THE SPATIAL $\Lambda-\text{FLEMING}-\text{VIOT}$ PROCESS IN A RANDOM ENVIRONMENT

Tommaso Rosati¹ and Aleksander Klimek²

ABSTRACT. We study the large scale behaviour of a population consisting of two types which evolve in dimension d = 1, 2 according to a spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot process subject to random time-independent selection. If one of the two types is rare compared to the other, we prove that its evolution can be approximated by a super-Brownian motion in a random (and singular) environment. Without the sparsity assumption, a diffusion approximation leads to a Fisher-KPP equation in a random potential. The proofs build on two-scale Schauder estimates and semidiscrete approximations of the Anderson Hamiltonian.

MSC: 35R60, 60F05, 60J68, 60G51, 60J70, 92D15.

Keywords: Spatial Lambda Fleming-Viot, super-processes, Anderson Hamiltonian, scaling limits.

Contents

Introduction		1
1.	Models and statement of main results	5
2.	Scaling to the rough super-Brownian motion	14
3.	Scaling to Fisher-KPP	21
4.	Schauder estimates	28
5.	Semidiscrete parabolic Anderson model	38
Appendix A.		56
References		66

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental challenge in population genetics is to understand the interplay between different evolutionary and ecological factors and their overall contribution to genetic variety, i.e. the distribution of different types within a population. A prominent example of such a force is the random neutral process of 'genetic drift', which occurs due to the random reproduction of organisms. Another one is the adaptive process of selection. Both genetic drift and selection work, in different ways, to reduce the genetic variability of populations. However, other ecological and evolutionary forces may counterbalance those factors and explain durable heterogeneity within the populations.

¹Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, GB, t.rosati@imperial.ac.uk ²School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh, GB, aleksander.klimek@ed.ac.uk

 $\mathbf{2}$

Starting with the pioneering works by Wright [58], spatial structure has played a key role in understanding genetic diversity. Since individuals inhabit different, possibly distant geographical regions and do not move too far from their place of birth, the likelihood of mating between geographically distant populations is very small. This leads to a greater differentiation between subpopulations, as distant individuals evolve essentially independently of each other. In extreme cases, this mechanism, which is usually referred to as isolation by distance may even lead to the creation of different species. Even though, in principle, selection acts to reduce the genetic variety, Wright argued in the same article that if the selection is spatially heterogeneous, that is, if selection favors different types of individuals in different regions in space, it may further enhance the differentiation coming from isolation by distance. A large body of empirical evidence suggests that this may indeed be the case. Studies on plants [44], bacteria [48], animals [35] seem to all confirm that inhomogeneity in the spatial environmental enhances diversity. For more indepth description of biological literature, including less favorable viewpoints of the phenomena we are concerned with, we refer to [54, 30, 52].

Our work is similarly motivated by the question: does spatially heterogeneous selection enhance the genetic diversity?

There are many approaches one could take to model a spatially structured population. The stepping stone models (see e.g. [36]), where the population evolves in separated islands distributed on a lattice and interacts only with neighboring islands, lead to an artificial subdivision of the population. Approaches based around the Wright–Malécot formula [4, 39, 58] (which was introduced to study the isolation by distance phenomena) suffer from either inconsistencies in their assumptions or lead to unnatural 'clumping' of the population. We refer to [6] for an overview of the difficulties associated with modelling spatially distributed populations. The spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot (SLFV) class of models, introduced in [21] and formally constructed in [5], has been proposed specifically to overcome those difficulties, and is at the basis of our work. Here the population is distributed over continuous space, and reproductive events involve macroscopic regions of space (in this work balls of a fixed radius 1/n, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$) and follow a space-time Poisson point process.

In the neutral SLFV there is no bias in the relative fitness of the populations at hand. Our work considers instead the case in which the population consists of just two types (\mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{A}) and their relative fitness is modeled by a sign changing selection coefficient $s_n(x), x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ (\mathbb{T}^d being the *d*-dimensional torus), so that \mathfrak{a} is favored in the location x if $s_n(x) > 0$ and \mathfrak{A} is favored in the opposite case. Instead of choosing a specific selection coefficient, we sample it from a probability distribution \mathbb{P} . We will consider the proportion $X^n(\omega, t, x)$, evaluated at time $t \ge 0$ and position $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, of particles of type \mathfrak{a} with respect to the total population, given the realization $s_n(\omega)$ of the selection coefficient. The parameter $n \in \mathbb{N}$ indicates the size of the impact area of reproductive events: we are interested in the limit $n \to \infty$ and will scale the magnitude of the reproductive events and the strength of the selection coefficient s_n according to n as well. All our scaling limits are diffusive and the effect of selection is *weak* with respect to neutral events.

We study two different scenarios. In the first one, we assume that type \mathfrak{a} is rare compared to \mathfrak{A} . The rarity is described by considering an initial condition $X^n(\omega, 0, x)$ of order $n^{-\varrho}$ for certain values of $\varrho > 0$, so that the process will be of order $n^{-\varrho}$ for very long times. In this scenario \mathfrak{a} represents a mutation which tries to establish itself among the wild type \mathfrak{A} . Just as a small sub-population in the Wright-Fisher model is described by a branching process, we expect the limit to be a superBrownian motion (see [20] for an introduction to superprocesses) in a random time-independent environment. A similar scaling result without selection was first obtained by [10] (see also [14] for an analogous result regarding the voter model) and recently extended in [15] to critical values of the parameter ϱ . A scaling limit for a model with a selection coefficient which is white in time and correlated in space, was obtained by [11] using a lookdown representation.

We will assume, instead, that s_n scales to a spatial white noise ξ on the torus \mathbb{T}^d and consider only dimension d = 1, 2. In this setting, the limit (cf. Theorem 1) is the rough superBrownian motion introduced in [47], which formally solves the following stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) for some $\nu_0 > 0$ (in d = 2 the SPDE has to be replaced by the associated martingale problem):

$$\partial_t Y = \nu_0 \Delta Y + (\xi - \infty \mathbb{1}_{\{d=2\}}) Y + \sqrt{Y} \widetilde{\xi}, \qquad Y(0) = Y_0.$$
 (1)

Here $\tilde{\xi}$ is a space-time white noise independent of ξ . The ∞ appearing in d = 2 is a formal representation of the renormalisation required to make sense of the Anderson mode (see the discussion below), which is described by the SPDE

$$\partial_t Y = \nu_0 \Delta Y + (\xi - \infty \mathbf{1}_{\{d=2\}}) Y, \qquad Y(0) = Y_0.$$
⁽²⁾

The latter equation is *singular* in d = 2 because the expected regularity of the solution Y is not sufficient to make sense of the product $\xi \cdot Y$ and requires theories such as regularity structures or paracontrolled distributions (cf. Section 5 or see [29, 28] for complete works on singular SPDEs). In particular, there is no understanding of the Anderson model in dimension $d \ge 4$. We restrict to $d \le 2$ as these are the biologically interesting cases and in d = 3 the renormalization procedure is more involved. The quoted solution theories for singular SPDEs work pathwhise, conditional on the realization of the noise ξ and some functionals thereof. As a consequence, solutions to (1) are defined as martingale solutions conditional on the realization of solution of solutions to (1) is proven through a conditional duality argument. This lies in contrast to cases where the environment is white in time [43], where the martingale term can contain also the environment.

A crucial step in the proof of the scaling limit is to show that the continuous Anderson Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H} = \nu_0 \Delta + \xi - \infty \mathbb{1}_{\{d=2\}}$ is the limit of approximations $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{A}_n + \xi_n - c_n \mathbb{1}_{\{d=2\}}$ (cf. Theorem 4). In the latter operator, the approximate Laplacian \mathcal{A}_n acts on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and is expressed in terms of local averages of functions: we call this setting semidiscrete, as opposed to the fully discrete setting, where the underlying space is for example a lattice. Fully discrete approximations of singular SPDEs have been the object of many studies (see [41, 19, 12, 40] for a partial literature). Instead, approximations in the present semidiscrete case appear new. In the study of such SPDEs the smoothing effect of the Laplacian is crucial: the first step towards understanding the convergence of the operators is to establish the regularization properties of the approximate Laplacian \mathcal{A}_n , commonly known as Schauder estimates. Through a two-scale argument, we separate macroscopic scales in frequency space, at which \mathcal{A}_n regularizes analogously to the Laplacian, and microscopic scales, which are small but see no regularization (see Theorem 3). Once we are provided with the Schauder estimates and the convergence of \mathcal{H}_n , the scaling limit is proven through an application of the Krein-Rutman theorem. At 4

this point it is particularly important that the space is compact, while all other results in this work seem to extend from \mathbb{T}^d to \mathbb{R}^d .

In the second scenario, s_n is chosen to scale to a smooth random function $\overline{\xi}$, and we do not make the sparsity assumption. This regime corresponds to studying the long time behaviour of a large population. In this case under diffusive scaling one obtains (cf. Theorem 2) convergence to a solution of the (in d = 1 stochastic) Fisher-KPP equation

$$\partial_t X = \nu_0 \Delta X + \overline{\xi} X(1-X) + \sqrt{X(1-X)} \widetilde{\xi} \mathbb{1}_{\{d=1\}}, \qquad X(0) = X_0.$$
 (3)

As before $\tilde{\xi}$ is a space-time white noise independent of $\overline{\xi}$. In a nutshell, the intensity of the martingale term is governed by a parameter $\eta \geq 0$ and there exists a critical value $\eta_c(d) \geq 0$ such that the martingale term is of order $n^{-(\eta-\eta_c)}$. In dimension d = 1 we consider $\eta = \eta_c$, while in dimension d = 2 we take $\eta > \eta_c$. In some models, by taking into account dual processes, cf. [21, 24], one can prove that in d = 2 the deterministic limit holds also at the critical value. To the best of our knowledge the process we consider does not have a dual: hence although a similar result is expected, it remains open as the quoted methods do not apply. Due to the same lack of duality, in d = 1 uniqueness of the solutions seems out of reach. Similar results have been obtained in [22] where the selection coefficient is constant in space and time (in this case the process admits a dual) and in [7], where the selection coefficient is fluctuating in time and space and correlated in the latter, giving rise to an additional martingale term.

The treatment of this second regime is apparently much simpler, as the solution is bounded between 0 and 1. The only difficulty is to prove convergence in a topology, in which one can pass to the limit inside the nonlinearity. Unlike the previous works [22, 7] we can make good use of the Schauder estimates and directly prove tightness for a smoothed version of X^n in a Sobolev space of positive regularity (see Theorem 2).

In conclusion, this work extends previous scaling limits to incorporate a sign changing, possibly rough, selection. Choosing the selection at random provides a natural setting which exhibits interesting longtime behavior. We believe this could be the starting point for some ulterior studies: for example Equation (3) in d = 1with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (so globally in space) can be recovered with the same methods and could have interesting longtime properties, as the selection could balance out the genetic drift. The methods we used are based on two-scale Schauder estimates and do not rely on duality. They allow us to establish a connection to singular SPDEs, but appear to be a fairly simple, powerful tool to treat nonlinearities appearing in the SLFV.

Discussion. Let us briefly come back to our first question, concerning the influence of spatially heterogeneous selection on genetic diversity. Our scaling limits show how strong the effect of weak selection can be, even in presence of genetic drift. One observation is that the degree of spatial heterogeneity, encoded in the regularity of the environment, plays a key rôle. In fact, we see that if the environment is sufficiently irregular, a rare type will invade the population in finite time, in our parabolic scale: this is captured by the necessity of *renormalisation*. Our analysis then moves on to finer scales. Once we remove this first impact via an appropriate exponential damping – captured by the sequence of renormalisation constants – we obtain (1): here the survival of the rare type is determined by the longtime behavior of the Anderson model, despite the presence of genetic drift [47] and becomes ever more likely on large domains, since the top eigenvalue of the Anderson Hamiltonian tends to increase with the volume size [13] (for the 2D case). Yet, if we pass to the nonlinear regime (3) the effect of weak selection is not strong enough to overcome genetic drift (at least not on finite volume) and we expect fixation to one of the stable states in finite time. Instead, without the presence of genetic drift, we will observe longtime coexistence (that is, a limiting stable fixed point that is neither $X \equiv 0$ not $X \equiv 1$) as long as both the linearization at 0 and 1 are unstable: so once more the dynamic is governed by the top eigenvalue of the Anderson Hamiltonian (with smooth noise), see [31, Theorem 10.1.5].

Structure of the paper. In Section 1, we introduce the model and state our main results. Section 2 is devoted to the relation between the Spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot process with fluctuating selection and the rough super-Brownian motion, whereas in Section 3 we establish the scaling limit to the Fisher-KPP equation in rough potential. The rest of the paper is devoted to analytical backbone of our results. Section 4 covers Schauder estimates and Section 5 discusses analytic and probabilistic aspects of the Anderson model.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Nicolas Perkowski for many helpful discussions and comments, Guglielmo Feltrin for an enlightening conversation and the anonymous referees for pointing out certain mistakes and their numerous suggestions to improve the article.

AK acknowledges that the funding for this work has been provided by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in the framework of the Sofja Kovalevskaja Award endowed by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research.

TR gratefully acknowledges support by the IRTG 1740: this paper was developed within the scope of the IRTG 1740/TRP2015/50122-0, funded by the DFG/FAPESP.

1. Models and statement of main results

We begin with introducing our notation. In Subsection 1.2 we describe the Spatial-Lambda-Fleming-Viot process. In Subsection 1.3 we study the convergence to the rough super-Brownian motion. Subsection 1.4 is devoted to the diffusive scaling which leads to Fisher-KPP equation. In Subsection 1.5 we describe the main analytical components of the proofs.

1.1. Notation. We write $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, and $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$. The *d*-dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^d is defined as $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{Z}^d$, where \mathbb{Z}^d acts by translation on \mathbb{R}^d .

We indicate with |A| the Lebesgue measure of a Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$. Let $\overline{B}_n(x) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be the ball (with respect to the Euclidean norm) of volume n^{-d} around x. Similarly, let $\overline{Q}_n(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the *d*-dimensional cube

$$y \in \overline{Q}_n(x) \iff (y-x)_i \in [-(2n)^{-1}, (2n)^{-1}), \qquad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

As we work on the d-dimensional torus we denote with

$$B_n(x) = \overline{B}_n(x) / \mathbb{Z}^d \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d, \quad Q_n(x) = \overline{Q}_n(x) / \mathbb{Z}^d \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$$

the projections of $\overline{Q}_n,\overline{B}_n$ on the torus. To make sure that these still satisfy the normalization

$$|B_n(x)| = |Q_n(x)| = n^{-d},$$

observe that for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $c(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\overline{B}_n(0), \overline{Q}_n(0) \subseteq (-1/2, 1/2)^d, \qquad \forall n \ge c(d).$$

For this reason, throughout this work we consider only $n \ge c(d)$. We will not repeat this assumption to avoid an additional burden on the notation. Next, consider the lattice

$$\mathbb{Z}_n^d = \left(n^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^d\right) \cap \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Since $\{Q_n(x)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\cap\mathbb{T}^d}$ is a collection of disjoint sets, the torus is the disjoint union

$$\mathbb{T}^d = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d \cap \mathbb{T}^d} Q_n(x).$$

For integrable $w: \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ define $\Pi_n w(x)$ as an average integral of w over $B_n(x)$, that is

$$\Pi_n w(x) := \int_{B_n(x)} w(y) \, \mathrm{d}y := \frac{1}{|B_n(x)|} \int_{B_n(x)} w(y) \, \mathrm{d}y.$$

Next, we make often use of the Fourier transform both on the torus and in the full space. We denote with $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the space of (smooth) Schwartz test functions and (its dual) of Schwartz distributions respectively. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we define

$$\widehat{arphi}(k) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d} arphi(k) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} e^{-2\pi \iota k \cdot x} \varphi(x) \, \mathrm{d}x, \;\; k \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Analogously, for $\psi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d) : \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}\psi(k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2\pi\iota k \cdot x}\psi(x) \, \mathrm{d}x$, for $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$. These Fourier transforms admit inverses, which we denote with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}^{-1}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1}$ respectively.

For $a: \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with at most polynomial growth we define the Fourier multiplier as an operator of the form

$$a(D)\varphi = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}^{-1}(a(\cdot)\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}\varphi(\cdot)), \qquad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

Since characteristic functions normalized to integrate to 1 enter the calculations repeatedly, for a set A we write:

$$\chi_A(x) = \frac{1}{|A|} \mathbf{1}_A(x).$$

In the special case of balls and cubes we additionally define for $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\chi_n(x) = n^d \mathbf{1}_{B_n(0)}(x), \qquad \widehat{\chi}_n(k) = \widehat{\chi}(n^{-1}k) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}\chi_n(k) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_n(k),$$

$$\chi_{Q_n}(x) = n^d \mathbf{1}_{Q_n(0)}(x), \qquad \widehat{\chi}_{Q_n}(k) = \widehat{\chi}_Q(n^{-1}k) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}\chi_{Q_n}(k) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{Q_n}(k).$$

Observe that in order to obtain the identity between the Fourier transform on the torus and in the full space, we have used that $n \ge c(d)$. A special role will be played by the *semidiscrete Laplace* operator \mathcal{A}_n :

$$\mathcal{A}_{n}(\varphi)(x) = n^{2} \oint_{B_{n}(x)} \oint_{B_{n}(y)} \oint_{B_{n}(z)} \oint_{B_{n}(r)} \varphi(s) - \varphi(x) \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}r \,\mathrm{d}z \,\mathrm{d}y = n^{2} \big(\Pi_{n}^{4} \varphi - \varphi \big)(x).$$

$$\tag{4}$$

Such an operator is a Fourier multiplier with

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \vartheta_n(D), \qquad \vartheta_n(k) = n^2 (\widehat{\chi}^4(n^{-1}k) - 1).$$

We proceed with a definition of Besov spaces. Following [3, Proposition 2.10], fix a dyadic partition of the unity $\{\varrho_j\}_{j\geq -1}$. We assume that for $j \geq 0$, $\varrho_j(\cdot) = \varrho(2^{-j} \cdot)$ is a radial, smooth compactly supported function. For a distribution $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ define $\Delta_j \varphi = \varrho_j(D)\varphi$ and then define the spaces $B_{p,q}^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, p, q \in [1, \infty]$ via the norms

$$\|\varphi\|_{B^{\alpha}_{p,q}} = \|(2^{\alpha j}\|\Delta_{j}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})})_{j\geq -1}\|_{\ell^{q}}.$$

Since the partition of unity was chosen to be smooth, we define the Besov spaces on the full space via the same formula. It is convenient to introduce the notation

$$K_j^x(y) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}^{-1} \rho_j(x-y).$$

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \mathbb{N}_0$ and $p, q = \infty$ the above definition coincides with that of classical Hölder spaces. We therefore write (for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$)

$$\mathcal{C}^{\alpha} = B^{\alpha}_{\infty,\infty}, \qquad \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p = B^{\alpha}_{p,\infty}.$$

We shall denote the norm of the Hölder space \mathcal{C}^{α} by $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha}$.

