}_{t,T})$ in Proposition 4.3 and then to use Theorem 3.4 to turn the variational formula into a quantitative estimate. Observe that for W_t , by (3.3) we get

$$W_t + \frac{1}{2} L_n^* \mathbf{1} = V(\theta n^{-d/2} \vec{g}_{t,T} + \frac{\lambda}{2d\rho_*} \vec{1}).$$

Therefore, by Theorem 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left(W_t + \frac{1}{2} L_n^* \mathbf{1} \right) f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n - \int \Gamma_n \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n &\leq \left(C\kappa(\rho_*) \mathcal{A} \left(\frac{\theta}{n^{d/2}} \|\vec{g}_{t,T}\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda}{2d\rho_*} \right) - 1 \right) \int \Gamma_n^r \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \\ &\quad + C \mathcal{A} \left(\frac{\theta}{n^{d/2}} \|\vec{g}_{t,T}\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda}{2d\rho_*} \right) g_d(n) n^{d-2}, \end{aligned}$$

for every $\lambda \in [-\lambda_c, \lambda_c]$, where the constant λ_c was chosen in (3.15). From our choice of θ we conclude that

$$\int \left(W_t + \frac{1}{2} L_n^* \mathbf{1} \right) f d\nu_{\rho_*}^n - \int \Gamma_n \sqrt{f} d\nu_{\rho_*}^n \leq C \mathcal{A} \left(\frac{\lambda_c}{d\rho_*} \right) g_d(n) n^{d-2}.$$

From the right-hand side of (3.15) we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} [|I_T^n(V; f)|] \leq C \|f\|_\infty g_d(n) n^{d/2-2} (1+T). \quad (4.17)$$

4.4. Tightness. In this section we prove tightness of the sequence $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ with respect to the strong topology of $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ for m large enough. By Prohorov's theorem, $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set K_ϵ in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ such that

$$\mu_{ss}^n(X^n \notin K_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It can be shown that whenever $m < m'$, the inclusion $\mathcal{H}^{-m} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{-m'}$ is compact, which means that closed balls in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ are compact in $\mathcal{H}^{-m'}$. Therefore, in order to prove tightness of $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ in $\mathcal{H}^{-m'}$, it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_{ss}^n(\|X^n\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} > M) = 0$$

for some $m < m'$. Observe that for every $T > 0$, the law of X^n under μ_{ss}^n is equal to the law of X_T^n under $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n$. Therefore, it is enough to estimate the probabilities $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} > M)$ for each of the terms on the right-hand side of (4.11).

Let Y be a random variable with values in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$. We have that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|Y\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} > M) \leq M^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n[\|Y\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2].$$

Observe that

$$|\hat{Y}(k)| \leq |Y(\cos(2\pi kx))| + |Y(\sin(2\pi kx))|.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[\|Y\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2] \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m} (Y(\cos(2\pi kx))^2 + Y(\sin(2\pi kx))^2).$$

The relation

$$f \mapsto X_0^n(P_T f)$$

defines by duality a random variable in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$, which for simplicity we just denote by $X_0^n(g_{0,T})$. Using (4.12), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[\|X_0^n(g_{0,T})\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2] &\leq C g_d(n) n^{d-2} e^{2F'(\rho_*)T} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m} \\ &\leq C g_d(n) n^{d-2} e^{2F'(\rho_*)T} \end{aligned}$$

for every $m > d/2$. Recall that our aim is to provide a uniform bound for $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}[\|X_0^n(g_{0,T})\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2]$. This is the case if we choose

$$T = T_n := \frac{\log(g_d(n)n^{d-2})}{-2F'(\rho_*)}. \quad (4.18)$$

Now let us estimate the second moment in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ of the process

$$f \mapsto \int_0^T X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})dt. \quad (4.19)$$

Observe that for every $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\sin(2\pi(k + nk')x) = \sin(2\pi kx), \quad \cos(2\pi(k + nk')x) = \cos(2\pi kx).$$

Therefore, $\hat{X}^n(k + nk') = \hat{X}^n(k)$. The same identity holds for all the processes appearing in (4.11) and in particular for the process defined in (4.19). Take $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\|k\| \leq n$. For $f(x) = \sin(2\pi kx)$ or $f = \cos(2\pi kx)$, (4.13) gives the bound

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} \left[\left| \int_0^T X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})dt \right|^2 \right] \leq C g_d(n) n^{d-6} \|k\|^8.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\|k\| > n$ there exists $k' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\|k - nk'\| \leq n$. Therefore, (4.13) gives us the bound

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} \left[\left| \int_0^T X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})dt \right|^2 \right] \leq C g_d(n) n^{d-6} n^8 \leq C g_d(n) n^{d+2}.$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} \left[\left\| \int_0^T X_t^n((\partial_t + \mathbb{L}_n)g_{t,T})dt \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2 \right] &\leq C g_d(n) n^{d-6} \left(\sum_{\|k\| \leq n} \frac{\|k\|^8}{(1 + \|k\|^2)^m} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\|k\| > n} \frac{n^8}{(1 + \|k\|^2)^m} \right) \\ &\leq C g_d(n) n^{2d+2-2m}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

whenever $m > d/2$, so that the sum $\sum_{\|k\|>n} (1 + \|k\|^2)^m$ is finite. In particular, (4.20) is bounded in n for $m > 3$ if $d = 2$ and for $m \geq 4$ if $d = 3$. Observe that the bound is independent of T , and in particular it holds for $T = T_n$ as defined in (4.18).

Now we will prove tightness of $\mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n(f)$ for T_n chosen as in (4.18). By (4.14), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} [\|\mathcal{M}_{T, T}^n\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2] \leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m} k^2 \leq C$$

if $m > 1 + d/2$. Since the constant C does not depend on T , tightness is proved. Observe that the cut-off introduced in (4.20) does not improve the value of m .

We are only left to show tightness of the integral term $I_T^n(V)$. Since we only have $L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n)$ bounds for $I_T^n(V; f)$, we need to estimate $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|I_T^n(V)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} > M)$ in a different way. Let $(p(k); k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ be a probability measure to be chosen in a few lines. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|I_T^n(V)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} \geq M) &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|I_T^n(V)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}}^2 \geq M^2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\widehat{I_T^n(V)}(k)|^2 (1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m} \geq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p(k) M^2\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(|\widehat{I_T^n(V)}(k)|^2 (1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m} \geq p(k) M^2) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{(1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n[|\widehat{I_T^n(V)}(k)|]}{p(k)^{1/2} M}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.17) we obtain the bound

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|I_T^n(V)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} \geq M) \leq C g_d(n) n^{d/2-2} (1 + T) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{(1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m/2}}{M p(k)^{1/2}}.$$

Choose $p(k) = c(1 + \|k\|^2)^{-d/2+\delta}$ for $\delta > 0$, where c is the corresponding normalization constant. We obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|I_T^n(V)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} \geq M) &\leq C g_d(n) n^{d/2-2} (1 + T) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{T}^d} (1 + \|k\|^2)^{-m/2+d/2+\delta} \\ &\leq C g_d(n) n^{d/2-2} (1 + T) \end{aligned}$$

for every $m > 3d/2$. We conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n(\|I_{T_n}(W)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-m}} \geq M) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C g_d(n) n^{d/2-2} \left(1 + \frac{\log(g_d(n) n^{d-2})}{-2F'(\rho_*)}\right) = 0,$$

from where $I_{T_n}(W)$ converges to 0 in probability with respect to $L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n)$. Since convergence in probability implies tightness, $I_{T_n}(W)$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ for $m > 3d/2$. We conclude that $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}^{-m}$ for $m > 3$ in $d = 2$ and $m > 9/2$ in $d = 3$.