To conclude, let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be the space of finite positive measures over \mathbb{T}^d . For metric spaces X, Y let C(X; Y) and $C_b(X; Y)$ be respectively the space of continuous, and continuous and bounded functions from X to Y. If $Y = \mathbb{R}$, we may drop the second argument. In addition, for a metric space X we define $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); X)$ to be the space of càdlàg functions with values in X, endowed with the Skorohod topology as in [23, Section 3.5] (similarly for finite time horizon T > 0 we write $\mathbb{D}([0,T];X)$). If X is a Banach space we write $L^2([0,T];X)$ for the space of measurable functions φ on [0,T] taking values in X and satisfying $\|\varphi\|_{L^2([0,T];X)} = (\int_0^T \|\varphi(s)\|_X^2 ds)^{1/2} < \infty$. The local variant of the space for $T = \infty$ is then defined as $L^2_{\text{loc}}([0,\infty);X) = \bigcap_{T>0} L^2([0,T];X)$.

1.2. The spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process in a random environment. We now describe the Spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot process. In addition to the original neutral process we consider the effect of a (later randomly chosen) spatially inhomogeneous selection. We consider a population that presents two genetic types, \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{A} . At each time $t \geq 0$, X_t^n is a random function such that

 $X_t^n(x) =$ proportion of individuals of type **a** at time t and at position x.

The dynamics of the Spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot model are determined by reproduction events. In order to incorporate selection, we distinguish two types of reproduction events, neutral and selective. These events are driven by independent Poisson point processes. In simple terms

Neutral event: Both types have the same chance of reproducing,

Selective event: One of the two types is more likely to reproduce than the other.

The strength, and the direction of the selection are encoded respectively by the magnitude and sign of a function s_n . In our setting the function s_n will be chosen at random (so it will depend on events ω in a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$), thus implying that the entire process X_t^n will also depend on ω and be a Markov process only conditionally on the realization of the environment. The function s_n should satisfy the following requirements.

Assumption 1.1. Consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that s_n is a measurable map $s_n \colon \Omega \to L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$, such that:

$$|s_n(\omega, x)| < 1, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega, x \in \mathbb{T}^d$$

8

Conditional on the realization $s_n(\omega)$ of the environment, $X^n(\omega)$ will be a Markov process. Its dynamics are defined below, deferring technical steps of the construction to Appendix A.1. We write:

$$M = \{ w \colon \mathbb{T}^d \to [0, 1], w \text{ measurable} \}$$

Definition 1.2 (Spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process with random selection). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathfrak{u} \in (0, 1)$ and consider s_n and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ satisfying Assumption 1.1 and $X^{n,0} \in M$. Define the process X^n on the probability space

$$(\Omega \times \mathbb{D}([0,\infty);M), \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{D}([0,\infty);M)), \mathbb{P} \ltimes \mathbb{P}^{\omega,n}),$$

where $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}'$ is the product sigma-field of $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathbb{P}^{\omega,n}$ the conditional law of X^n given the realization $s_n(\omega)$ of the environment and \ltimes the semidirect product as defined in the Appendix A.1. Then for every $\omega \in \Omega$ it holds that

- i) The space $(\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); M), \mathbb{P}^{\omega,n})$ supports a pair of independent Poisson point processes $\Pi^{\text{neu}}_{\omega}$ and $\Pi^{\text{sel}}_{\omega}$ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^d$ with intensity measures $dt \otimes (1 |s_n(\omega, x)|)dx$ and $dt \otimes |s_n(\omega, x)|dx$ respectively.
- ii) The random process $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto X_t^n(\omega)$ is the canonical process on $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); M)$. It is the Markov process with law $\mathbb{P}^{\omega,n}$ started in $X^{n,0}$ with values in M associated to the generator

$$\mathcal{L}(n, s_n(\omega), \mathfrak{u}) \colon C_b(M; \mathbb{R}) \to C_b(M; \mathbb{R})$$
,

(see Appendix A.1) that can be described by the following dynamics.

- (1) If $(t,x) \in \Pi_{\omega}^{\text{neu}}$, a neutral event occurs at time t in the ball $B_n(x)$, namely:
 - (a) Choose a parental location y uniformly in $B_n(x)$.
 - (b) Choose the parental type $\mathfrak{p} \in {\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{A}}$ according to the distribution \mathbb{Q}

$$\mathbb{Q}\left[\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{a}\right]=\Pi_n^2 X_{t-}^n(\omega,y), \quad \mathbb{Q}\left[\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{A}\right]=1-\Pi_n^2 X_{t-}^n(\omega,y).$$

(c) A proportion \mathfrak{u} of the population within $B_n(x)$ dies and is replaced by an offspring with type \mathfrak{p} . Therefore, for each point $z \in B_n(x)$,

$$X_t^n(\omega, z) = (1 - \mathfrak{u}) X_{t-}^n(\omega, z) + \mathfrak{u} \chi_{\{\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{a}\}}.$$

- (2) If $(t, x) \in \Pi_{\omega}^{sel}$, a selective event occurs in the ball $B_n(x)$, namely:
 - (a) Choose two parental locations y_0, y_1 independently, uniformly in $B_n(x)$.
 - (b) Choose the two parental types, $\mathfrak{p}_0, \mathfrak{p}_1$, independently, according to

$$\mathbb{Q}\left[\mathfrak{p}_{i}=\mathfrak{a}\right]=\Pi_{n}^{2}X_{t-}^{n}(\omega,y_{i}), \quad \mathbb{Q}\left[\mathfrak{p}_{i}=\mathfrak{A}\right]=1-\Pi_{n}^{2}X_{t-}^{n}(\omega,y_{i}).$$

- (c) A proportion \mathfrak{u} of the population within $B_n(x)$ dies and is replaced by an offspring with type chosen as follows:
 - (i) If $s_n(\omega, x) < 0$, their type is set to be \mathfrak{a} if $\mathfrak{p}_0 = \mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{a}$, and \mathfrak{A} otherwise. Thus for each $z \in B_n(x)$

$$X_t^n(\omega, x) = (1 - \mathfrak{u}) X_{t-}^n(\omega, z) + \mathfrak{u} \chi_{\{\mathfrak{p}_0 = \mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{a}\}}.$$

(ii) If $s_n(\omega, x) > 0$, their type is set to be \mathfrak{a} if $\mathfrak{p}_0 = \mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{a}$ or $\mathfrak{p}_0 \neq \mathfrak{p}_1$ and \mathfrak{A} otherwise, so that for each $z \in B_n(x)$,

$$X_t^n(\omega, z) = (1 - \mathfrak{u}) X_{t-}^n(\omega, z) + \mathfrak{u}(1 - \chi_{\{\mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{p}_2 = \mathfrak{A}\}}).$$

Remark 1.3. In the original SLFV process the probabilities at points 1.b, 2.b of the definition do not depend on the local average $\Pi_n^2 X_{t-}(y)$. Instead they depended only on the evaluation at the exact point $X_{t-}(y)$. Introducing the local average is a mathematical simplification of the model: the main implication is that the operator \mathcal{H}_n^{ω} considered in Theorem 4 will be selfadjoint.

Most of the arguments we use take advantage of the martingale representation of the process. We record this representation as a lemma. The proof can be found in Appendix A.1. For a function $\varphi \colon [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ we write

$$\varphi_{t,s} = \varphi_t - \varphi_s.$$

Lemma 1.4. Fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and let X^n be the SLFV process as in the previous definition. For every $\varphi \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the process $t \mapsto \langle X_t^n(\omega), \varphi \rangle$ satisfies the following martingale problem, for $t \geq s \geq 0$:

$$\begin{split} \langle X_{t,s}^{n}(\omega),\varphi\rangle &= \mathfrak{u}n^{-d}\int_{s}^{t} \langle \left(\Pi_{n}^{4}-\mathrm{Id}\right)(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)),\varphi\rangle \\ &+ \langle \Pi_{n}\left[s_{n}(\omega)\left(\Pi_{n}^{3}X_{r}^{n}(\omega)-(\Pi_{n}^{3}X_{r}^{n}(\omega))^{2}\right)\right],\varphi\rangle\,\mathrm{d}r + M_{t,s}^{n}(\varphi) \end{split}$$

where $M_{t,s}^n(\varphi)$ is the increment of a square integrable martingale with predictable quadratic variation given by

$$\begin{split} \langle M^{n}(\varphi) \rangle_{t} &= \mathfrak{u}^{2} n^{-2d} \int_{0}^{t} \langle (1+s_{n}(\omega)) \Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}(\omega), (\Pi_{n}\varphi)^{2} - 2(\Pi_{n}\varphi) \big(\Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi) \big) \rangle \\ &+ \langle \big(\Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi) \big)^{2}, 1 \rangle \\ &- \langle s_{n}(\omega) (\Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}(\omega))^{2}, (\Pi_{n}\varphi)^{2} - 2(\Pi_{n}\varphi) \big(\Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi) \big) \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r \end{split}$$

1.3. **Sparse regime.** First, we consider a scaling regime in which the part of the population of type \mathfrak{a} is rare, which means that X_t^n is very close to 0. To quantify what we mean with "close to zero", we introduce a smallness parameter $\rho > 0$. We assume that the initial condition $X^{n,0}$ is of order $n^{-\rho}$ and we will work under the following assumptions on the parameter ρ (it will be a consequence of our scaling limit that if the initial condition is small, then X_t^n stays of order $n^{-\rho}$, at least for times of order one in the appropriate diffusive scaling).

Assumption 1.5 (Sparsity). Fix any $\rho > \frac{3d}{2}$ and a sequence $\{X^{n,0}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq M$ such that for some $Y^0 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{\varrho} X^{n,0} = Y^0 \text{ in } \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)$$

Our selection coefficient will converge to space white noise. To obtain a nontrivial scaling limit in dimension d = 2, renormalisation has to be taken into account. Hence we define

$$c_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{\hat{\chi}^2 (n^{-1}k) \hat{\chi}_Q (n^{-1}k)}{-\vartheta_n (k) + 1} \simeq \log n.$$
(5)

The assumptions on the noise are summarized in what follows. We emphasize that ξ^n is an approximation of space white noise that is constant on the disjoint boxes $Q_n(x)$. In particular for any $y \in \mathbb{T}^d$ there exists a unique x such that $y \in Q_n(x)$.

Assumption 1.6 (White noise scaling). Fix d = 1 or 2 and consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ supporting for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\{Z_n(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}[Z_n^2(x)] = 1$, $Z_n(\omega, x) \in (-2, 2)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. Then define

$$s_n(\omega, y) = Z_n(\omega, x) - n^{-\frac{a}{2}} c_n \mathbb{1}_{\{d=2\}}, \quad \text{if } y \in Q_n(x), \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d$$

and write:

$$\xi_e^n(\omega, x) = n^{\frac{d}{2}} s_n(\omega, x), \qquad \xi^n(\omega, x) = \xi_e^n(\omega, x) + c_n \mathbb{1}_{\{d=2\}}$$

Under appropriate scaling, we will prove that the process X^n converges to a rough superBrownian motion. First, we recall the Anderson Hamiltonian on the torus, and its relationship to our setting.

Lemma 1.7. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space supporting a white noise $\xi \colon \Omega \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$, that is a process such that for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the projection $\langle \xi, f \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x)\xi(dx)$ are Gaussian random variables with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, f \rangle \langle \xi, g \rangle] = \langle f, g \rangle, \qquad \forall f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

For almost every $\omega \in \Omega$ there exists an operator

$$\mathcal{H}^{\omega} \colon \mathcal{D}_{\omega} \subseteq C(\mathbb{T}^d) \to C(\mathbb{T}^d)$$

with a dense domain $\mathcal{D}_{\omega} \subseteq C(\mathbb{T}^d)$, such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{\omega} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left[\mathcal{A}_n + \Pi_n^2 (\xi^n - c_n \mathbb{1}_{\{d=2\}}) \Pi_n^2 \right] =: \nu_0 \Delta + \xi,$$

with ν_0 defined by:

$$\nu_0 = \frac{1}{3} \quad in \quad d = 1, \qquad \nu_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \quad in \quad d = 2.$$
(6)

The limit is taken in distribution, with ξ^n as in Assumption 1.6. The precise meaning of the limit is provided in Theorem 4.

This lemma is a consequence of Proposition 1.15 and Theorem 4 below. The rough superBrownian motion is then a Markov process conditional on the realization of the spatial white noise and thus on the realization of the Anderson Hamiltonian.

Definition 1.8. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space supporting a white noise ξ and consider $Y^0 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Consider an enlarged probability space $(\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathbb{P} \ltimes \overline{\mathbb{P}}^{\omega})$, where \mathbb{P}^{ω} is the conditional (given the realization ω of the environment) law of a process $Y : \Omega \times \overline{\Omega} \to C([0, \infty); \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. For any $\omega \in \Omega$ let $\{\mathcal{F}_t^{\omega}\}_{t\geq 0}$ be the filtration generated by $t \mapsto Y_t(\omega)$, right-continuous and enlarged with all null sets. And let \mathcal{H}^{ω} be the operator in the definition above. Y is a rough superBrownian motion, if for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega}$ and T > 0, the process

$$M_t^{\varphi}(\omega) = \langle Y_t(\omega), \varphi \rangle - \langle Y^0, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle Y_s(\omega), \mathcal{H}^{\omega}\varphi \rangle \mathrm{d}s$$

is a centered continuous, square integrable $\mathcal{F}^\omega_t\text{-martingale}$ on [0,T] with quadratic variation

$$\langle M^{\varphi}(\omega) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \langle Y_s(\omega), \varphi^2 \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

We are now in position to state the first main result of this work.

Theorem 1. For any $\rho > \frac{3}{2}d$ consider a random environment s_n as in Assumption 1.6, and initial conditions $X^{n,0}$ as in Assumption 1.5. Consider the process X^n as in Definition 1.2, but associated, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, to the generator

$$n^{d+2+\eta}\mathcal{L}(n, n^{\frac{d}{2}-2}s_n(\omega), n^{-\eta})$$

meaning that with respect to the process constructed in Definition 1.2, we speed up time by a factor $n^{d+2+\eta}$, consider impacts of order $n^{-\eta}$ and use as environment the function $n^{\frac{d}{2}-2}s_n(\omega)$. Here η is defined by

$$\eta := \varrho + 2 - d. \tag{7}$$

11

Then the process $t \mapsto Y_t^n = n^{\varrho} X_t^n$ converges in distribution in $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ to a process Y, which is the unique (in distribution) rough superBrownian motion as in Definition 1.8, started in Y^0 .

Remark 1.9. Let us comment on the scaling in the previous theorem. The temporal speed of order $n^{d+2+\eta}$ corresponds to parabolic scaling. The factor n^d is payed to cancel the corresponding factor appearing in Lemma 1.4. The factor n^{η} instead cancels with the size of the impact. So we are left with a factor n^2 , which corresponds to parabolic scaling, since spatial distances are of order 1/n.

As for the selection, we necessarily consider a weak regime, that is $|s_n| \simeq n^{-2}$, which cancels with the temporal speed up, providing a term of macroscopic order. Finally, the smallness of the impact enters only to see fluctuations of the correct order.

1.4. **Diffusive regime.** The second scaling regime we consider is a purely diffusive one. As before, the impact factor \mathfrak{u} is scaled as $n^{-\eta}$. The restrictions on the value of η follow

Assumption 1.10. Choose η such that $\eta = 1$ if d = 1, and $\eta > 0$ if d = 2.

In this diffusive regime we still assume that the selection coefficient may be random, but we restrict to smooth selection.

Assumption 1.11. Consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and let $\overline{\xi}$ be a measurable map: $\overline{\xi} \colon \Omega \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then define:

$$s_n(\omega, x) = (n^{-2}\bar{\xi}(\omega, x)) \lor 1 \land (-1).$$

The limiting process in this setting will be the (stochastic if d = 1) Fisher–KPP equation in a random potential, defined as follows.

Definition 1.12. Consider Ω and $\overline{\xi}$ as in Assumption 1.11. Fix any $\alpha > 0$ and $X^0 \in B^{\alpha}_{2,2}$. A (stochastic if d = 1) Fisher–KPP process in random potential is a couple given by a probability space $(\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathbb{P} \ltimes \overline{\mathbb{P}}^{\omega})$ (cf. Definition 1.8) and a map $X \colon \Omega \times \overline{\Omega} \to L^2_{loc}([0, \infty); B^{\alpha}_{2,2})$. For $\omega \in \Omega$ let $\{\mathcal{F}^{\omega}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ be the filtration generated by $t \mapsto X_t(\omega)$, right-continuous and enlarged with all null sets. Then for all $\omega \in \Omega$ it is required that:

i) In dimension d = 1 for all $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T})$:

$$N_t^{\varphi} := \langle X_t(\omega), \varphi \rangle - \langle X^0, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle X_s(\omega), \nu_0 \Delta \varphi \rangle - \langle \overline{\xi}(\omega) X_s(\omega)(1 - X_s(\omega)), \varphi \rangle \mathrm{d}s$$

is a continuous in time, square integrable martingale with quadratic variation $\$

$$\langle N^{\varphi} \rangle_t = \int_0^t \langle X_s(\omega)(1 - X_s(\omega)), \varphi^2 \rangle \mathrm{d}s.$$

ii) In dimension d = 2 for all $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$

$$\langle X_t(\omega), \varphi \rangle = \langle X^0, \varphi \rangle + \int_0^t \langle X_s(\omega), \nu_0 \Delta \varphi \rangle + \langle \overline{\xi}(\omega) X_s(\omega)(1 - X_s(\omega)), \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Remark 1.13. Note that in the previous definition, since $X \in L^2_{loc}([0,\infty); B^{\alpha}_{2,2})$ for $\alpha > 0$, the non-linearity $\int_0^t \langle X_s^2, \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s$ is well-defined. Moreover, up to enlarging the probability space, the process can be represented in d = 1 as a solution to an SPDE of the form

$$\partial_t X = \nu_0 \Delta X + \overline{\xi} X(1-X) + \sqrt{X(1-X)} \widetilde{\xi},$$

where the spatial noise $\overline{\xi}$ is independent of the space-time white noise $\widetilde{\xi}$, following [37].