4.5. Convergence. In this section we will complete the proof of Theorem 2.7 by proving the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions of $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ to X_∞ .

Putting estimates (4.12), (4.13) and (4.17) into (4.11), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} [|X_{T_n}^n(f) - \mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n(f)|] &\leq C g_d(n)^{1/2} n^{d/2-1} \|f\|_\infty e^{2F'(\rho_*)T_n} \\ &\quad + C g_d(n)^{1/2} n^{d/2-3} (\|D^2 f\|_\infty + \|D^4 f\|_\infty) \\ &\quad + C \|f\|_\infty g_d(n) n^{d/2-2} (1 + T_n). \end{aligned}$$

For the choice of T_n made in (4.18), we see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (X_{T_n}^n(f) - \mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n(f)) = 0.$$

Therefore, we have reduced the problem of convergence of $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ to the problem of convergence of $(\mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$. We have already proved that the sequence $(\mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ is tight. Therefore, we only need to obtain the limits of the sequences $(\mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n(f); n \in \mathbb{N})$ for every test function f . We will use the following martingale convergence theorem:

Proposition 4.4. *Let $(M_t^n; t \in [0, T])_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of $\mathcal{L}^2$ -martingales. Let*

$$\Delta_t^n := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t^n - M_{t-}^n|$$

be the size of the largest jump of $(M_t^n; t \in [0, T])$ on the interval $[0, T]$ and let $\Phi : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a continuous increasing function. Assume that

- i) *as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $|\Delta_t^n| \rightarrow 0$ in probability,*
- ii) *as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\langle M^n \rangle_t \rightarrow \Phi(t)$ in probability for every $t \in [0, T]$.*

Under these conditions,

$$M_t^n \rightarrow M_t$$

in law with respect to the J_1 -Skorohod topology of $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, where $(M_t; t \geq 0)$ is a continuous martingale of quadratic variation $\langle M \rangle_t = \Phi(t)$ for every $t \in [0, T]$.

This proposition is a restatement of Theorem VIII.3.11 of [9]. Observe that in this proposition, the time window $[0, T]$ is fixed, while in our situation T_n grows with n . We will overcome this difficulty in the following way. Let $T > 0$ be fixed and assume without loss of generality that $T_n \geq T$. Define $(M_t^n; t \in [0, T])$ as

$$M_t^n := \mathcal{M}_{T_n - T + t, T_n}^n(f)$$

for every $t \in [0, T]$. Observe that $(M_t^n; t \in [0, T])$ is a martingale. Its quadratic variation is equal to

$$\langle M^n \rangle_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_n X_{T_n - T + s}^n(g_{T_n - T + s, T_n}) ds.$$

Recall (4.10) and recall the definition of $G(\rho)$ given in (2.5). For every $g : \mathbb{T}_n^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let us define

$$\varphi_n(g) := \frac{2\chi(\rho_*)}{n^d} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} n^2 (g(y) - g(x))^2 + \frac{G(\rho_*)}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_n^d} g(x)^2.$$

By Theorem 3.4, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} [(\Gamma_n X_{T_n - T + s}^n(g_{T_n - T + s, T_n}) - \varphi_n(g_{T_n - T + s, T_n}))^2] \leq \frac{C g_d(n) (\|g_{T_n - T + s, T_n}\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla g_{T_n - T + s, T_n}\|_\infty^2)}{n^2}.$$

For simplicity we have estimated the ℓ_n^2 bounds of the functions appearing in (4.10) by their ℓ^∞ bounds; we are only missing a multiplicative constant that does not affect the computations. Observe that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(g_{T_n-T+s, T_n}) =: \tilde{\varphi}_{T-s}(f) = 2\chi(\rho_*) \int \|\nabla P_{T-s}f(x)\|^2 dx + G(\rho_*) \int P_{T-s}f(x)^2 dx.$$