In this setting, we can prove the following scaling limit.

Theorem 2. Let η satisfy Assumption 1.10 and s_n be as in Assumption 1.11. Consider $X_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $0 \leq X_0(x) \leq 1$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, and let $X^n(\omega)$ be the Markov process associated to the generator

$$n^{\eta+d+2} \mathcal{L}(n, s_n(\omega), n^{-\eta})$$

and started in X_0 , as in Definition 1.2. There exists an $\alpha > 0$ such that for every $\omega \in \Omega \{t \mapsto \prod_n X_t^n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the space $L^2_{loc}([0,\infty); B^{\alpha}_{2,2}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Similarly, the sequence $\{t \mapsto X_t^n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. In particular:

- i) In dimension d = 1 both sequences converge in distribution to the unique in law solution to the martingale problem of the stochastic Fisher-KPP process in a random potential, as in Definition 1.12.
- ii) In dimension d = 2 both sequences converge in distribution to the unique solution to the Fisher-KPP equation in a random potential as in Definition 1.12.

Remark 1.14. The scaling in Theorem 2 is similar to that of Theorem 1 in the case $\varrho = 0$. The only difference is the assumption $\eta > 0$ in d = 2. At $\eta = 2 - d$ we expect to see fluctuations, so a natural guess would be the appearance of a stochastic Fisher-KPP equation. Instead, the limit should be deterministic. Indeed if $\overline{\xi} = 0$ one can show that the dual converges to a system of coalescing Brownian motions: in dimension d = 2 Brownian motions cannot meet, leading to the heat equation. In our setting we expect that the same argument holds and the correct scaling limit should be the deterministic Fisher-KPP equation.

1.5. **Proof methods.** The main ingredient in the proofs of the previous scaling limits is a careful study of the semidiscrete Laplace operator \mathcal{A}_n . Intuitively, one expects that this operator approximates the Laplacian with periodic boundary conditions and therefore has similar regularizing properties. To quantify this intuition we introduce a division of scales. On large scales, namely for Fourier modes k of order $|k| \leq n$ we show that \mathcal{A}_n has the required regularizing properties. On small scales, that is for modes of order $|k| \geq n$ we do not expect any regularization at all.

Instead we prove that small scales are negligible in terms of powers of n. Below we state a slimmed version of the results we require. The proof of the following theorem, as well as additional side results, is the content of Section 4.

Theorem 3. Fix any smooth radial function with compact support $\exists : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for some $0 < r < R \ \exists (k) = 1, \ \forall |k| \leq r, \ and \ \exists (k) = 0, \ \forall |k| \geq R$. Then define

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \exists (n^{-1}D), \qquad \mathcal{Q}_n = (1 - \exists)(n^{-1}D).$$

For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, p \in [1, \infty]$ the following holds:

i) For ν_0 as in (6), any $\zeta > 0$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}$

$$\mathcal{A}_n \varphi \to \nu_0 \Delta \varphi \quad in \quad \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha - 2 - \zeta}, \qquad as \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

ii) Uniformly over $\lambda > 1, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}$ the following estimates hold:

$$\|\mathcal{P}_n(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+2}}+n^2\|\mathcal{Q}_n(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}\lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$$

A precise control of the regularization effects of the semidiscrete Laplacian \mathcal{A}_n allows us to treat semidiscrete approximations of the Anderson model that appear in the study of the rough superBrownian motion. In the next proposition we recall some salient features of the continuous Anderson Hamiltonian.

Proposition 1.15. Fix d = 1 or 2, $\kappa > 0$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space supporting a space white noise $\xi \colon \Omega \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then the following holds true for all $\omega \in \Omega$.

i) The Anderson Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}^{\omega} = \nu_0 \Delta + \xi(\omega)$$

associated to $\xi(\omega)$ is defined, as constructed in [25] in d = 1 and [2] in d = 2.

ii) The Hamiltonian, as an unbounded selfadjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, has a discrete spectrum given by pairs of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions $\{(\lambda_k(\omega), e_k(\omega))\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that:

$$\lambda_1(\omega) > \lambda_2(\omega) \ge \lambda_3(\omega) \ge \dots, \qquad \lim_{k \to \infty} \lambda_k(\omega) = -\infty, \qquad e_1(\omega, x) > 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

iii) In addition, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $e_k(\omega) \in \mathcal{C}^{2-\frac{d}{2}-\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and the following set is dense in $C(\mathbb{T}^d)$:

 $\mathcal{D}_{\omega} = \{ Finite \ linear \ combination \ of \ \{e_k(\omega)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \}.$

The proof of this proposition is postponed to Section 5, in Lemmata 5.1 and 5.2. For the semidiscrete Laplace operator \mathcal{A}_n the following holds.

Theorem 4. Fix d = 1 or 2, $\kappa > 0$ and ξ^n satisfying Assumption 1.6. Up to changing probability space Ω , the following hold true for almost all ω in Ω . For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $m(\lambda_k)$ be the multiplicity of the eigenvalue λ_k of \mathcal{H}^{ω} and let $\{e_k^i(\omega)\}_{i=1}^{m(\lambda_k)}$ be an associated set of orthonormal eigenfunctions. In particular, $m(\lambda_1) = 1$.

Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $n_0(\omega, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0(\omega, k)$ there exist orthonormal functions $\{e_k^{i,n}(\omega)\}_{i=1}^{m(\lambda_k)} \subseteq L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that, considering the operator

$$\mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} := \mathcal{A}_n + \Pi_n^2 (\xi^n(\omega) - c_n) \Pi_n^2, \qquad \mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} \colon L^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \to L^2(\mathbb{T}^d),$$

with c_n as in (5), one has for some $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} e_k^{i,n}(\omega) = e_k^i(\omega), \quad in \quad L^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \Pi_n e_k^{i,n}(\omega) = e_k^i(\omega) \quad in \quad \mathcal{C}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^d),$$

and

 $\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} e_k^{i,n}(\omega) = \lambda_k e_k^i(\omega), \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{T}^d), \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \Pi_n \mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} e_k^i(\omega) = \lambda_k e_k^i(\omega) \text{ in } \mathcal{C}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^d).$ If the eigenvalue is simple, i.e. $m(\lambda_k) = 1$, then in addition $e_k^n(\omega)$ is an eigenfunction for \mathcal{H}_n^{ω} :

$$\mathcal{H}_{n}^{\omega}e_{k}^{n}(\omega) = \lambda_{k}^{n}e_{k}^{n}(\omega),$$

with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_k^n = \lambda_k$.

The proof of this result is the content of Section 5.4.

2. Scaling to the rough super-Brownian motion

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. Since we want to prove convergence in distribution for the sequence Y^n , the exact choice of the probability space Ω of Definition 1.2 is not important. For this reason we make the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, the probability space in Definition 1.2 and Assumption 1.6, be such that results of Proposition 1.15 and Theorem 4 hold true for all $\omega \in \Omega$.

The first step towards establishing tightness is to restate the martingale problem of Lemma 1.4 to take into account the scaling assumed in Theorem 1.

Lemma 2.2. In the setting of Theorem 1 and under Assumption 2.1, for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, under the law \mathbb{P}^{ω} , and for every $\varphi \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the process $t \mapsto \langle Y_t^n(\omega), \varphi \rangle$ satisfies the following martingale problem:

$$\langle Y_{t,s}^{n}(\omega),\varphi\rangle = \int_{s}^{t} \langle \mathcal{A}_{n}(Y_{r}^{n}(\omega)) + \Pi_{n}[\xi_{e}^{n}(\omega)\Pi_{n}^{3}Y_{r}^{n}(\omega)],\varphi\rangle - n^{-\varrho} \langle \left(\Pi_{n}^{3}Y_{r}^{n}(\omega)\right)^{2}, \xi_{e}^{n}(\omega)\Pi_{n}(\varphi)\rangle \,\mathrm{d}r + M_{t,s}^{n}(\varphi),$$

$$(8)$$

where $M^n_{\cdot}(\varphi)$ is a square integrable martingale with predictable quadratic variation

$$\langle M^{n}(\varphi) \rangle_{t} = \int_{0}^{t} \langle (1 + n^{-2 + \frac{d}{2}} s_{n}(\omega)) \Pi_{n}^{3} Y_{r}^{n}(\omega), (\Pi_{n}\varphi)^{2} - 2n^{-\varrho} \Pi_{n}(\varphi) \Pi_{n}(Y_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi) \rangle$$

$$+ n^{-\varrho} \langle (\Pi_{n}(Y_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi))^{2}, 1 \rangle$$

$$- n^{-\varrho} \langle n^{-2 + \frac{d}{2}} s_{n}(\omega) (\Pi_{n}^{3} Y_{r}^{n}(\omega))^{2}, (\Pi_{n}\varphi)^{2} - 2n^{-\varrho} \Pi_{n}(\varphi) \Pi_{n}(Y_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi) \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r.$$

$$(9)$$

Remark 2.3. The only term that is not of lower order in the quadratic variation is $\langle \Pi_n^3 Y_r^n, (\Pi_n \varphi)^2 \rangle$, which explains the superBrownian noise in the limit. Furthermore, at first sight this martingale problem has no relationship with the operator

$$\mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} = \mathcal{A}_n + \Pi_n^2 \xi_e^n(\omega) \Pi_n^2$$

we introduced earlier. The reason for our definition of \mathcal{H}_n^{ω} is that if we test on $\varphi = \prod_n e^n$, with e^n in the domain of \mathcal{H}_n^{ω} , then the first line of the drift becomes $\langle Y_r(\omega), \prod_n \mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} e^n \rangle$, which is exactly the kind of term that Theorem 4 aims at controlling.

In order to obtain the convergence, the first step is to prove a tightness result.

Proposition 2.4. In the setting of Theorem 1 and under Assumption 2.1 fix any $\omega \in \Omega$. For any T > 0 the sequence $\{Y^n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Moreover any limit point is continuous, i.e. lies in $C([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Since $\omega \in \Omega$ is fixed, we omit the dependence on it. The proof relies on Jakubowski's tightness criterion [33, Theorem 3.1]. The criterion consists of a compact containment condition and the tightness of one-dimensional projections.

In a first step of the proof, we establish the compact containment condition. Since for R > 0 sets of the form $K_R = \{\mu : \langle \mu, 1 \rangle \leq R\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ are compact in the weak topology, it is sufficient to show that

$$\forall \delta > 0, \quad \exists R(\delta) > 0, \ n(\delta) \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \inf_{n \ge n(\delta)} \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \langle Y_t^n, 1 \rangle \le R(\delta)\Big) \ge 1 - \delta.$$
(10)

In a second step, we establish one-dimensional tightness. By Theorem 4 (since the domain \mathcal{D}_{ω} is dense in $C(\mathbb{T}^d)$), it is sufficient to show that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the process $\langle Y_t^n, e_k \rangle$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}([0,T];\mathbb{R})$, where the sequence $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ consisting of eigenfunctions of \mathcal{H} , as in Proposition 1.15. By Aldous' tightness criterion [1, Theorem 1], this reduces to proving that for any sequence of stopping times τ_n , taking finitely many values and adapted to the filtration of Y^n , and any sequence δ_n of constants such that $\delta_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$

$$\forall \delta > 0, \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{\tau_n + \delta_n}^n, e_k \rangle - \langle Y_{\tau_n}^n, e_k \rangle | \ge \delta \Big) = 0. \tag{11}$$

In the third step we address the continuity of the limiting process.

Step 1. By Theorem 4, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq n_0(k)$ there exists a function $e_k^n \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $\prod_n e_k^n \to e_k$ in $\mathcal{C}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and $\prod_n \mathcal{H}_n e_k^n \to \lambda_k e_k$ in $\mathcal{C}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, choose k = 1. Then λ_1 is simple and we can choose e_1^n to be an eigenfunction of \mathcal{H}_n of eigenvalue $\lambda_1^n \to \lambda_1$. Since $e_1 > 0$, we may assume that $\prod_n e_1^n > 0, \forall n \geq n_0(1)$ and hence for any positive measure μ there exists a C > 0 such that

$$\langle \mu, 1 \rangle \le C \langle \mu, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle, \qquad \forall n \ge n_0(1).$$

Therefore (10) follows if one can show that

$$\forall \delta > 0, \quad \exists R(\delta) > 0, \ n(\delta) \ge n_0(1) \text{ such that } \inf_{n \ge n(\delta)} \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \langle Y_t^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle \le R(\delta)\Big) \ge 1 - \delta.$$

Let us hence focus on $\langle Y_t^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle$. By the martingale representation (8) (see also the discussion in Remark 2.3) one obtains

$$\langle Y_t^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle = \langle Y_0^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle + \int_0^t \lambda_0^n \langle Y_r^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle - n^{-\varrho} \langle \left(\Pi_n^3 Y_r^n\right)^2, \xi_{\varepsilon}^n \Pi_n^2 e_1^n \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r + M_t^n (\Pi_n e_1^n).$$

To treat the nonlinear quadratic term, we shall consider a stopped process. Let us fix R > 0 and consider the stopping time τ_R and a parameter ρ_0 , defined as

$$\tau_R := \inf\{t \ge 0 : \langle Y_t^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle \ge R\}, \qquad \varrho_0 = \varrho - \frac{d}{2} - d.$$

Since $|\xi^n(x)| \lesssim n^{\frac{d}{2}}$ and since

$$\|\Pi_n^3 Y_r^n\|_{\infty} \leqslant \|\Pi_n Y_r^n\|_{\infty} \leqslant n^d \langle Y_r^n, 1 \rangle \lesssim n^d \langle Y_r^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle,$$

one can bound

$$n^{-\varrho}|\langle (\Pi_n^3 Y_{r\wedge\tau_R}^n)^2, \xi^n \Pi_n^2 e_1^n \rangle| \lesssim n^{-\varrho+\frac{d}{2}+d} \langle Y_{r\wedge\tau_R}^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle^2 \lesssim Rn^{-\varrho_0} \langle Y_{r\wedge\tau_R}^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle,$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}|\langle Y_{t\wedge\tau_R}^n,\Pi_n e_1^n\rangle|^2 \lesssim \langle Y_0^n,1\rangle + (1+Rn^{-\varrho_0})\int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\langle Y_{r\wedge\tau_R}^n,\Pi_n e_1^n\rangle|^2 \,\mathrm{d}r + \mathbb{E}\langle M^n(\Pi_n e_1^n)\rangle_{t\wedge\tau_R}.$$

Furthermore, using the formula for the predictable quadratic variation from Lemma 2.2

$$\mathbb{E}\langle M^{n}(\Pi_{n}e_{1}^{n})\rangle_{t\wedge\tau_{R}} \leqslant \mathbb{E}\int_{0}^{t} \langle (1+n^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}s_{n})\Pi_{n}^{3}Y_{r\wedge\tau_{R}}^{n}, (\Pi_{n}^{2}e_{1}^{n})^{2}\rangle + n^{-\varrho} \langle \left(\Pi_{n}(Y_{r\wedge\tau_{R}}^{n}\Pi_{n}e_{1}^{n})\right)^{2}, 1\rangle \\ + n^{-\varrho} \langle n^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}|s_{n}|(\Pi_{n}^{3}Y_{r\wedge\tau_{R}}^{n})^{2}, (\Pi_{n}^{2}e_{1}^{n})^{2} + 2n^{-\varrho}(\Pi_{n}^{2}e_{1}^{n})\Pi_{n}(Y_{r\wedge\tau_{R}}^{n}\Pi_{n}e_{1}^{n}) \,\mathrm{d}r.$$

Since by Assumption 1.6 $n^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}|s_n| \leq 2n^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}$, and since $\sup_{n \geq n_0(1)} \|\Pi_n e_1^n\|_{\infty} < \infty$ as well as $0 \leq Y_r \leq n^{\varrho}$, we can rewrite the bound as:

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E} \langle M^n(\Pi_n e_1^n) \rangle_{t \wedge \tau_R} &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \langle \Pi_n^3 Y_{r \wedge \tau_R}^n, \Pi_n^2 e_1^n \rangle + \langle \Pi_n (Y_{r \wedge \tau_R}^n \Pi_n e_1^n), 1 \rangle + \langle \Pi_n^3 Y_{r \wedge \tau_R}^n, \Pi_n^2 e_1^n \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \langle Y_{r \wedge \tau_R}, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r. \end{split}$$

Therefore, by Gronwall's inequality, there exists a C > 0 such that

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \mathbb{E} |\langle Y_{t \land \tau_R}^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle|^2 \lesssim e^{C(1+Rn^{-\varrho_0})}.$$
(12)

It follows that if $n \ge R^{\frac{1}{\ell_0}}$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{0 \le t \le T} |\langle Y_t^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle| \ge R\Big) = \mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{\tau_R \wedge T}^n, \Pi_n e_1^n \rangle| = R\Big) \lesssim R^{-2}.$$

This concludes the proof of the compact containment condition (10).