By Taylor's formula and the trapezoidal rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} n^2 (g_{T_n-T+s, T_n}(\frac{y}{n}) - g_{T_n-T+s, T_n}(\frac{x}{n}))^2 - \int \|\nabla P_{T-s}f(x)\|^2 dx \right| &\leq \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n^2} (\|DP_{T-s}f\|_\infty \|D^3P_{T-s}f\|_\infty + \|D^2P_{T-s}f\|_\infty^2) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n^2} (\|Df\|_\infty \|D^3f\|_\infty + \|Df\|_\infty^2) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d \\ x \sim y}} g_{T_n-T+s, T_n}(\frac{x}{n})^2 - \int P_{T-s}f(x)^2 dx \right| &\leq \frac{C}{n^2} (\|P_{T-s}f\|_\infty \|D^2P_{T-s}f\|_\infty + \|DP_{T-s}f\|_\infty^2) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n^2} (\|f\|_\infty \|D^2f\|_\infty + \|Df\|_\infty^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since these estimates are uniform in s , we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle M^n \rangle_t = \int_0^t \tilde{\varphi}_{T-s}(f) ds$$

in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{ss}^n}^n)$, and condition ii) of Proposition 4.4 is satisfied for

$$\Phi(t) = \Phi_t(f) := \int_0^t \tilde{\varphi}_{T-s}(f) ds.$$

The jumps of $(M_t^n; t \in [0, T])_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ at time $t \in [0, T]$ have size at most

$$n^{-d/2} \|g_{T_n-T+t, T_n}\|_\infty \leq n^{-d/2} \|f\|_\infty,$$

and in particular condition i) of Proposition 4.4 is satisfied. We conclude that $(M_t^n; t \geq 0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in law to a continuous martingale of quadratic variation $\{\Phi(t); t \in [0, T]\}$. In particular, the limit in law

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n(f) - \mathcal{M}_{T_n-T, T_n}^n(f)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (M_T^n - M_0^n)$$

exists and it is equal to $\mathcal{N}(0, \Phi_T(f))$. Now let us estimate the variance of $\mathcal{M}_{T_n-T, T_n}^n(f)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} [\mathcal{M}_{T_n-T, T_n}^n(f)^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} [\langle \mathcal{M}_{T_n-T, T_n}^n(f) \rangle] = \int_0^{T_n-T} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{ss}^n} [\Gamma_n X_s^n(g_{s, T_n})] ds \\ &\leq \int_0^{T_n-T} C(\|g_{s, T_n}\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla g_{s, T_n}\|_\infty^2) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^{T_n-T} C(\|f\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla f\|_\infty^2) e^{2F'(\rho_*)(T_n-s)} ds \\ &\leq C(\|f\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla f\|_\infty^2) e^{2F'(\rho_*)T}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $F'(\rho_*) < 0$, the last line of this estimate converges to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in n . Therefore, we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_{T_n, T_n}^n(f) = \mathcal{N}(0, \Phi_\infty(f)),$$

where

$$\Phi_\infty(f) := 2\chi(\rho_*) \int_0^\infty \int \|\nabla P_t f(x)\|^2 dx dt + G(\rho_*) \int_0^\infty \int P_t f(x)^2 dx dt.$$

Observe that $\Phi_\infty(f)$ is also given by (4.5). Now we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.7. By Wald's device, the law of X_∞ is characterized by the laws of $X_\infty(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Let $\tilde{X}$ be a limit point of $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$, which exists by tightness, and let $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$. We have just proved that $\tilde{X}(f)$ has the same law of $X_\infty(f)$. We conclude that $\tilde{X} = X_\infty$, and in particular $(X^n; n \in \mathbb{N})$ has a unique limit point, which finishes the proof of Theorem 2.7.