Step 2. Next we want to prove (11), so let us fix $k \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. In view of the calculations from Step 1 there exist $R(\gamma), n(\gamma)$ for which (10) holds (with δ replaced by γ). In addition, for some $n(\gamma, \delta) \ge n(\gamma)$ we may also assume that

$$\forall n \ge n(\gamma, \delta) \qquad \|e_k - \prod_n e_k^n\|_{L^{\infty}} \le \frac{\delta}{2R(\gamma)}.$$

Hence, for every $n \ge n(\gamma, \delta)$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{\tau_n+\delta_n}^n, e_k\rangle - \langle Y_{\tau_n}^n, e_k\rangle| \ge \delta\Big) \le \gamma + \mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{\tau_n+\delta_n}^n, \Pi_n e_k^n\rangle - \langle Y_{\tau_n}^n, \Pi_n e_k^n\rangle| \ge \delta\Big).$$

Now, using the definition of $R(\gamma)$ (and writing for simplicity R instead of $R(\gamma)$):

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{\tau_n+\delta_n}^n, \Pi_n e_k^n \rangle - \langle Y_{\tau_n}^n, \Pi_n e_k^n \rangle| \ge \delta\Big) \le \gamma + \mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R}^n, \Pi_n e_k^n \rangle - \langle Y_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}^n, \Pi_n e_k^n \rangle| \ge \delta\Big).$$

At this point, via the representation of Lemma 2.2 we have that

$$\langle Y_{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R}^n - Y_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}^n, \Pi_n e_k^n \rangle = \int_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}^{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R} \langle Y_r^n, \Pi_n \mathcal{H}_n e_k^n \rangle - n^{-\varrho} \langle \left(\Pi_n Y_r^n\right)^2, \xi_e^n \Pi_n^2 e_k^n \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r + M_{\tau_n+\delta_n}^n (\Pi_n e_k^n) - M_{\tau_n}^n (\Pi_n e_k^n).$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R}^n,\Pi_n e_k^n\rangle - \langle Y_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}^n,\Pi_n e_k^n\rangle| \geq \delta\Big) \\ &\leqslant \mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\int_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}^{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R} \langle Y_r^n,\Pi_n\mathcal{H}_n e_k^n\rangle - n^{-\varrho}\langle \left(\Pi_n Y_r^n\right)^2, \xi_e^n\Pi_n^2 e_k^n\rangle \,\mathrm{d}r\Big| \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\Big) \\ &+ \frac{4}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E}|M_{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R}^n(\Pi_n e_k^n) - M_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}^n(\Pi_n e_k^n)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov's inequality in the last line. Following the calculations of Step 1 and using that both $\Pi_n \mathcal{H}_n e_k^n$ and $\Pi_n e_k^n$ are uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{C}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, we find

$$\left|\int_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}^{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R} \langle Y_r^n, \Pi_n\mathcal{H}_n e_k^n \rangle - n^{-\varrho} \langle \left(\Pi_n Y_r^n\right)^2, \xi_e^n \Pi_n^2 e_k^n \rangle \,\mathrm{d}r \right| \lesssim \int_{\tau_n}^{\tau_n+\delta_n} \langle Y_{r\wedge\tau_R}^n, 1 \rangle \,\mathrm{d}r \lesssim \delta_n R(\gamma)$$

Similar calculations for the quadratic variation show that

$$\mathbb{E}|M^n_{(\tau_n+\delta_n)\wedge\tau_R}(\Pi_n e^n_k) - M^n_{\tau_n\wedge\tau_R}(\Pi_n e^n_k)|^2 \lesssim \delta_n R(\gamma).$$

Collecting all the bounds we proves so far and passing to the limit $n \to \infty$ we obtain that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle Y_{\tau_n + \delta_n}^n, e_k \rangle - \langle Y_{\tau_n}^n, e_k \rangle| \ge \delta \Big) \le 2\gamma.$$

Since γ is arbitrary, this proves (11).

Step 3. So far any limit point Y of the sequence Y^n lies in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Since $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is endowed with the weak topology, to prove that actually $Y \in C([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$, it is sufficient to show that for any continuous function $\varphi, \langle Y_t, \varphi \rangle$ is continuous in time. Here one can apply a criterion [23, Theorem 3.10.2] according to which it is sufficient to prove that the maximum size of a jump converges weakly to zero. In our case such convergence happens even almost surely:

$$|\langle Y_t^n, \varphi \rangle - \langle Y_{t-}^n, \varphi \rangle| \lesssim n^{\varrho - d - \eta} \|\varphi\|_{C(\mathbb{T}^d)} = n^{-2} \|\varphi\|_{C(\mathbb{T}^d)}.$$

This follows from the definition of the generator, as well as Equation (7)) for η , which imply that jumps are bounded by $||Y_t^n - Y_{t-}^n||_{L^{\infty}} \leq n^{\varrho - \eta} \leq 1$. Since a jump has impact only in a ball $B_n(x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, integrating φ over such ball guarantees the claimed estimate.

Finally we are in position to deduce Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. By Proposition 2.4 the sequence $Y^n(\omega)$ is tight, for every $\omega \in \Omega$, under Assumption 2.1. It remains to show that, for fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, every limit point satisfies the martingale problem for the rough superBrownian motion as in Definition 1.8, which is covered by Steps 1 and 2, and that such solutions are unique, which is covered by Step 3.

Step 1. As in the proof of Proposition 2.4, since $\omega \in \Omega$ is fixed we omit writing it. Moreover it is sufficient to fix a finite but arbitrary time horizon T > 0and check the martingale property until that time. Assume that (up to taking a subsequence and applying the Skorohod representation theorem) $Y^n \to Y$ almost surely in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Recall that the domain \mathcal{D} of the Anderson Hamiltonian is composed of finite linear combinations of eigenfunctions, hence we have to check the martingale property for φ of the form $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{k_i} e_{k_i}$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}, k_1, \ldots, k_m \in \mathbb{N}, \ \alpha_{k_i} \in \mathbb{R}$, and where $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the set of eigenfunctions of \mathcal{H} . Now consider the approximate eigenfunctions e_k^n from Theorem 4 and define φ^n by $\varphi^n = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{k_i} e_{k_i}^n$. Then Theorem 4 implies that for some $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \prod_n \varphi^n = \varphi, \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \prod_n \mathcal{H}_n \varphi^n = \mathcal{H}\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{k_i} \lambda_{k_i} e_{k_i}, \quad \text{in} \qquad \mathcal{C}^{\varepsilon}$$

In this setting, with the notation of Lemma 2.2, one has almost surely

$$\begin{split} M_t^{\varphi} &= \langle Y_{t,0}, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle Y_s, \mathcal{H}\varphi \rangle \,\mathrm{d}s \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} \left[\langle Y_{t,0}^n, \Pi_n \varphi^n \rangle - \int_0^t \langle Y_r^n, \Pi_n \mathcal{H}_n \varphi^n \rangle - n^{-\varrho} \langle \left(\Pi_n^3 Y_r^n\right)^2, \xi^n \Pi_n^2 \varphi^n \rangle \,\mathrm{d}r \right] \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} \left[\langle Y_{t,0}^n, \Pi_n \varphi^n \rangle - \int_0^t \langle \mathcal{A}_n (Y_r^n) + \Pi_n [\xi_e^n \Pi_n^3 Y_r^n], \Pi_n \varphi^n \rangle - n^{-\varrho} \langle \left(\Pi_n^3 Y_r^n\right)^2, \xi_e^n \Pi_n^2 \varphi^n \rangle \,\mathrm{d}r \right] \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} M_t^n (\Pi_n \varphi^n). \end{split}$$

Here the convergence to zero of the non-linear term follows as in the proof of Proposition 2.4:

$$\langle (\Pi_n Y_r^n)^2, \xi_e^n \Pi_n^2 \varphi^n \rangle \lesssim n^{-\varrho+d+\frac{d}{2}} \| \Pi_n \varphi^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\varepsilon}} \langle Y_r^n, 1 \rangle^2 \to 0,$$

by the assumption on ϱ . Our aim is to establish the martingale property for M_t^{φ} with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}_t generated by Y_t . The almost sure convergence $M_t^n(\Pi_n\varphi^n) \to M_t^{\varphi}$ is not sufficient. Instead, we will pick a sequence of stopped martingales $\widetilde{M}_t^n(\Pi_n\varphi^n)$, such that $\widetilde{M}_t^n(\Pi_n\varphi^n) \to M_t^{\varphi}$ almost surely and in L^1 , for all $t \in [0,T]$. As we will see, the additional convergence in L^1 will guarantee that the limit M^{φ} is a martingale. Hence, let us define the following stopping time, for any path $z \in \mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$:

$$\tau_R(z) \colon = \inf\{t \in [0,T] : |\langle z_t, 1 \rangle| \ge R\}.$$

Since Y takes values in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ we have that $\lim_{R\to\infty} \tau_R(Y) = \infty$. Now, Lemma 2.6 guarantees that almost surely (that is, on the events in which $Y^n \to Y$ in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)))$ for any $0 < \varepsilon < R$:

$$\tau_{R-\varepsilon}(Y) \leqslant \liminf_{n \to \infty} \tau_R(Y^n).$$

We deduce, using the monotonicity $\tau_R(z) \leq \tau_{R'}(z)$ if $R \leq R'$, that for $\varrho_0 = \rho - \frac{d}{2} - d > 0$ (by Assumption 1.5) almost surely: $\lim_{n \to \infty} \tau_{n^{\varrho_0}}(Y^n) = \infty$. Now, Equation (12) implies that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \left\langle Y_{t \wedge \tau_n e_0}^n(Y^n), 1 \right\rangle \right|^2 \right] < \infty.$$

In particular, following the calculations of Proposition 2.4 the sequence of stopped martingales $\{M_{t\wedge\tau_n\varrho_0}^n(Y^n)(\Pi_n\varphi^n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable:

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\mathbb{E}|M^n_{t\wedge\tau_n\varrho_0}(Y^n)(\Pi_n\varphi^n)|^2<\infty.$$

Moreover, following from the previous observations $\widetilde{M}_t^n(\Pi_n \varphi^n)$: $= M_{t \wedge \tau_n \varphi_0}^n(Y^n)(\Pi_n \varphi^n)$ converges almost surely to M_t^{φ} . The uniform integrability implies that the convergence holds also in L^1 . In order to conclude that M^{φ} is a martingale with respect to \mathcal{F} it suffices to show that for every s < t, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq s_1 \leq \cdots \leq s_m \leq s$ and every $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R})$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[M_t^{\varphi}h(Y_{s_1},\ldots,Y_{s_m})\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[M_s^{\varphi}h(Y_{s_1},\ldots,Y_{s_m})\Big].$$

From the convergence in L^1 and almost surely that we just proved we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[M_{t}^{\varphi}h(Y_{s_{1}},\ldots,Y_{s_{m}})\right] = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{M}_{t}^{n}(\Pi_{n}\varphi^{n})h(Y_{s_{1}\wedge\tau_{n}\varrho_{0}}^{n}(Y^{n}),\ldots,Y_{s_{m}\wedge\tau_{n}\varrho_{0}}^{n}(Y^{n}))\right]$$
$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{M}_{s}^{n}(\Pi_{n}\varphi^{n})h(Y_{s_{1}\wedge\tau_{n}\varrho_{0}}^{n}(Y^{n}),\ldots,Y_{s_{m}\wedge\tau_{n}\varrho_{0}}^{n}(Y^{n}))\right]$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\left[M_{s}^{\varphi}h(Y_{s_{1}},\ldots,Y_{s_{m}})\right],$$
(13)

where in the second line we used the martingale property for $\widetilde{M}^n(\Pi_n \varphi^n)$.

Step 2. Now we have to show that the martingale has the correct quadratic variation. Here the problem is that we do not control moments of $\widetilde{M}_t^n(\prod_n \varphi^n)$ higher than the second one. So proving that the martingale property of $(\widetilde{M}_t^n)^2 - \langle \widetilde{M}^n \rangle_t$ is preserved in the limit does not follow from the same arguments we just used. Instead we stop the martingales in a different way. Consider the following stopping times as a sequence indexed by $R \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\{\tau_R(Y^n) \wedge T\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}} \in [0, T]^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Here the space $[0, T]^{\mathbb{N}}$ is endowed with the product topology and under this topology it is both compact and separable. In particular, since we are assuming that $Y^n \to Y$ in distribution in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$, the sequence $(\{\tau_R(Y^n) \land T\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}, Y^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the space $[0,T]^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Hence let $(\{\overline{\tau}_R\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}, Y)$ be any limit point of the joint distribution. Since the space $[0,T]^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is separable, by the Skorohod representation theorem, up to changing probability space, we can pick a subsequence n_k , for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that almost surely

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} (\{\tau_R(Y^{n_k}) \land T\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}, Y^{n_k}) = (\{\overline{\tau}_R\}_{R \in \mathbb{N}}, Y), \quad \text{in} \quad [0, T]^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{D}([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d)).$$

The limiting random variables still satisfy the ordering: $\bar{\tau}_R \leq \bar{\tau}_{R+m}$, $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}$, as well as, by Lemma 2.6:

$$\tau_{R-\varepsilon}(Y) \wedge T \le \bar{\tau}_R \le \tau_{R+\varepsilon}(Y) \wedge T, \qquad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \tag{14}$$

Now, the same calculations leading to Equation (13) show that for any $R \in \mathbb{N}$ the stopped martingales $M_{t\wedge\tau_R(Y^{n_k})}^{n_k}(\prod_{n_k}\varphi^{n_k})$ converge to $M_{t\wedge\bar{\tau}_R}^{\varphi}$ almost surely and in L^1 (note that now the martingales $M_{t\wedge\tau_R(Y^{n_k})}^{n_k}(\prod_{n_k}\varphi^{n_k})$ are even bounded). Similarly we obtain that $M_{t\wedge\bar{\tau}_R}^{\varphi}$ is a martingale with respect to the filtration $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t^R$ generated by $Y_{t\wedge\bar{\tau}_R}$. Following the calculations of Proposition 2.4 we observe that

$$\langle M^{n_k}(\Pi_{n_k}\varphi^{n_k})\rangle_{t\wedge\tau_R(Y^{n_k})} \leqslant C \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R(Y^{n_k})} \langle Y_s^{n_k}, 1\rangle \,\mathrm{d}s,$$

for some deterministic C > 0. In particular, following once more the calculations of Proposition 2.4, we deduce that the martingale $\left(M_{t\wedge\tau_R}^{n_k}(\Pi_{n_k}\varphi^{n_k})\right)^2 - \langle M^{n_k}(\Pi_{n_k}\varphi^{n_k})\rangle_{t\wedge\tau_R}(Y^{n_k})$ is bounded and converges almost surely to $\left(M_{t\wedge\overline{\tau}_R}^{\varphi}\right)^2 - \int_0^{t\wedge\overline{\tau}_R} \langle Y_s,\varphi^2\rangle \,\mathrm{d}s$. We then conclude that $\langle M_{\cdot\wedge\overline{\tau}_R}^{\varphi}\rangle_t = \int_0^{t\wedge\overline{\tau}_R} \langle Y_s,\varphi^2\rangle \,\mathrm{d}s$. Now, defining $t_k^n = \frac{kT}{n}$, for $k \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can view the quadratic variation as the limit in probability:

$$\langle M^{\varphi}_{\cdot\wedge\overline{\tau}_{R}}\rangle_{t} = \mathbb{P} - \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} (M_{t\wedge\overline{\tau}_{R}\wedge t^{n}_{k+1}} - M_{t\wedge\overline{\tau}_{R}\wedge t^{n}_{k}})^{2}$$

Similarly for the martingale whose quadratic variation we would actually like to compute:

$$\langle M^{\varphi} \rangle_t = \mathbb{P} - \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k=0}^n (M_{t \wedge t_{k+1}^n} - M_{t \wedge t_k^n})^2.$$

Now, for any $\delta > 0$ and $t \in [0,T)$ we can choose an $R \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau}_R > t) \geq 1 - \delta$, by comparison with the stopping time $\tau_{R-\varepsilon}(Y)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ (see Equation (14)) and since $\lim_{R\to\infty} \tau_R(Y) = \infty$. So we conclude that for any t < T it holds that $\mathbb{P}(\langle M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \langle Y_s, \varphi^2 \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s) \geq 1 - \delta$. Since $\delta, T > 0$ are arbitrary we obtain the correct quadratic variation for all times.

Step 3. We conclude by explaining the uniqueness in law of any process Y satisfying the martingale problem of the rough superBrownian motion (in the following as always $\omega \in \Omega$ is fixed, and we omit from writing it). The uniqueness is the consequence of a duality argument. For any $\varphi \geq 0, \varphi \in C^{\infty}$ we find a process $t \mapsto U_t \varphi$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\langle Y_t,\varphi\rangle}\right] = e^{-\langle Y^0,U_t\varphi\rangle}.$$
(15)

Hence the distribution of $\langle Y_t, \varphi \rangle$ is uniquely characterized by its Laplace transform. This also characterizes the law of the entire process $\langle Y_t, \varphi \rangle$ through a monotone class argument (see [17, Lemma 3.2.5]), proving the required result.

We are left with the task of describing the process $U_t\varphi$. This is the solution, evaluated at time $t \ge 0$, of the non-linearly damped parabolic equation

$$\partial_t (U.\varphi) = \mathcal{H}(U.\varphi) - \frac{1}{2} (U.\varphi)^2, \qquad U_0 \varphi = \varphi,$$

where we consider solutions in the mild sense, namely $U_t \varphi = e^{t\mathcal{H}} \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathcal{H}} (U_s \varphi)^2 \, \mathrm{d}s$, as in Lemma 2.5. To obtain Equation (15) consider some $\zeta > 0$ and a process $\psi \in C([0,T]; \mathcal{C}^{\zeta})$ of the form $\psi_t = e^{t\mathcal{H}} \psi_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathcal{H}} f_s \, \mathrm{d}s$, with $f \in C([0,T]; \mathcal{C}^{\zeta}), \psi_0 \in \mathcal{C}^{\zeta}$. Now approximate f through a piecewise constant function in time \tilde{f} and in turn approximate both \tilde{f} and ψ_0 via a finite number of eigenfunctions (here we use the density of the domain proved in Lemma 5.2). Using the continuity of the semigroup as in Equation (34), it follows from the definition of the rough superBrownian motion that for $0 \leq s \leq t$:

$$\langle Y_s, \psi_{t-s} \rangle - \langle Y_0, \psi_t \rangle - \int_0^s \langle Y_r, f_r \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r =: \widetilde{M}_s(\psi)$$

is a continuous martingale with quadratic variation $\langle M(\psi) \rangle_s = \int_0^s \langle Y_r, \psi_{t-r}^2 \rangle dr$. We apply this observation together with Itô's formula to deduce that $[0, t] \ni s \mapsto e^{-\langle Y_s, U_{t-s}\varphi \rangle}$ is a martingale on [0, t]. In particular, this implies Equation (15) and concludes the proof.