5. Discussion

We have proved that the CLT fluctuations of the density of particles under the NESS of an example of a driven-diffusive model are given by a Gaussian process presenting non-local correlations. For the sake of clarity, we have presented the proof for one of the simplest driven-diffusive models for which a non-trivial limit appears, that is, for a reaction-diffusion model with quadratic interactions. The restriction to quadratic interactions is not essential; however the restrictions to small parameters λ and dimensions $d \leq 3$ could not be removed without new arguments.

General reaction rates. For $\lambda \geq 0$, the reaction rates c_x can be written as $c_x = h_x + \lambda r_x$, where

$$h_x(\eta) := a(1 - \eta_x) + b\eta_x$$

can be interpreted as a chemical reservoir of particles at density $\frac{a}{a+b}$, and

$$r_x(\eta) = \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{y \sim x} \eta_y (1 - \eta_x)$$

can be interpreted as the interaction rate of some chemical reaction. The parameter λ corresponds to the intensity of the reaction, and our smallness condition in λ corresponds to assuming that the strength of the chemical reaction is uniformly bounded in n , with respect to the strength of the chemical bath, by some constant depending only on the density of the bath.

For $\lambda \in (-a, 0)$ some adjustments are needed, but a similar interpretation is possible. Our results hold for general local reaction rates r_x , but always under the boundedness assumption described above.

MFT and density fluctuations. The correlation operator of the limiting fluctuation density field can be described in terms of thermodynamic functions appearing in MFT. The MFT for reaction-diffusion models like the one presented here has been described in great generality in [15]. One starts from the hydrodynamic equation

$$\partial_t \rho = \nabla \cdot (D(\rho) \nabla \rho) + A(\rho) - B(\rho),$$

where $D(\rho)$ is the diffusivity of the diffusion dynamics, equal to 1 in our case, $A(\rho) := \int c_x(\eta)(1 - \eta_x) d\nu_\rho^n$ and $B(\rho) := \int c_x(\eta)\eta_x d\nu_\rho^n$. Then, under the invariant measure μ_{ss}^n , the density of particles is concentrated on stable solutions of the elliptic equation

$$\nabla \cdot (D(\rho) \nabla \rho) + A(\rho) - B(\rho) = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Observe that in our notation, $F = A - B$ and $G = A + B$. If F has a unique zero ρ_* on the interval $[0, 1]$, then the elliptic equation (5.1) has a unique solution, which is the constant solution equal to ρ_* . In [15], large deviations principles were proved for the hydrodynamic and hydrostatic limit of the density of particles of the reaction-diffusion model under the assumption $\lambda \geq 0$. At a formal level, the correlation operator of the CLT for the density of particles corresponds to the Hessian of the rate function at its unique zero. In our infinite-dimensional context, such expansion is difficult to justify, but *a posteriori* it provides the right answer. In [11] it has been shown that the fluctuations around the hydrodynamic limit follow the stochastic heat equation

$$\partial_t X = \nabla \cdot (D(\rho_*) \nabla X + \sqrt{\chi(\rho_*)} \dot{W}^1) + F'(\rho_*) X + \sqrt{G(\rho_*)} \dot{W}^2, \quad (\text{SHE})$$

where $\dot{W}^1$ is a space-time white noise with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\dot{W}^2$ is a space-time white noise independent of $\dot{W}^1$ and $\chi(\rho_*) = \rho_*(1 - \rho_*)$ is the *mobility* of the model. The density fluctuations around the hydrostatic limit are given by the stationary solution of this equation. The stationary solution of (SHE) can be obtained from *Duhamel's formula*:

$$X_\infty = \int_0^\infty \sqrt{2\chi(\rho_*)} \dot{W}^1 \cdot \nabla P_t + \int_0^\infty \sqrt{G(\rho_*)} \dot{W}^2 P_t,$$

where $P_t := e^{(D(\rho_*)\Delta + F'(\rho_*)t)}$. Therefore, X_∞ is a centered, Gaussian process satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\infty(f)^2] = \int_0^\infty (\chi(\rho_*) \|\nabla P_t f\|^2 + G(\rho_*) \|P_t f\|^2) dt.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \|\nabla P_t f\|^2 dt &= \int_0^\infty \langle P_t f, -\Delta P_t f \rangle dt = \int_0^\infty \left(-\frac{1}{2} \partial_t \langle P_t f, P_t f \rangle + F'(\rho_*) \langle P_t f, P_t f \rangle \right) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|f\|^2 + F'(\rho_*) \int_0^\infty \|P_t f\|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\infty(f)^2] = \chi(\rho_*) \|f\|^2 + (G(\rho_*) + 2\chi(\rho_*) F'(\rho_*)) \int_0^\infty \|P_t f\|^2 dt.$$

One can check that λ and $G(\rho_*) + 2\chi(\rho_*)F'(\rho_*)$ have the same sign. Therefore, the sign of λ indicates whether X_∞ has positive or negative correlations. We observe that for $\lambda > 0$, one can interpret X_∞ as the sum of a white noise and an independent *massive Gaussian free field*. For $\lambda < 0$, it turns out that the sum of X_∞ and an independent massive free field is equal to a white noise.

Local equilibrium. Since diffusion has a diffusive scaling and reaction does not have scaling, at small scales the effect of the diffusive dynamics is stronger than the effect of the reaction dynamics. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect the reaction-diffusion model to be in *local equilibrium*, meaning that at small scales the law of the density of particles should look like the invariant law of the diffusive dynamics. In our case, this corresponds to a product Bernoulli measure with constant density. In Theorem 2.6, we have proved that this is indeed the case for the NESS, and we have established a mesoscopic scale up to which local equilibrium holds. In dimension $d = 1$, we have shown that non-equilibrium behavior only appears at macroscopic scales, since at every mesoscopic scale, the NESS is statistically indistinguishable from a product Bernoulli measure with density ρ_* . We conjecture that Theorem 2.6 is *sharp*, that is, the scale R_n is the largest scale at which one should expect the NESS to behave as a local equilibrium. Observe that for $d \geq 3$ the covariance operator of the massive free field has a singularity of order $\|y - x\|^{2-d}$ at the diagonal ($\log \|y - x\|$ for $d = 2$), which is compatible with the mesoscopic scale R_n stated in Theorem 2.6.

Local equilibrium is one of the axioms from which MFT is derived [3]. Although the validity of MFT has been proved for a range of models, we are not aware of any proof of Theorem 2.6. Therefore, Theorem 2.6 can be seen as the mathematical basis of the derivation of MFT from first principles.

Absolute continuity of fluctuations with respect to white noise. In this section we prove that the limit fluctuations given by X_∞ are absolutely continuous with respect to a white noise. Recall that our results are for $d \leq 3$. Let $(\zeta_{k,i}; k \in \mathbb{Z}^d, i = 1, 2)$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with common law $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and define $(\xi_k; k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ as follows. For $k = 0$, $\xi_0 = \zeta_{0,1}$, and for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $k_1 > 0$,

$$\xi_k := \frac{\zeta_{k,1} + i\zeta_{k,2}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ and } \xi_{-k} := \frac{\zeta_{k,1} - i\zeta_{k,2}}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

From (4.5), X_∞ has the representation

$$X_\infty(f) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}(k) \xi_k \sqrt{\lambda_k},$$

where

$$\lambda_k := \frac{4\pi^2 k^2 \chi(\rho_*)}{4\pi^2 k^2 - F'(\rho_*)} + \frac{G(\rho_*)}{8\pi^2 k^2 - 2F'(\rho_*)}.$$

The white noise of variance $\chi(\rho_*)$ has the representation

$$Y(f) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}(k) \xi_k \sqrt{\chi(\rho_*)}.$$