The following result states the well-posedness of the dual PDE to the rough superBrownian motion. The proof is identical to that of [47, Proposition 4.5].

Lemma 2.5. Under Assumption 2.1, fix $\omega \in \Omega$. For any $\varphi \geq 0, \varphi \in C^{\infty}$, time horizon T > 0 and $\zeta < 2 - \frac{d}{2}$, there exists a unique function $(t, x) \mapsto (U_t^{\omega} \varphi)(x)$ such that $U^{\omega} \varphi \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{C}^{\zeta})$, where

$$U_t^{\omega}\varphi = e^{t\mathcal{H}^{\omega}}\varphi - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathcal{H}^{\omega}} (U_s^{\omega}\varphi)^2 \,\mathrm{d}s.$$

We conclude the section with a consideration on stopping times and convergence in the Skorohod topology, which is used in the proofs above. The proof of this lemma follows from the definition of the Skorohod distance.

Lemma 2.6. Consider T > 0 and $\{z^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, z \in \mathbb{D}([0,T];\mathbb{R})$ such that $z^n \to z$ in $\mathbb{D}([0,T],\mathbb{R})$. Define, for R > 0:

$$\tau_R(z) = \inf\{t \in [0,T] : |z_t| \ge R\},\$$

and identically also $\tau_R(z^n)$, with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\tau_{R-\varepsilon}(z) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \tau_R(z^n) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \tau_R(z^n) \leq \tau_{R+\varepsilon}(z).$$

3. Scaling to Fisher-KPP

As in Section 2, we fix one realization $\omega \in \Omega$ of the environment and work conditionally on that realization. The first step towards the scaling limit is to restate the martingale problem of Lemma 1.4 under the present scaling. The proof of the next result is an immediate consequence of the aforementioned lemma.

Lemma 3.1. In the setting of Theorem 2 fix any $\omega \in \Omega$. For all $\varphi \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the process $t \mapsto \langle X_t^n(\omega), \varphi \rangle$ satisfies

$$\langle X_{t,s}^{n}(\omega),\varphi\rangle = \int_{s}^{t} \langle \mathcal{A}_{n}(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)),\varphi\rangle + \langle \Pi_{n} \left[\bar{\xi}(\omega) (\Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}(\omega) - (\Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}(\omega))^{2}) \right],\varphi\rangle \,\mathrm{d}r + M_{t,s}^{n}(\varphi),$$
(16)

where $M^n(\varphi)$ is a centered square integrable martingale with predictable quadratic variation

$$\langle M^{n}(\varphi) \rangle_{t} = n^{-\eta - d + 2} \int_{0}^{t} \langle (1 + s_{n}(\omega)) \Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}(\omega), (\Pi_{n}\varphi)^{2} - 2\Pi_{n}(\varphi) \Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi) \rangle + \langle (\Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi))^{2}, 1 \rangle - \langle s_{n}(\omega) (\Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}(\omega))^{2}, (\Pi_{n}\varphi)^{2} - 2\Pi_{n}(\varphi) \Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}(\omega)\varphi) \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r.$$

$$(17)$$

Now we are able to prove tightness of our process.

Proposition 3.2. In the setting of Theorem 2 fix any $\omega \in \Omega, T > 0$ and α such that

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \in (0, 1/2) & \text{if } d = 1, \\ \alpha \in (0, \min\{\eta, 1\}) & \text{if } d = 2. \end{cases}$$

Then the sequence $\{s \mapsto \prod_n X_s^n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the space $L^2([0,T]; B_{2,2}^{\alpha})$. In addition, the sequence $\{s \mapsto X_s^n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$, and any limit point lies in $C([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$.

To prove the proposition we will make use of the regularizing properties of the semigroup $e^{t\mathcal{A}_n}$ as described by the following result.

Lemma 3.3. For any $\gamma \in [0,1), p \in [1,\infty], T > 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ one can bound, uniformly over $n \in \mathbb{N}, \ \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}, t \in [0,T]$:

$$\|\Pi_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\gamma}} \lesssim t^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$$

Proof. We can bound $\|\mathcal{P}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \Pi_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\gamma}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\gamma}} \lesssim t^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$, where in the first step we applied Corollary 4.14 and in the last step the large scale estimate of Proposition 4.7. Instead, on small scales we find $\|\mathcal{Q}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \Pi_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\gamma}} \lesssim$ $n^{\gamma} \|\mathcal{Q}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim t^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$, where we again applied Corollary 4.14 and Proposition 4.7.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. As $\omega \in \Omega$ is fixed, we omit writing it.

Step 1. The tightness of the sequence X^n in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is a consequence of the bound $0 \leq X_t^n \leq 1$. In fact, we can apply Jakubowski's tightness criterion [33, Theorem 3.1]. The criterion consists in proving first a compact containment condition. This is immediately satisfied since $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\langle X_t^n, 1 \rangle| > 1) = 0$, from the boundedness of X^n . The second and last requirement for Jakubowski's tightness criterion is the tightness of one dimensional distributions. Namely it suffices to prove that for any $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the sequences of process $\{t \mapsto \langle X_t^n, \varphi \rangle\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}([0.T]; \mathbb{R})$. For this purpose we use Aldous' tightness criterion (this is the same approach as in the proof of Proposition 2.4). Let us define

$$D_{t,s}^{n}(\varphi) = \langle X_{t,s}^{n}, \varphi \rangle - M_{t,s}^{n}(\varphi),$$

where we used the notations of Lemma 3.1. Now to prove tightness of the onedimensional distributions Aldous' criterion guarantees that it suffices to show that for any sequence of stopping times τ^n and any deterministic sequence δ_n with $\delta_n \to 0$ one has

$$\forall \delta > 0$$
 $\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(|\langle X_{\tau_n + \delta_n, \tau_n}^n, \varphi \rangle| \ge \delta \Big) = 0.$

In particular it suffices to show that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(|D_{\tau_n + \delta_n, \tau_n}^n(\varphi)| \ge \delta\Big) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(|M_{\tau_n + \delta_n, \tau_n}^n(\varphi)| \ge \delta\Big) = 0.$$

Now by Proposition 4.6 we find that (since φ is smooth) $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mathcal{A}_n \varphi\|_{L^{\infty}} < \infty$. Hence the following deterministic bound holds (since $0 \leq X_t^n \leq 1$):

$$D^n_{\tau_n+\delta_n,\tau_n}(\varphi)| \lesssim_{\varphi} \delta_n,$$

which proves the first limit. As for the second one, we observe that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|M_{\tau_n+\delta_n,\tau_n}^n(\varphi)| \ge \delta\Big) \leqslant \frac{1}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E}\Big[\langle M^n(\varphi) \rangle_{\tau_n+\delta_n,\tau_n}\Big] \lesssim \frac{\delta_n}{\delta^2} \to 0,$$

where for the quadratic variation we used similar bounds as for the drift. Finally, to show that any limit point lies in $C([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ note that for any $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$\langle X_t^n, \varphi \rangle - \langle X_{t-}^n, \varphi \rangle | \lesssim n^{-\eta-d} \|\varphi\|_{L^{\infty}} \le n^{-2} \|\varphi\|_{L^{\infty}},$$

so that the maximal jump size is vanishing as $n \to \infty$. The continuity of the limit points follows then through [23, Theorem 3.10.2].

Step 2. Tightness in the space of measures is not sufficient to make sense of the nonlinearity in the limit. Hence from now on we now concentrate on proving the

tightness of the sequence $\Pi_n X_s^n$ in $L^2([0,T]; B_{2,2}^{\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Our aim is to apply Simon's tightness criterion, which we recall in Proposition 3.4. We will apply the criterion for some $\alpha' > \alpha > \alpha''$ and

$$X = B_{2,2}^{\alpha'}, \quad Y = B_{2,2}^{\alpha}, \quad Z = B_{2,2}^{\alpha''},$$

Then, as a first objective, we derive a uniform bound for the second moment of the $B_{2,2}^{\alpha}$ norm (this in particular implies boundedness of the sequence $\Pi_n X^n$ in $L^2([0,T]; B_{2,2}^{\alpha}))$:

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_n X_t^n\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}}^2<\infty.$$
(18)

To obtain this bound it is convenient to prove the following stronger estimate. for $s \in [0, T]$

$$\sup_{\leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi_n X_t^n\|_{B_{2,2}}^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \lesssim_T 1 + \|\Pi_n X_s^n\|_{B_{2,2}}^2, \tag{19}$$

where $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is the natural filtration generated by X^n (we omit the dependence of the filtration on n). We state the bound with the conditional expectation, since in this form it is simpler to derive, via a Gronwall-type argument. For brevity, fix the notation $\overline{X}^n = \prod_n X^n$. By the martingale representation of Lemma 3.1 and a change of variables formula

$$\overline{X}_{t}^{n} = e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\overline{X}_{s}^{n} + \int_{s}^{t} e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\Pi_{n}^{2} \left[\overline{\xi} \left(\Pi_{n}^{2}\overline{X}_{r}^{n} - (\Pi_{n}^{2}\overline{X}_{r}^{n})^{2}\right)\right] \mathrm{d}r + \int_{s+}^{t}\Pi_{n}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}} \mathrm{d}M_{r}^{n}$$

where the last integral is understood as a stochastic integral against a martingale measure (cf. [56]). For the purpose of the proof it is sufficient to consider its one dimensional projections, that is for $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$\begin{split} \langle \overline{X}_{t}^{n}, \varphi \rangle &= \langle \overline{X}_{s}^{n}, e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\varphi \rangle + \int_{s}^{t} \langle \Pi_{n}^{2} \left[\overline{\xi} \left(\Pi_{n}^{2} \overline{X}_{r}^{n} - (\Pi_{n}^{2} \overline{X}_{r}^{n})^{2} \right) \right], e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\varphi \rangle \,\mathrm{d}r \\ &+ \int_{s+}^{t} \mathrm{d}M_{r}^{n} (\Pi_{n} e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\varphi). \end{split}$$

The $B_{2,2}^{\alpha}$ norm is then estimated by

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\overline{X}_{t}^{n}\right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2}\left|\mathcal{F}_{s}\right] \lesssim \left\|\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2} + \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\int_{s}^{t}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\Pi_{n}^{2}\left[\bar{\xi}(\Pi_{n}^{2}\overline{X}_{r}^{n} - (\Pi_{n}^{2}\overline{X}_{r}^{n})^{2})\right]\mathrm{d}r\right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2}\left|\mathcal{F}_{s}\right] \\ + \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\int_{s+}^{t}\Pi_{n}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathrm{d}M_{r}^{n}\right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2}\left|\mathcal{F}_{s}\right].$$

An extension of the paraproduct estimates of Lemma 5.14 to the $B^{\alpha}_{p,q}$ scale (see [3, Theorems 2.82, 2.85]) guarantees that

$$\|f^2\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}} \le 2\|f \otimes f\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}} + \|f \odot f\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\infty}} \|f\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}}.$$

Now we apply the Schauder estimates of Proposition 4.7. Note that here we do not need the real strength of the estimates, as we do not need to gain any regularity. Note also that the estimates are proven on the scale of $B_{p,\infty}^{\alpha}$ spaces but extend verbatim to $B_{p,q}^{\alpha}$ spaces for $q \in [1,\infty)$. Hence, using the L^{∞} bound on \overline{X}^n and the fact that $\overline{\xi}$ is smooth one obtains

$$\left\| e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} \Pi_n^2 \left[\bar{\xi} (\Pi_n^2 \overline{X}_r^n - (\Pi_n^2 \overline{X}_r^n)^2) \right] \right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}} \lesssim \left\| \Pi_n^2 \left[\bar{\xi} (\Pi_n^2 \overline{X}_r^n - (\Pi_n^2 \overline{X}_r^n)^2) \right] \right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}} \lesssim \| \overline{X}_r^n \|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg\|\int_s^t e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} \Pi_n^2 \big[\bar{\xi}(\Pi_n^2 \overline{X}_r^n - (\Pi_n^2 \overline{X}_r^n)^2)\big] \,\mathrm{d}r\bigg\|_{B_{2,2}^\alpha}^2 \Big|\mathcal{F}_s\bigg] \lesssim |t-s|^2 \sup_{s \le t \le T} \mathbb{E}\big[\|\overline{X}_t^n\|_{B_{2,2}^\alpha}^2 \big|\mathcal{F}_s\big].$$

As for the martingale term, let us introduce a parameter λ according to the following definition:

$$\begin{cases} \text{If } d = 1, & \eta = 1 \implies \text{set } \lambda = 0, \\ \text{If } d = 2, & \eta > 0 \implies \text{set } \lambda = \min\{\eta, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

Then, from the definition of the space $B_{2,2}^{\alpha}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\int_{s+}^{t}\Pi_{n}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\,\mathrm{d}M_{r}^{n}\right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2}\left|\mathcal{F}_{s}\right]=\sum_{j\geq-1}2^{2\alpha j}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{s+}^{t}\,\mathrm{d}M_{r}^{n}(e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\Pi_{n}K_{j}^{x})\right|^{2}\left|\mathcal{F}_{s}\right]\,\mathrm{d}x\right]$$

where K_j^x stands for the function $K_j^x(y) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}^{-1} \varrho_j(x-y)$, with ϱ_j the elements of the dyadic partition of the unity that define the Besov spaces. Using the predictable quadratic variation computed in Lemma 3.1 one obtains, uniformly over x

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{s+}^{t} \mathrm{d}M_{r}^{n}(e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\Pi_{n}K_{j}^{x})\right|^{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_{s}\right] \\
\leqslant n^{-\lambda}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{s}^{t} \langle \Pi_{n}^{2}\overline{X}_{r}^{n},(1+s_{n})\left[(\Pi_{n}^{2}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x})^{2}-2\Pi_{n}^{2}(e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x})\Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}\Pi_{n}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x})\right]\rangle \\
+ \left\langle\left(\Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}\Pi_{n}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x})\right)^{2},1\right\rangle \\
- \left\langle\left(\Pi_{n}^{2}\overline{X}_{r}^{n}\right)^{2},s_{n}\left[(\Pi_{n}^{2}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x})^{2}-2\Pi_{n}^{2}(e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x})\Pi_{n}(X_{r}^{n}\Pi_{n}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x})\right]\right\rangle\mathrm{d}r \mid \mathcal{F}_{s}\right] \\
\lesssim n^{-\lambda}\int_{s}^{t}\left|\left|\Pi_{n}\right|\Pi_{n}e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}K_{j}^{x}\right|\left|\right|_{L^{2}}^{2}\mathrm{d}r,$$
(20)

since $|s_n|, |X^n|, |\overline{X}^n| \leq 1$. Now, for $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$, for example via the Poisson summation formula in Lemma 4.9 and a scaling argument on $\mathbb{R}^d \|K_j^x\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\zeta}_1} \lesssim 2^{j\zeta}$. Therefore by the Schauder estimates that we recalled in Lemma 3.3, for $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ $\|\Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x\|_{\mathcal{C}_1^{\zeta+\gamma}} \lesssim (t-r)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} 2^{j\zeta}.$

Now, for clarity, dimension d = 1 and dimension d = 2 will be treated separately. In dimension d = 1 choose $-\frac{1}{2} < \zeta < -\alpha$ and fix $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that $\zeta + \gamma > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, by Besov embedding, one has

$$\|\Pi_n |\Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x|\|_{L^2}^2 \le \|\Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|\Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x\|_{\mathcal{C}_1^{\zeta+\gamma}}^2 \lesssim (t-r)^{-\gamma} 2^{2j\zeta}$$

In dimension d = 2, we make additional use of the regularizing properties of Π_n together with the factor $n^{-\lambda}$ appearing in front of the quadratic variation. Note that Corollary 4.14 allows only to gain one degree of regularity, which is why we have defined $\lambda = \min\{1, \eta\}$ (we have no use for additional powers of n). Now, choose $\kappa > 0$ such that $\alpha < \lambda - 5\kappa$ and set $\gamma = 1 - \kappa$. Then Corollary 4.14 implies that

$$\|\Pi_n |\Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x|\|_{L^2} \lesssim n^{\lambda-\kappa} \||\Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x|\|_{\mathcal{C}_2^{-\lambda+2\kappa}},$$

so that:

and Besov embeddings 4.10 additionally guarantee the following chain of inequalities (here the main aim is to get rid of the absolute value):

$$\begin{split} \| \left| \Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x \right| \|_{\mathcal{C}_2^{-\lambda+2\kappa}} &\lesssim \| \left| \Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x \right| \|_{\mathcal{C}_{\frac{2}{1+\lambda-3\kappa}}^{-\kappa}} &\lesssim \| \Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x \|_{L^{\frac{2}{1+\lambda-3\kappa}}} \\ &\lesssim \| \Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x \|_{\mathcal{C}_1^{1-\lambda+4\kappa}} &\lesssim (t-r)^{\frac{1-\kappa}{2}} \| K_j^x \|_{\mathcal{C}_1^{-\lambda+5\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim (t-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} 2^{-j(\lambda-5\kappa)}. \end{split}$$

Overall, we have obtained that

$$\|\Pi_n |\Pi_n e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_n} K_j^x |\|_{L^2} \lesssim n^{\lambda-\kappa} (t-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} 2^{-j(\lambda-5\kappa)}.$$

In this way, in both dimensions, substituting the estimate into (20) one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\int_{s}^{t} \Pi_{n} e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}} \, \mathrm{d}M_{r}^{n}\right\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2} \left|\mathcal{F}_{s}\right] \lesssim |t-s|^{1-\gamma}.$$

For sufficiently small and deterministic T^* , chosen uniform over all parameters, inequality (19) is then proven for all $s \leq t$ such that $(t - s) \leq T^*$. Due to the presence of the conditional expectation, one can obtain the estimate for all $s \leq t$ via a Gronwall-type argument. Indeed, to extend the estimate to $2T^*$, observe there exists a $C(T^*)$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [s,s+2T^*]} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi_n X_t^n\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}}^2 |\mathcal{F}_s] \le C(T^*) \left(1 + \sup_{t \in [s,s+T^*]} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi_n X_t^n\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}}^2 |\mathcal{F}_s] \right) \right]$$
$$\le C(T^*) \left(1 + C(T^*) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi_n X_s^n\|_{B^{\alpha}_{2,2}}^2 \right] \right) \right).$$

Iterating this argument yields the bound for arbitrary T.

Step 3. The next goal is a bound for the expectation of an increment. For this reason fix $0 < \beta < \alpha$, with α as in Step 1. We shall prove that there exists a $\zeta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\overline{X}_{t}^{n} - \overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\beta}}^{2}\right] \lesssim |t - s|^{4\zeta}.$$
(21)

Indeed, arguments similar to those in Step 1 show that

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}\Big[\|\overline{X}_{t}^{n}-\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\beta}}^{2}\Big] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\Big[\|\overline{X}_{t}^{n}-e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\beta}}^{2}\Big] + \mathbb{E}\Big[\|e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\overline{X}_{s}^{n}-\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\beta}}^{2}\Big] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\Big[\|\overline{X}_{t}^{n}-e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\beta}}^{2}\Big] + |t-s|^{\alpha-\beta}\mathbb{E}\|\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2} \\ &\lesssim |t-s|^{1-\gamma}(1+\mathbb{E}\|\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\beta}}^{2}) + |t-s|^{\alpha-\beta}\mathbb{E}\|\overline{X}_{s}^{n}\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha}}^{2}, \end{split}$$

where the penultimate step follows from Lemma 4.8. This is enough to establish (21).

Step 4. Notice that (18) and (21) together guarantee that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \Big[\|\overline{X}^n\|_{L^2([0,T];B_{2,2}^{\alpha})}^2 + \|\overline{X}^n\|_{W^{2,\zeta}([0,T];B_{2,2}^{\beta})} \Big] < \infty,$$

with ζ as in (21). This implies tightness in $L^2([0,T]; B_{2,2}^{\alpha'})$ for any $\alpha' < \alpha$, which is still sufficient for the result, since α varies in an open set.

Below we recall for convenience Simon's tightness criterion. Here the space $W^{2,\zeta}([0,T];Y) \subset L^2([0,T];Y)$ is defined by the Sobolev-Slobodeckij norm

$$\|f\|_{W^{2,\zeta}([0,T];Y)} = \|f\|_{L^2([0,T];Y)} + \left(\int_0^T \int_0^T \frac{\|f(t) - f(r)\|_Y^2}{|t - r|^{2\zeta + 1}} \,\mathrm{d}t \,\mathrm{d}r\right)^{1/2}.$$

Proposition 3.4 (Corollary 5, [51]). Let X, Y, Z be three Banach spaces such that $X \subset Y \subset Z$ with the embedding $X \subset Y$ being compact. Then also the following embedding is compact, for any s > 0:

$$L^{p}([0,T];X) \cap W^{s,p}([0,T];Z) \subseteq L^{p}([0,T];Y).$$

At this point, the last step is to prove that any limit point satisfies the required martingale problem (in d = 1) or solves the required PDE (in d = 2).

Proof of Theorem 2. As in all previous cases, we fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and do not state explicitly the dependence on it. We treat the drift and the martingale part differently.

Step 1. We start with the drift, which is the same in both dimensions. Let X be any limit point of X^n in $C([0,T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. The previous proposition guarantees that X lies almost surely in $L^2([0,T]; B_{2,2}^{\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 0$. In addition, through Skorohod representation, we assume that $\Pi_n X^n \to X$ in $L^2([0,T]; B_{2,2}^{\alpha})$ almost surely (in fact this is the reason why we prefer to work with $\Pi_n X^n$ instead of X^n – the latter converging only as a positive measure). In particular, for $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, define

$$N_t^{\varphi} = \langle X_{t,0}, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle X_s, \nu_0 \Delta \varphi \rangle + \langle \bar{\xi} (X_s - X_s^2), \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Then, regarding the nonlinear term, since both $X_s, \Pi_n X_s^n \in [0, 1]$, we can estimate:

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |X_s^2 - (\Pi_n X^n)^2| \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}s \le \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} 2|X_s - \Pi_n X^n| \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}s \lesssim \|X_s - \Pi_n X^n\|_{L^2([0,T]; B^{\alpha}_{2,2})},$$

so that applying Lemma 4.5, we have almost surely:

$$N_t^{\varphi} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left[\langle \Pi_n X_{t,0}^n, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle \mathcal{A}_n \Pi_n X_s^n, \varphi \rangle + \langle \Pi_n^2 \overline{\xi} \big[\Pi_n^3 X_s^n - (\Pi_n^3 X_s^n)^2 \big], \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s \right]$$

=: $\lim_{n \to \infty} N_t^{n,\varphi}$.

Step 2. Now we prove that N_t^{φ} is a centered continuous martingale. In d = 2 the quadratic variation will be zero and hence $N^{\varphi} \equiv 0$, proving that the limit is deterministic (conditional on the environment). Since $N_t^{n,\varphi}$ is a sequence of martingales, by Lemma 3.1, the fact that also N_t^{φ} is a martingale follows from the uniform bound of Equation (18) (the continuity of N^{φ} is as well a consequence of Proposition 3.2). The quadratic variation of $N^{n,\varphi}$ is

$$\begin{split} \langle N^{n,\varphi} \rangle_t &= n^{-\lambda} \int_0^t \langle (1+s_n) \Pi_n^3 X_r^n, (\Pi_n^2 \varphi)^2 - 2\Pi_n^2(\varphi) \Pi_n(X_r^n \varphi) \rangle \\ &+ \langle \left(\Pi_n(X_r^n \Pi_n \varphi) \right)^2, 1 \rangle - \langle s_n(\Pi_n^3 X_r^n)^2, (\Pi_n^2 \varphi)^2 - 2\Pi_n^2(\varphi) \Pi_n(X_r^n \Pi_n \varphi) \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r, \end{split}$$

with $\lambda = 0$ in d = 1 and $\lambda = \eta > 0$ in d = 2. In the latter case $(d = 2, \lambda > 0)$ the bounds $0 \leq X^n \leq 1, |s_n| \leq n^{-2}$ guarantee that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle N^{n,\varphi} \rangle_t = 0$. Instead if

 $d = 1, \lambda = 0$ we have to take more care. As before, the bound $|s_n| \leq n^{-2}$ guarantees that all terms multiplied by s_n vanish in the limit, so we are left with considering

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_0^\iota \langle \Pi_n^3 X_r^n, (\Pi_n^2 \varphi)^2 - 2\Pi_n^2(\varphi) \Pi_n(X_r^n \varphi) \rangle + \langle \left(\Pi_n(X_r^n \Pi_n \varphi) \right)^2, 1 \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r.$$

We can rewrite the quantity in the limit as:

- +

$$\begin{split} \int_{0}^{t} \langle \Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}, (\Pi_{n}^{2} \varphi)^{2} - 2(\Pi_{n}^{2} \varphi) [(\Pi_{n} X_{r}^{n}) \varphi] \rangle + \langle ((\Pi_{n} X_{r}^{n}) \Pi_{n} \varphi)^{2}, 1 \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r \\ + \int_{0}^{t} -2 \langle \Pi_{n}^{3} X_{r}^{n}, (\Pi_{n}^{2} \varphi) [D^{\Pi, n} (X_{r}^{n}, \varphi)] \rangle + \langle (D^{\Pi, n} (X_{r}^{n}, \Pi_{n} \varphi))^{2}, 1 \rangle \\ + 2 \langle D^{\Pi, n} (X_{r}^{n}, \Pi_{n} \varphi), (\Pi_{n} X_{r}^{n}) \Pi_{n} \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r, \end{split}$$

where we have defined the commutator (cf. Lemma 5.17 for a similar construction)

$$D^{\Pi,n}(\psi,\psi') = \Pi_n(\psi\cdot\psi') - (\Pi_n\psi)\cdot\psi'.$$

Now we observe that for $\delta \in [0, 1]$:

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |D^{\Pi, n}(\psi, \psi')|(x) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \int_{B_n(x)} \psi(y)(\psi'(y) - \psi'(x)) \,\mathrm{d}y \right| \lesssim n^{-\delta} \|\psi\|_{L^{\infty}} \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\delta}}.$$

We can apply this bound to our quadratic variation, observing that $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $||X^n||_{\infty} \leq 1$, so that:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_0^t -2\langle \Pi_n^3 X_r^n, (\Pi_n^2 \varphi) [D^{\Pi, n}(X_r^n, \varphi)] \rangle + \langle (D^{\Pi, n}(X_r^n, \Pi_n \varphi))^2, 1 \rangle + 2\langle D^{\Pi, n}(X_r^n, \Pi_n \varphi), (\Pi_n X_r^n) \Pi_n \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r = 0.$$

Finally we are left with computing the limit

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle N^{n,\varphi} \rangle_t = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_0^t \langle \Pi_n^3 X_r^n, (\Pi_n^2 \varphi)^2 - 2(\Pi_n^2 \varphi) [(\Pi_n X_r^n) \varphi] \rangle + \langle ((\Pi_n X_r^n) \Pi_n \varphi)^2, 1 \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r$$
$$= \int_0^t \langle X_r, \varphi^2 - 2X_r \varphi^2 \rangle + \langle X_r^2, \varphi^2 \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r = \int_0^t \langle X_r (1 - X_r), \varphi^2 \rangle \, \mathrm{d}r.$$

Here the second equality follows by calculations analogous to those in Step 1, since now the quadratic nonlinearity is a function of $\Pi_n X^n$ and the latter is converging in $L^2([0,T]; B^{\alpha}_{2,2})$.

Finally, since the martingale $(N_t^{n,\varphi})^2 - \langle N^{n,\varphi} \rangle_t$ is bounded (using that $0 \leq X^n \leq 1$), also the limiting process $(N_t^{\varphi})^2 - \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle N^{n,\varphi} \rangle_t$ is a martingale, implying that $\langle N^{\varphi} \rangle_t = \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle N^{n,\varphi} \rangle_t$. Hence the quadratic variation is of the required form for Theorem 2.

So far we have proven that any limit point solves the required equation. To deduce the convergence, we have to prove that such solutions are unique. In d = 2, that for every $\omega \in \Omega$ there exists a unique solution to the equation

$$\partial_t X = \nu_0 \Delta X + \overline{\xi}(\omega) X(1-X), \qquad X(0) = X_0$$

follows from classical solution theory. Instead in d = 2 uniqueness in law can be established via a Girsanov transform, as we show in Lemma 3.5 below.

Lemma 3.5. In d = 1 and under Assumption 1.11, solutions to the stochastic Fisher-KPP equation as in Definition 1.12 are unique in distribution.

Proof. As usual, the argument works for fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, so we omit writing the dependence on it. First, the same calculations as in Proposition 3.2 prove that any solution X to the martingale problem of the stochastic Fisher-KPP equation lives in $L^2([0,T]; B^{\alpha}_{2,2})$, for some $\alpha > 0$ and arbitrary T > 0. Then, following the same arguments as in the proof of [47, Theorem 2.18], we see that (up to enlarging the probability space) X is a solution to the SPDE:

$$\partial_t X = \nu_0 \Delta X + \overline{\xi} X(1-X) + \sqrt{X(1-X)} \tilde{\xi}, \qquad X(0) = X_0,$$

where $\tilde{\xi}$ is a space time white noise. Here we mean solutions in the sense that for any $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $t \in [0, T]$:

$$\begin{split} \langle X_t, \varphi \rangle &= \langle X_0, \varphi \rangle = \int_0^t \langle X_s, \nu_0 \Delta \varphi \rangle + \langle \overline{\xi} X_s (1 - X_s), \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sqrt{X_s(x)(1 - X_s(x))} \varphi(x) \, \mathrm{d}\tilde{\xi}(s, x), \end{split}$$

where the latter is understood as an integral against a martingale measure, in the sense of Walsh [56]. Now we can use a Girsanov transform [16, Theorem 5.1] (see also [46, Theorem IV.1.6] and [42, Section 2.2] for more recent accounts). Let us denote with \mathbb{P} the law of X on $L^2([0,T]; B^{\alpha}_{2,2})$ and define the measure \mathbb{Q} by:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{Q}}{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}} = \exp\left(-\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\overline{\xi}(x)X_s(x)(1-X_s(x))}{\sqrt{X_s(x)(1-X_s(x))}} \,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\xi}(s,x) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\left(\overline{\xi}(x)X_s(x)(1-X_s(x))\right)^2}{X_s(x)(1-X_s(x))} \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}x\right).$$

Clearly, this transformation defines a change of measure, since

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\left(\overline{\xi}(x) X_s(x) (1 - X_s(x))\right)^2}{X_s(x) (1 - X_s(x))} \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}x \le T \|\overline{\xi}\|_{\infty}^2$$

Under this change of measure, for every $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the process:

$$\langle X_t, \varphi \rangle - \langle X_0, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle X_s, \nu_0 \Delta \varphi \rangle \, \mathrm{d}s =: L_t^{\varphi}$$

is a continuous \mathbb{Q} -martingale with quadratic variation: $\langle L^{\varphi} \rangle_t = \int_0^t \langle X_s(1-X_s), \varphi^2 \rangle ds$. This means that under \mathbb{Q} , the process X_t is the unique (in law) solution to the SPDE:

$$\partial_t X = \nu_0 \Delta X + \sqrt{X(1-X)}\tilde{\xi}, \qquad X(0) = X_0.$$

The uniqueness in law of solutions to the latter equation follows by duality, see e.g. [49].

4. Schauder estimates

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3 and other similar results. Since the central object in this section, the semidiscrete Laplace operator \mathcal{A}_n , is defined through convolutions with characteristic functions, the following result collects some information that will be useful in the upcoming discussion.

Lemma 4.1. Let $(D\varphi)_i = \frac{d\varphi}{dx_i}$ and $(D^2\varphi)_{i,j} = \frac{d^2\varphi}{dx_i dx_j}$ indicate the gradient and the Hessian matrix of a smooth function $\varphi \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ respectively. Recall that $\hat{\chi}_n(k) =$

29

 $\hat{\chi}(n^{-1}k) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}(n^d \mathbb{1}_{\{B_n(0)\}})(k).$ Then:

$$D\hat{\chi}(0) = 0,$$
 $D^2\hat{\chi}(0) = -\frac{(2\pi)^2}{4}\nu_0 \mathrm{Id},$

with ν_0 as in (6). Next recall that $\vartheta_n(k) = n^2 (\hat{\chi}_n^4(k) - 1)$. Then for any choice of constants c < 1 < C, there exists a $\kappa(c, C) > 0$ such that

$$c \leq \frac{\vartheta_n(k)}{-(2\pi)^2 \nu_0 |k|^2} \leq C, \qquad \forall k \colon \ |k|n^{-1} \leq \kappa(c,C).$$

Finally, the decay of $\hat{\chi}$ can be controlled as follows for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$:

$$\left|\frac{d^n \hat{\chi}(k)}{dx_{i_1} \cdots dx_{i_n}}\right| \lesssim_n (1+|k|)^{-\frac{d+1}{2}}.$$

The proof of this result is deferred to Appendix A.3. Instead, we pass to the central result of this section, from which all other will follow. Recall that \mathcal{A}_n is a Fourier multiplier, therefore also the exponential $e^{t\mathcal{A}_n}$ and the resolvent $(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1}$ (for $\lambda > 1$) are naturally defined as Fourier multipliers. As explained already in other points, the action of \mathcal{A}_n is different on large and small Fourier modes.

Proposition 4.2. For some, and hence for all, $\kappa_0 > 0$ the following holds. For any $p \in [1, \infty], \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $j \geq -1$ there exists a c > 0 such that uniformly over $n \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0, j \geq -1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}$ one can bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_{j}\mathcal{A}_{n}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} &\lesssim 2^{-(\alpha-2)j} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}, \quad if \quad 2^{j} \leq \kappa_{0}n, \\ \|\Delta_{j}\mathcal{A}_{n}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} &\lesssim n^{2}2^{-\alpha j} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{n}}, \quad if \quad 2^{j} > \kappa_{0}n. \end{aligned}$$

$$(22)$$

And similarly for the exponential:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_{j}e^{t\mathcal{A}_{n}}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} &\lesssim e^{-ct2^{2j}}2^{-\alpha j}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}, \quad for \quad 2^{j} \leq \kappa_{0}n, \\ \|\Delta_{j}e^{t\mathcal{A}_{n}}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} &\lesssim e^{-ctn^{2}}2^{-\alpha j}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}, \quad for \quad 2^{j} > \kappa_{0}n, \end{aligned}$$

$$(23)$$

and for the resolvent (uniformly over $\lambda > 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_{j}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\lambda)^{-1}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} &\lesssim \frac{1}{2^{2j}+\lambda}2^{-\alpha j}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}, \quad for \quad 2^{j} \leq \kappa_{0}n, \\ \|\Delta_{j}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\lambda)^{-1}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{2}+\lambda}2^{-\alpha j}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}, \quad for \quad 2^{j} > \kappa_{0}n, \end{aligned}$$

$$(24)$$

Proof. If the estimates hold for a certain $\kappa_0 > 0$, it is evident that they hold for all $\kappa_0 > 0$ (up to changing proportionality constants). In fact, for $2^j \simeq n$ the first and second estimate in every pair are equivalent.

Since all of the estimates follow the same pattern and the first one is particularly simple, we will mainly discuss the proof of the inequalities in (23), pointing out how to adapt the calculations to the other cases. We also restrict to the case $j \ge 0$, since the case j = -1 is immediate. We begin by restating the inequalities for distributions on \mathbb{R}^d . This is useful because on the entire space we can use scaling arguments. Then we examine the behaviour on large and small scales separately. The precise separation of modes is chosen based on Lemma 4.1.