In other words, in Fourier space, both processes X_∞ and Y are represented by tensor products of independent Gaussians. It will be convenient to rewrite the expressions for X_∞ and Y as

$$X_\infty(f) := \hat{f}(0)\zeta_{0,1}\sqrt{\lambda_0} + \sum_{k_1>0} \sqrt{2}(\Re(\hat{f}(k))\zeta_{k,1} + \Im(\hat{f}(k))\zeta_{k,2})\sqrt{\lambda_k},$$

$$Y(f) := \hat{f}(0)\zeta_{0,1} + \sum_{k_1>0} \sqrt{2}(\Re(\hat{f}(k))\zeta_{k,1} + \Im(\hat{f}(k))\zeta_{k,2}).$$

The relative entropy between two centered Gaussians satisfies the formula

$$H(\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_2^2) | \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_1^2)) = \Xi\left(\frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2}\right),$$

where $\Xi(r) := \frac{1}{2}(r - \log r - 1)$. In particular, the relative entropy is of order $\frac{1}{4}(\frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2} - 1)^2$ as $\frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2} \rightarrow 1$, and therefore for every $M > 0$ there exists a finite constant C_M such that

$$H(\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_2^2) | \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_1^2)) \leq C_M \left(\frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2} - 1\right)^2,$$

whenever $\frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2} \in [\frac{1}{M}, M]$. Recall (4.6). Therefore, there exists $\widetilde{M}$ finite such that

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{\chi(\rho_*)} \in [\widetilde{M}^{-1}, \widetilde{M}]$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By the tensorization property of the relative entropy, the relative entropy of the law of X_∞ with respect to the law of Y is equal to

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Xi\left(\frac{\lambda_k}{\chi(\rho_*)}\right),$$

which turns to be bounded by

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} C_{\widetilde{M}} \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{\chi(\rho_*)} - 1\right)^2.$$

Observe that there exists a constant C such that

$$\left| \frac{\lambda_k}{\chi(\rho_*)} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{C}{1 + \|k\|^2}.$$

Therefore, the sum

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{\chi(\rho_*)} - 1\right)^2$$

is finite for $d < 4$, from where we conclude that X_∞ has a density with respect to Y , as we wanted to show.

Appendix A. Lemmas

The following estimate is known as *Hoeffding's lemma*:

Lemma A.1. *Let X be a random variable such that $a \leq X \leq b$ a.s. For every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta(X - \mathbb{E}[X])}] \leq \frac{1}{8}(b - a)^2 \theta^2.$$

The following lemma states that random variables satisfying the bound in Hoeffding's lemma are subgaussian:

Lemma A.2. *Let X be a real-valued random variable such that $\log \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta X}] \leq \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\theta^2$ for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. We have that*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma X^2}] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - 2\sigma^2\gamma}}$$

for every $\gamma < \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}$.

Proof. Let Z be a Gaussian random variable of mean zero and unit variance, independent of X . We have that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma X^2}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\sqrt{2\gamma}XZ}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\sigma^2\theta Z^2}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - 2\sigma^2\gamma}}.$$

□

Acknowledgements: P.G. thanks FCT/Portugal for financial support through CAMGSD, IST-ID, projects UIDB/04459/2020 and UIDP/04459/2020. M.J. has been funded by CNPq grant 312146/2021-3, CNPq grant 201384/2020-5 and FAPERJ grant E-26/201.031/2022. M.J. was supported in part by funding from the Simons Foundation and the Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, through the Simons-CRM scr-in-residence program and by the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach. 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). R.M. thanks the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq). Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