Step 1. To restate the problem on \mathbb{R}^d we extend distributions on the torus periodically. Let $\pi: \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d) \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote such periodic extension operator

mapping distributions on \mathbb{T}^d to distributions on the full space. Its adjoint is the operator $\pi^* \colon \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, given by

$$\pi^*\varphi(\cdot) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \varphi(\cdot + k).$$

We observe that $\pi(\mathcal{A}_n\varphi) = \mathcal{A}_n\pi(\varphi)$, where with a slight abuse of notation we have extended \mathcal{A}_n to act on distributions on the whole space (simply through Equation (4) – and note that it is still a Fourier multiplier, since for $\varphi \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{A}_n\varphi = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1}\vartheta_n\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi$). Similarly, by the Poisson summation formula of Lemma 4.9 we have $\pi(\Delta_j\varphi) = \Delta_j\pi(\varphi)$. As a consequence of this last observation, and since $\pi(\Delta_j\varphi)$ is periodic, for any $a > \frac{d}{p}$ (or $a \ge 0$ if $p = \infty$):

$$\|\Delta_j \pi(\varphi)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d;p(a))} \simeq_{a,p} \|\Delta_j \varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)},$$

where $||f||_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d;p(a))} = ||f(\cdot)/(1+|\cdot|^2)^{\frac{a}{2}}||_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. Therefore in order to show (23) it is sufficient to show that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and setting a = d + 1:

$$\begin{split} \|\Delta_j e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; p(d+1))} &\lesssim e^{-ct2^{2j}} \|\Delta_j \varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; p(d+1))}, \quad \text{for} \quad 2^j \leq \kappa_0 n, \\ \|\Delta_j e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; p(d+1))} &\lesssim e^{-ctn^2} \|\Delta_j \varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; p(d+1))}, \quad \text{for} \quad 2^j > \kappa_0 n. \end{split}$$

The same holds for (22) and (24), with natural changes. Hence, from now on let us consider all functions and operators defined on \mathbb{R}^d . Let ψ be a smooth radial function with compact support in an annulus (i.e. $\psi(k) = 0$ if $|k| \leq c_1$ or $|k| \geq c_2$ for some $0 < c_1 < c_2$) such that $\rho \psi = \rho$ (here ρ is associated to the dyadic partition of the unity through which we define Besov spaces: see the notations section). By Young's inequality for convolutions and by estimating uniformly over $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(1+|x|^2)^{-\frac{(d+1)}{2}} \lesssim (1+|y|^2)^{-\frac{(d+1)}{2}} (1+|x-y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}},$$

one obtains:

$$\|\Delta_j e^{t\mathcal{A}_n}\varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d;p(d+1))} \lesssim \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1}(e^{t\vartheta_n(\cdot)}\psi(2^{-j}\cdot))\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d;p(-d-1))} \|\Delta_j\varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d;p(d+1))}.$$

In this way, through a change of variables, we reduced the problem to a bound for

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + 2^{-2j} |x|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1} \Big[e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)} \psi(\cdot) \Big](x) \Big| \,\mathrm{d}x \tag{25}$$

(and similarly for (22) and (24), with $e^{t\vartheta_n}$ replaced by ϑ_n and $(-\vartheta_n + \lambda)^{-1}$ respectively). Before we move on, we finally observe that by Lemma 4.1, there exists a $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that for $2^j n^{-1} \leq \kappa_0$:

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\vartheta_n(2^jk)}{-(2\pi)^2\nu_0 2^{2j}|k|^2} \leq \frac{3}{2}, \qquad \forall k \in \operatorname{supp}(\psi).$$

Step 2. We now estimate (25) on large scales, i.e. $2^{j}n^{-1} \leq \kappa_0$. In this case the term can be bounded by:

$$\begin{split} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1}[e^{t\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}\cdot)}\psi(\cdot)] + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1}[\partial_{k_{i}}^{2(d+1)}e^{t\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}\cdot)}\psi(\cdot)] \right| \right\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \\ \lesssim \sup_{k\in \mathrm{supp}(\psi)} \left[\left| e^{t\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}k)}\psi(k) \right| + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| \partial_{k_{i}}^{2(d+1)}e^{t\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}k)}\psi(k) \right| \right] \end{split}$$

To bound the term involving derivatives we observe that:

$$D[t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)](k) = f(2^j n^{-1}k)t2^{2j}|k|, \qquad f(k) = 4\hat{\chi}^3(k)\frac{D\hat{\chi}(k)}{|k|}$$

where f is smooth on \mathbb{R}^d , again by Lemma 4.1. In particular, since $2^j \leq n$, taking higher order derivatives one has for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$: $\left|\partial_{k_i}^{\ell}[t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)]\right|(k) \leq t2^{2j}$ for $k \in \operatorname{supp}(\psi)$. Now recall Faá di Bruno's formula for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\partial_x^\ell f(g(x)) = \sum_{\{m\}} C(\{m\}, \ell) (\partial_x^{m_1 + \dots + m_\ell} f)(g(x)) \prod_{r=1}^\ell \left(\partial_x^r g(x)\right)^{m_j},$$

where the sum runs over all $\{m\} := (m_1, \ldots, m_\ell)$ such that $m_1 + 2m_2 + \cdots + \ell m_\ell = \ell$. Applying this formula and by our choice of κ_0 , there exists a constant c > 0 such that:

$$\sup_{k \in \operatorname{supp}(\psi)} \left[\left| e^{t\vartheta_n(2^jk)\psi(k)} \right| + \sum_{i=1}^d \left| \partial_{k_i}^{2(d+1)} e^{t\vartheta_n(2^jk)} \psi(k) \right| \right] \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{2}(2\pi)^2 \nu_0 t 2^{2j}} (1 + t 2^{2j})^{2(d+1)} \lesssim e^{-c(t2^{2j})}.$$

This concludes the proof of the large-scale bound in (23). For the resolvent equation one similarly has to bound:

$$\sup_{k \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \left[\left| \frac{\psi(k)}{-\vartheta_n(2^jk) + \lambda} \right| + \sum_{i=1}^d \left| \partial_{k_i}^{2(d+1)} \frac{\psi(k)}{-\vartheta_n(k) + \lambda} \right| \right].$$

Here as before, for the derivative term one has, through the choice of κ_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_{k_{i}}^{\ell} \frac{1}{-\vartheta_{n}(k) + \lambda} \right| &\lesssim \sum_{\{m\}} \left| \frac{1}{-\vartheta_{n}(k) + \lambda} \right|^{1+m_{1}+\dots+m_{\ell}} \prod_{r=1}^{\ell} \left(2^{2j} \right)^{m_{r}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\{m\}} \left| \frac{1}{\frac{3}{2}(2\pi)^{2}\nu_{0}2^{2j} + \lambda} \right|^{1+m_{1}+\dots+m_{\ell}} (2^{2j})^{m_{1}+\dots+m_{\ell}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}(2\pi)^{2}\nu_{0}2^{2j} + \lambda} \lesssim \frac{1}{2^{2j}+\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

as requested for (24). The estimate (22) follows similarly.

Step 3. We pass to the small-scale estimates, namely for j such that $2^{j}n^{-1} > \kappa_{0}$. Here we will need tighter control on the decay of $\hat{\chi}(k)$: since χ is not smooth, the decay at infinity is not faster than any polynomial and is quantified in Lemma 4.1. We now estimate (25) by

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{(1+|x|)^{d+1}} \, \mathrm{d}x \right) \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[(1+|x|^{d+1}+2^{-j(d+1)}|x|^{2(d+1)}) \Big| \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1} \Big[e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)}\psi(\cdot) \Big] \Big| (x) \Big] \\ \lesssim \| e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)}\psi(\cdot)\|_{L^{\infty}} + \| (1-\Delta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)}\psi(\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \sum_{i=1}^d 2^{-j(d+1)} \| \partial_{k_i}^{2(d+1)} e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)}\psi(\cdot)\|_{L^{\infty}},$$

for any $p \in (1, \infty)$. As for the first term, since $|\hat{\chi}(k)| < 1$ for $k \neq 0$ and it decays to zero at infinity, up to reducing the value of c > 0 we can assume that:

$$\vartheta_n(2^jk) \le -cn^2.$$

This is sufficient to show $\|e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j\cdot)}\psi(\cdot)\|_{L^{\infty}} \lesssim e^{-ctn^2}$, which is a bound of the required order.

Now bounding these derivatives is similar to bounding the last term:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} 2^{-j(d+1)} \|\partial_{k_i}^{2(d+1)} e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)} \psi(\cdot)\|_{L^{\infty}},$$

so we concentrate on the latter, which has the added difficulty of containing derivatives of higher order, counterbalanced by the factor $2^{-j(d+1)}$. Here observe that for $1 \le \ell \le 2(d+1)$:

$$\partial_{k_i}^{\ell} e^{t\vartheta_n(2^jk)} = \partial_{k_i}^{\ell-1} \left[e^{t\vartheta_n(2^jk)} 4\hat{\chi}^3(2^jn^{-1}k) [\partial_{k_i}\hat{\chi}](2^jn^{-1}k) \right] \cdot (2^jn^{-1}) \cdot (tn^2).$$

Iterating the above procedure, we apply Faá Di Bruno's formula again to obtain

$$\left|2^{-j(d+1)}\partial_{k_{i}}^{\ell}e^{t\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}k)}\right| \lesssim 2^{-j(d+1)}e^{t\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}k)} \sum_{\{m\}} \prod_{r=1}^{\ell} \left(\partial_{k_{i}}^{r-1} \left[4\hat{\chi}^{3}(\cdot)[\partial_{k_{i}}\hat{\chi}(\cdot)]\right]\right|_{2^{j}n^{-1}k} \cdot (2^{j}n^{-1})^{r}\right)^{m_{r}} \cdot (tn^{2})^{m_{r}}.$$

In view of Lemma 4.1, for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\sup_{k \in \text{supp}(\psi)} |\partial_{k_i}^{r-1} \left[4\hat{\chi}^3(\cdot) [\partial_{k_i} \hat{\chi}(\cdot)] \right] \Big|_{2^j n^{-1} k}| \lesssim \frac{1}{1 + |2^j n^{-1}|^{2(d+1)}}$$

Hence, as before up to further reducing the value of c > 0:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{k_i}^{\ell} e^{t\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot)}\|_{L^{\infty}} &\lesssim e^{-ctn^2} 2^{-j(d+1)} (2^j n^{-1})^{\ell} \sum_{\{m\}} \prod_{r=1}^{\ell} (1+|2^j n^{-1}|)^{-2m_r(d+1)} \\ &\lesssim e^{-ctn^2} 2^{-j(d+1)} (2^j n^{-1})^{\ell-2(d+1)} \lesssim e^{-ctn^2}, \end{aligned}$$

since at least one of the elements of the sequence m_r is strictly positive and since $\ell \leq 2(d+1)$. This concludes the proof of (23). Regarding the resolvent, one can follow mutatis mutandis the previous discussion until one has, as before, to bound:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} 2^{-j(d+1)} \left\| \partial_{k_i}^{2(d+1)} \frac{\psi(\cdot)}{-\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot) + \lambda} \right\|_{\infty} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sum_{\ell=0}^{2(d+1)} 2^{-j(d+1)} \left\| \partial_{k_i}^{\ell} \frac{1}{-\vartheta_n(2^j \cdot) - \lambda} \right\|_{L^{\infty}}$$

Then again, with Faá di Bruno's formula:

$$\begin{split} \left| \partial_{k_{i}}^{\ell} \frac{1}{-\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}k) + \lambda} \right| \lesssim \sum_{\{m\}} \left| \frac{1}{-\vartheta_{n}(2^{j}k) + \lambda} \right|^{1+m_{1}+\dots+m_{\ell}} \prod_{r=1}^{\ell} \left| \partial_{k_{i}}^{r-1}(\hat{\chi}^{3}(\cdot)\partial_{k_{i}}\hat{\chi}(\cdot)) \right|_{2^{j}n^{-1}k} \right|^{m_{r}} \cdot (2^{j}n^{-1})^{rm_{r}} \\ \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{2} + \lambda} \sum_{\{m\}} \left| \frac{1}{n^{2} + \lambda} \right|^{m_{1}+\dots+m_{\ell}} \prod_{r=1}^{\ell} \left(\frac{1}{1 + |2^{j}n^{-1}|} \right)^{2m_{r}(d+1)} (2^{j}n^{-1})^{rm_{r}} \\ \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{2} + \lambda} 2^{j(d+1)}. \end{split}$$

Plugging this into the previous formula provides us the correct bound. Similarly one can also treat the small-scale estimate for (22).

The previous proposition motivates the introduction of cut-off operators as follows.

Definition 4.3. Let $\exists : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth radial function with compact support. Let us define the annulus $A_r^R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : r \leq |x| \leq R\}$ for 0 < r < R and additionally assume that $\exists (x) = 1, \forall x \in A_0^r$, and $\exists (x) = 0, \forall x \in A_R^\infty$, for some $0 < r < R < \infty$. Then define

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \exists (n^{-1}D), \qquad \mathcal{Q}_n = (1 - \exists)(n^{-1}D).$$

We say that \mathcal{P}_n is a projection on **large scales**, since those Fourier modes describe a function macroscopically, whereas \mathcal{Q}_n is a projection on **small scales**.

The next lemma states that the cut-off operators are bounded.

Lemma 4.4. Consider $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$. For \exists as in Definition 4.3 one can bound uniformly over $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\|\mathcal{P}_n\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}, \qquad \|\mathcal{Q}_n\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$$

Proof. Define the inverse Fourier transform $\widehat{\neg}(x) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1} \neg(x)$. By an application of the Poisson summation formula (Lemma 4.9) and a scaling argument

$$\begin{aligned} \| \exists (n^{-1}D)\varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} &= \sup_{j \geq -1} 2^{j\alpha} \| (\mathcal{F}^{-1}_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}[\exists (n^{-1}\cdot)]) * \Delta_{j}\varphi \|_{L^{p}} \lesssim \| \mathcal{F}^{-1}_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}[\exists (n^{-1}\cdot)] \|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \| \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} \\ &\lesssim \| n^{d}\widehat{\exists}(n\cdot)\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \| \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} \lesssim \| \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

The same argument shows that $(1 - \neg(a \cdot))$ is bounded.

4.1. Elliptic regularity. In this subsection we prove Theorem 3. This theorem is a direct consequence of the lemma and the proposition that follow.

Lemma 4.5. Fix any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \zeta > 0, p \in [1, \infty]$. Uniformly over $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$: $\|\mathcal{A}_n \mathcal{P}_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha-2}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}.$

Moreover, as $n \to \infty$ and with ν_0 as in (6)

$$\mathcal{A}_n \varphi \to \nu_0 \Delta \varphi \quad in \quad \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha - 2 - \zeta}.$$

Proof. On large scales, Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 4.4 imply that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_n \mathcal{P}_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha-2}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}.$$

Moreover on small scales the same results guarantee that for any $\zeta \geq 0$:

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_n\mathcal{A}_n\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha-2-\zeta}} \lesssim n^2 \sup_{2^j \gtrsim n} 2^{j(\alpha-2-\zeta)} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{Q}_n\varphi\|_{L^p} \lesssim n^{-\zeta} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$$

which tends to 0 as n tends to ∞ if $\zeta > 0$. Combining these two observations provides the first bound and guarantees compactness in $\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha-2-\zeta}$. Convergence follows since, by Lemma 4.1, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}[\mathcal{A}_n \mathcal{P}_n \varphi](k) = \exists (n^{-1}k) n^2 (\hat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k) - 1) \hat{\varphi}(k) \to -(2\pi)^2 \nu_0 |k|^2 \hat{\varphi}(k) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}[\nu_0 \Delta \varphi](k).$$

The regularity gain provided by the operator \mathcal{A}_n can be described as follows (for the proof of Theorem 3 we require the result only for $\delta = 0$).

Proposition 4.6. Fix any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta \in [0,1]$ and $p \in [1,\infty]$. Uniformly over $\lambda \ge 1, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi \in C_p^{\alpha}$ the following estimates hold:

$$\lambda^{\delta} \| \mathcal{P}_n(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1} \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+2(1-\delta)}} + \lambda^{\delta} n^{2(1-\delta)} \| \mathcal{Q}_n(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1} \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}.$$

Moreover, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\mathcal{P}_n(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\varphi \to (-\nu_0\Delta+\lambda)^{-1}\varphi$$

where the convergence is in $C_p^{\alpha+2-\zeta}$ for any $\zeta > 0$ and ν_0 is as in Lemma 4.5.

Proof. Consider the large-scale estimate. Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 4.4 guarantee that for $2^j \lesssim n$:

$$\|\Delta_{j}\mathcal{P}_{n}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\lambda)^{-1}\varphi\|_{L^{p}} \lesssim \frac{1}{2^{2j}+\lambda}2^{-\alpha j}\|\mathcal{P}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} \lesssim 2^{-2j(1-\delta)-\alpha j}\lambda^{-\delta}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}}$$

which is a bound of the correct order. All other bounds follow similarly, and the proof of the convergence is analogous to the one in Lemma 4.5. $\hfill \Box$

4.2. **Parabolic regularity.** In this subsection we study the regularization effect of the semigroup $e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}}$. This discussion requires certain spaces of time-dependent functions, which we introduce in the following. Let us fix T > 0 an arbitrary time horizon. All function spaces will implicitly depend on T. For time dependent functions taking values in a Banach space \mathcal{X} the α -Hölder norm (with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$) is defined as

$$||f||_{C^{\alpha}\mathcal{X}} = \sup_{t \in [0,T]} ||f(t)||_{\mathcal{X}} + \sup_{t,s \in [0,T]} \frac{||f(t) - f(s)||_{\mathcal{X}}}{|t - s|^{\alpha}}.$$

It is convenient to incorporate a blow-up at time t = 0. This reflects the fact that the regularization of the semigroup occurs only at strictly positive times.

$$\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha} = \{f \colon (0,T] \to \mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha} \mid \|f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} = \sup_{t \in [0,T]} t^{\gamma}\|f(t)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} < \infty\},\$$

and one can combine the previous spaces in the following way:

$$\mathscr{L}_{p}^{\gamma,\alpha} = \{ f \in \mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha} \mid \|f\|_{\mathscr{L}_{p}^{\gamma,\alpha}} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} + \|t \mapsto t^{\gamma}f(t)\|_{C^{\alpha/2}L^{p}} < \infty \}.$$

Now we state the main result of this section, the parabolic Schauder estimates.