References

- [1] O. Benois, C. Kipnis, C. Landim: *Large deviations from the hydrodynamical limit of mean zero asymmetric zero range processes* Stochastic Process. Appl., Volume **55** no. 1, 65–89 (1995).
- [2] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim: *Macroscopic fluctuation theory for stationary non-equilibrium states*, J. Statist. Phys., Volume **107** no. 3-4, 635–675 (2002).
- [3] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim: *Macroscopic fluctuation theory* Rev. Mod. Phys., Volume **87**, 593–636 (2015).
- [4] A. De Masi, P. Ferrari, J. Lebowitz: *Reaction-diffusion equations for interacting particle systems*, J. Statist. Phys., Volume **44** no. 3-4, 589–644 (1986).
- [5] P. Diaconis, L. Saloff-Coste: *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for finite Markov chains*, Ann. Appl. Probab., Volume **6** no. 3, 695–750 (1996).
- [6] J. Farfan, C. Landim, M. Mourragui: *Hydrostatics and dynamical large deviations of boundary driven gradient symmetric exclusion processes*, Stochastic Process. Appl., Volume **121** no. 4, 725–758 (2011).
- [7] T. Franco, P. Gonçalves, A. Neumann: *Non-equilibrium and stationary fluctuations of a slowed boundary symmetric exclusion*, Stochastic Process. Appl., Volume **129** no. 4, 1413–1442 (2019).

- [8] P. Gonçalves, M. Jara, O. Menezes, A. Neumann: *Non-equilibrium and stationary fluctuations for the SSEP with slow boundary*, Stochastic Process. Appl., Volume **130**, no. 7, 4326–4357 (2020).
- [9] J. Jacod, A.N. Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*, Second ed., Springer-Verlag.
- [10] M. D. Jara, C. Landim: *The stochastic heat equations as the limit of a stirring dynamics perturbed by a voter model*, to appear in The Ann. App. Probab.
- [11] M. Jara, O. Menezes: *Non-equilibrium fluctuations of interacting particle systems*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09526 (2018).
- [12] C. Kipnis, C. Landim: *Scaling limits of interacting particle systems*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Volume **320**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1999).
- [13] C. Kipnis, S. Olla, S. R. S. Varadhan: *Hydrodynamics and large deviation for simple exclusion processes*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Volume **42** no. 2, 115–137 (1989).
- [14] C. Landim, A. Milanés, S. Olla: *Stationary and nonequilibrium fluctuations in boundary driven exclusion processes*, Markov Process. Related Fields, Volume **14** no. 2, 165–184 (2008).
- [15] C. Landim, K. Tsunoda: *Hydrostatics and dynamical large deviations for a reaction-diffusion model*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist., Volume **54**, 51–74 (2018).
- [16] M. Mourragui, E. Orlandi: *Large deviations from a macroscopic scaling limit for particle systems with Kac interaction and random potential*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist., Volume **43** no. 6, 677–715 (2007).
- [17] A. Simas: *Hydrodynamic Limit for a Boundary Driven Stochastic Lattice Gas Model with Many Conserved Quantities*, Journal of Statistical Physics, Volume **139**, 219–251 (2010).
- [18] H. Spohn: *Long range correlations for stochastic lattice gases in a nonequilibrium steady state*, J. Phys. A, Volume **16**, no. 18, 4275–4291 (1983).
- [19] H. T. Yau: *Relative entropy and hydrodynamics of Ginzburg-Landau models*, Letters in Mathematical Physics, Volume **22**, 63–80 (1991).

(P. Gonçalves) CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS, GEOMETRY AND DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS, INSTITUTO SUPERIOR TÉCNICO, UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA, 1049-001 LISBOA, PORTUGAL

Email address: pgoncalves@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

(M. Jara) INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA, ESTRADA DONA CASTORINA 110, 22460-320 RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL

Email address: mjara@impa.br

(R. Marinho) UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA MARIA, CAMPUS CACHOEIRA DO SUL, ROD. TAUFIK GERMANO, 3013, 96503-205, CACHOEIRA DO SUL, BRASIL

Email address: rodrigo.marinho@ufsm.br

(O. Menezes) UFBA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, CAMPUS DE ONDINA, AV. ADHEMAR DE BARROS, S/N. CEP 40170-110, SALVADOR, BRAZIL

Email address: ommenezes@gmail.com