Proposition 4.7. Fix $p \in [1, \infty], T > 0, \gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (-2, 0), \beta \in [\alpha, \alpha+2) \cap (0, 2)$. Uniformly over $\varphi \in C_p^{\alpha}$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\gamma} C_p^{\alpha}$ and locally uniformly over T > 0:

$$\|t \mapsto \mathcal{P}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \varphi\|_{\mathscr{L}_p^{(\beta-\alpha)/2,\beta}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}},\tag{26}$$

$$\left\| t \mapsto \int_0^t \mathcal{P}_n e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_n} f(s) \,\mathrm{d}s \right\|_{\mathscr{L}^{\gamma,\alpha+2}_p} \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_n f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p}.$$
 (27)

Next let $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in [0, 1)$ be such that $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 < 1$ and $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in [0, 1]$ such that $\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_3 = 1$. Then:

$$\|t \mapsto t^{\zeta_1 + \zeta_2} \mathcal{Q}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \varphi\|_{C^{\zeta_1} \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim n^{-2\zeta_2} \|\mathcal{Q}_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}},$$
(28)

$$\left\| t \mapsto t^{\gamma} \int_{0}^{t} e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}} \mathcal{Q}_{n} f(s) \,\mathrm{d}s \right\|_{C^{\delta_{1}} \mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} \lesssim n^{-2\delta_{2}} T^{\delta_{3}} \| \mathcal{Q}_{n} f \|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma} \mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}}.$$
 (29)

with constants independent of f, φ, T .

In many steps the proof mimics proofs in [26] and [28], to which we will often refer.

Proof. Step 1. We begin with large scales, namely (26). By Proposition 4.2: $\sup 2^{\beta j} \| \Lambda_{i} \mathcal{P}_{r} e^{t\mathcal{A}_{n}}(\rho) \|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \leq \sup e^{-ct2^{2j}} 2^{(\beta-\alpha)j} \| \mathcal{P}_{r}(\rho) \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}}$

$$\sup_{j\geq -1} \sum_{j\geq -1} ||\Delta_j \mathcal{F}_n \mathcal{C} - \varphi||_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \approx \sup_{j\geq -1} ||\mathcal{F}_n \varphi||_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$$
$$= t^{-\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}} \sup_{j\geq -1} e^{-ct2^{2j}} (t2^{2j})^{\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}} ||\mathcal{P}_n \varphi||_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim t^{-\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}} ||\mathcal{P}_n \varphi||_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$$

Therefore $||t \mapsto \mathcal{P}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} \varphi||_{\mathcal{M}^{(\beta-\alpha)/2}\mathcal{C}_p^\beta} \lesssim ||\mathcal{P}_n \varphi||_{\mathcal{C}_p^\alpha}$. Similarly, for (27)

$$\sup_{j\geq -1} 2^{j(\alpha+2)} \left\| \int_0^t \Delta_j e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_n} \mathcal{P}_n f(s) \,\mathrm{d}s \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_n f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \sup_{j\geq -1} 2^{j2} \int_0^t e^{-cs2^{2j}} (t-s)^{-\gamma} \,\mathrm{d}s$$

which can be bounded by $\|\mathcal{P}_n f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma} \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$ by the same arguments as in the proof of [26, Lemma A.9]. We still need to address the temporal regularity for both terms. By Proposition 4.2

$$\|(e^{t\mathcal{A}_{n}}-\mathrm{Id})\mathcal{P}_{n}\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} = \left\|\int_{0}^{t} e^{s\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathcal{A}_{n}\mathcal{P}_{n}\varphi\,\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})}$$

$$\lesssim \int_{0}^{t} s^{-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\|\mathcal{P}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}\,\mathrm{d}s \simeq t^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\|\mathcal{P}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}.$$
(30)

To conclude the proof of both (26) and (27) it is now sufficient to follow the same steps as in [28, Lemma 6.6].

Step 2. We turn our attention to the small scale bounds (28) and (29). Fix $\zeta_1 = \delta_1 = 0$ first. With calculations in the same spirit as in the Step 1, we arrive at $\|\mathcal{Q}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p} = \sup_{j\geq -1} 2^{\alpha j} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{Q}_n e^{t\mathcal{A}_n}\varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim e^{-ctn^2} \|\mathcal{Q}_n\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p} \lesssim (tn^2)^{-\zeta_2} \|\mathcal{Q}_n\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p}.$

For (29), if $\delta_3 > 0$ the spatial bound follows from the previous result. If $\delta_3 = 0$, we bound

$$\left\|\int_{0}^{t} \mathcal{Q}_{n} e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}} f(s) \,\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} \int_{0}^{t} e^{-csn^{2}} (t-s)^{-\gamma} \,\mathrm{d}s \lesssim n^{-2} t^{-\gamma} \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}.$$

The last bound in the above inequality is obtained in the same way as [26, Lemma A.9].

$$\int_0^t e^{-csn^2} (t-s)^{-\gamma} \,\mathrm{d}s \lesssim t^{1-\gamma} \lesssim t^{-\gamma} n^{-2}.$$

Step 3. We now investigate the full temporal regularity for (28) and (29), that is, we allow for $\zeta_1, \delta_1 > 0$. We first observe that for $\delta \in [0, 1)$

$$\|(e^{t\mathcal{A}_{n}}-\mathrm{Id})\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} = \left\|\int_{0}^{t} e^{s\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathcal{A}_{n}\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\,\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}}$$

$$\lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}}\int_{0}^{t} (sn^{2})^{-\delta}n^{-2}\,\mathrm{d}s = \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}}n^{-2(\delta-1)}t^{1-\delta}.$$
(31)

Hence for $\zeta = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 \in [0, 1)$, the temporal regularity of the first terms can be established via

$$\begin{split} \|t^{\zeta}e^{t\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi-s^{\zeta}e^{s\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} &\lesssim (t^{\zeta}-s^{\zeta})t^{-\zeta_{2}}n^{-2\zeta_{2}}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} + s^{\zeta}\|(e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}}-\mathrm{Id})e^{s\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} \\ &\lesssim (t^{\zeta}-s^{\zeta})t^{-\zeta_{2}}n^{-2\zeta_{2}}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} + s^{\zeta}(t-s)^{1-\delta}n^{-2(\delta-1)}\|e^{s\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} \\ &\lesssim [(t^{\zeta}-s^{\zeta})t^{-\zeta_{2}}n^{-2\zeta_{2}} + (t-s)^{1-\delta}n^{-2(\delta-1)}n^{-2\zeta}]\|\mathcal{Q}_{\varepsilon}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}} \\ &\lesssim (t-s)^{\zeta_{1}}n^{-2\zeta_{2}}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{p}}, \end{split}$$

where in the last step we set $\delta = 1 - \zeta_1$ and notice that $(t^{\zeta} - s^{\zeta})t^{-\zeta_2} \lesssim (t-s)^{\zeta_1}$.

The bound for (29) follows similar pattern. For simplicity write $V(t) = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_n} \mathcal{Q}_n f(s) ds$:

$$\|t^{\gamma}V(t) - s^{\gamma}V(s)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} \leq (t^{\gamma} - s^{\gamma})\|V(t)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} + s^{\gamma}\left\|\int_{s}^{t} e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}}\mathcal{Q}_{n}f(r)\mathrm{d}r\right\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} + s^{\gamma}\|(e^{(t-s)\mathcal{A}_{n}} - \mathrm{Id})V(s)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}}$$

The only term for which the estimation does not follow the already established pattern is the one in the middle, for which we observe that

$$s^{\gamma} \left\| \int_{s}^{t} e^{(t-r)\mathcal{A}_{n}} \mathcal{Q}_{n}f(r) \,\mathrm{d}r \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} \lesssim s^{\gamma} \int_{s}^{t} ((t-r)n^{2})^{-\delta_{2}} r^{-\gamma} \,\mathrm{d}r \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}}$$
$$\lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} n^{-2\delta_{2}} s^{\gamma} t^{-\delta_{2}-\gamma+1} \int_{s/t}^{1} (1-r)^{-\delta_{2}} r^{-\gamma} \,\mathrm{d}r$$
$$\lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} n^{-2\delta_{2}} t^{1-\delta_{2}} \int_{s/t}^{1} (1-r)^{-\delta_{2}} \,\mathrm{d}r \lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} n^{-2\delta_{2}} t^{1-\delta_{2}} (1-s/t)^{1-\delta_{2}}$$
$$\leq \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} n^{-2\delta_{2}} (t-s)^{1-\delta_{2}} \leq \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}f\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma}\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} n^{-2\delta_{2}} T^{\delta_{3}} (t-s)^{\delta_{1}},$$

which completes the proof of the proposition.

The following result is essentially a by-product of the previous proof.

Lemma 4.8. Consider $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$ with $\gamma := \alpha - \beta \in [0, 2]$. Then uniformly over $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}$ one can estimate $\|(e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} - \mathrm{Id})\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\beta}} \lesssim t^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}$.

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 4.7. Indeed, Equation (30) implies that for $2^j \lesssim n$ one has:

$$2^{j\beta} \| (e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} - \mathrm{Id}) \Delta_j \varphi \|_{L^p} \lesssim t^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} 2^{j\beta} \| \Delta_j \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\gamma}} \lesssim t^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \| \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_n^{\alpha}}$$

While a slight modification (to L^p spaces) of (31) guarantees that for $2^j \gtrsim n$:

$$2^{j\beta} \| (e^{t\mathcal{A}_n} - \mathrm{Id}) \Delta_j \varphi \|_{L^p} \lesssim t^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} 2^{j\beta} n^{\gamma} \| \Delta_j \varphi \|_{L^p} \lesssim t^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} 2^{j\alpha} \| \Delta_j \varphi \|_{L^p} \lesssim t^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \| \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}.$$

This concludes the proof.

4.3. Besov spaces & characteristic functions. In this subsection we collect some facts regarding Besov spaces and the regularity of characteristic functions. Let us begin by stating the Poisson summation formula (a proof is left to the reader, or can be found in many textbooks and web pages).

Lemma 4.9. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ it holds that: $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}^{-1}\varphi(x) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1}\varphi(x+z)$. In particular, this implies for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the bound: $\|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}^{-1}\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1}\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}$.

Recall that the Besov spaces $B_{p,q}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ are defined via a dyadic partition of the unity $\{\varrho_j\}_{j\geq -1}$ such that for $j\geq 0$, $\varrho_j=\varrho(2^j\cdot)$ for a smooth function ϱ with compact support in an annulus.

Proposition 4.10 (Besov embeddings). For any $1 \le p_1 \le p_2 \le \infty$ and $1 \le q_1 \le q_2 \le \infty$ the embedding $B_{p_1,q_1}^{\alpha} \subseteq B_{p_2,q_2}^{\alpha-d(1/p_1-1/p_2)}$ is continuous. In addition, for $\alpha' < \alpha$ the embedding $B_{p_2,q_2}^{\alpha} \subseteq B_{p_1,q_1}^{\alpha'}$ is compact.

In certain cases, it will be convenient to use the following alternative characterization of certain Besov spaces.

Proposition 4.11 (Sobolev-Slobodeckij norm). For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \mathbb{N}$ and for every $p \in [1, \infty)$ define the Sobolev-Slobodeckij norm for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ as:

$$\|\varphi\|_{W_p^{\alpha}} := \|\varphi\|_{L^p} + \sum_{|m|=\lfloor\alpha\rfloor} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d} \frac{|D^m \varphi(x) - D^m \varphi(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d + (\alpha - \lfloor\alpha\rfloor)p}} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y \right)^{1/p} \in [0, \infty].$$

There exist constants a pair of constants c(p), C(p) > 0 such that for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$

$$c\|\varphi\|_{B^{\alpha}_{p,p}} \leq \|\varphi\|_{W^{\alpha}_{p}} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{B^{\alpha}_{p,p}}$$

For a proof consult e.g. [55] Theorem 2.5.7 and the discussion in Section 2.2.2. The next result states the regularizing properties of convolutions.

Lemma 4.12. For $p, q, r \in [1, \infty]$ satisfying $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} - 1$ and for any $\varphi, \psi \in S'(\mathbb{T}^d)$:

$$\|\varphi * \psi\|_{C_r^{\alpha+\beta}} \lesssim \|f\|_{C_p^{\alpha}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{C}_q^{\beta}}$$

Proof. By Young's convolution inequality

$$\|\Delta_i(f*g)\|_{L^r} = \|\Delta_i f*\overline{\Delta}_i g\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\Delta_i f\|_{L^p} \|\overline{\Delta}_i g\|_{L^q},$$
(32)

where $\overline{\Delta}_i$ is associated with a dyadic partition of the unity different from the one we use for most of the proofs. Namely we require that it satisfies $\{\overline{\varrho_j}\}_{j\geq -1}$ such that $\varrho_j\overline{\varrho_j} = \varrho_j$. Then the bound follows immediately, since the Besov norms associated to different dyadic partitions are equivalent, cf. [3, Remark 2.17].

The following lemma is a special case of results obtained by [50]. The proof is included for completeness.

Lemma 4.13. Fix
$$p \in [1,\infty)$$
, $\zeta \in [0,\frac{1}{p})$. Then $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n^{-\zeta - d + \frac{d}{p}} \|\chi_n\|_{W_p^{\zeta}} < \infty$.

Proof. We shall make use of the characterization of fractional Sobolev spaces in terms of Sobolev-Slobodeckij norms. A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{split} \|\chi_n\|_{W_p^{\zeta}} &= \|\chi_n\|_{L^p} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d} n^{dp} \frac{|\mathbf{1}_{B_n}(x) - \mathbf{1}_{B_n}(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq n^{d - \frac{d}{p}} + \left(2\int_{B_n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \setminus B_n} n^{dp} \frac{|\mathbf{1}_{B_n}(x) - \mathbf{1}_{B_n}(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/p}. \end{split}$$

Now let $d_n(z)$ be the Euclidean distance of a point z from the boundary ∂B_n and let $\overline{B}_{d_n(z)}(y)$ be the ball of radius $d_n(z)$ about y. Then the previous integral can be estimated by:

$$\begin{split} \left(\int_{B_n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \setminus B_n} n^{dp} \frac{|\mathbf{1}_{B_n}(x) - \mathbf{1}_{B_n}(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/p} &\leq \left(\int_{B_n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{d_n(y)}(y)} n^{dp} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/p} \\ &= \left(\int_{B_n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{d_n(y)}(0)} n^{dp} \frac{1}{|x|^{d + \zeta p}} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/p} \lesssim \left(\int_{B_n} n^{dp} d_n(y)^{-\zeta p} \mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_0^{\frac{c}{n}} n^{dp} (c/n - r)^{-\zeta p} r^{d - 1} \mathrm{d}r\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim n^d \left(n^{\zeta p - d}\right)^{1/p} \leq n^{d + \zeta - d/p}. \end{split}$$

Corollary 4.14. Recall that we define the operator Π_n by $\Pi_n \varphi(x) = \chi_n * \varphi(x)$. Then, for $\zeta \in [0,1), p \in [1,\infty]$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n^{-\zeta} \|\Pi_n \varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+\zeta}_p} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p}$.

Proof. This is now a direct consequence of Lemma 4.12 and 4.13 (the latter with p = 1).

5. Semidiscrete parabolic Anderson model

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4. This theorem is an approximation result for the continuous Anderson Hamiltonian in dimensions d = 1 and d = 2. The Anderson Hamiltonian was introduced in d = 1 by [25], in d = 2 by [2] and d = 3 by [38]. In the last two cases the construction relies on theories from singular stochastic PDEs [29, 26], which is why the proof of the theorem concentrates on the two-dimensional case. In dimensions d = 4 or higher these solution theories do not work, because the noise becomes too rough (a problem known as supercriticality [29]).

In the construction of the Hamiltonian in d = 2 we follow the results in [2] that rely on paracontrolled calculus (we refer the reader to [26] and [28] for a more in-depth discussion). Our main result states that semidiscrete approximations converge in the *resolvent sense* to the continuous Anderson Hamiltonian.

5.1. **Density of the domain.** We start with some results regarding the continuous Anderson Hamiltonian, which imply Proposition 1.15.

Lemma 5.1. Consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ supporting a space white noise $\xi \colon \Omega \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Fix any $\kappa > 0$. The following hold true for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$. The Anderson Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}^{\omega} = \nu_0 \Delta + \xi(\omega)$$

associated to $\xi(\omega)$ is defined, as constructed in [25] in d = 1 and [2] in d = 2. The Hamiltonian, as an unbounded selfadjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, has a discrete spectrum given by pairs of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions $\{(\lambda_k(\omega), e_k(\omega))\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that:

 $\lambda_1(\omega) > \lambda_2(\omega) \ge \lambda_3(\omega) \ge \dots, \qquad \lim_{k \to \infty} \lambda_k(\omega) = -\infty, \qquad e_1(\omega, x) > 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$

Proof. The Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}^{ω} has been constructed in dimension d = 1 in [25] (albeit with Dirichlet boundary conditions, but the construction for periodic boundary conditions is identical) and in dimension d = 2 in [2], for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$. In both cases \mathcal{H}^{ω} is an unbounded, selfadjoint operator on L^2 , that is:

$$\mathcal{H}^{\omega}: \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\omega}) \subset L^2 \to L^2.$$

In particular, in d = 2 [2, Proposition 4.13] implies that the operator \mathcal{H}^{ω} admits compact resolvents (cf. [25, Section 2] for the analogous discussion in d = 1). This means that for some $\overline{\lambda}(\omega) > 0$ for all $\lambda \geq \overline{\lambda}(\omega)$ the operator $\mathcal{H}^{\omega} - \lambda$ is invertible, and $(\mathcal{H}^{\omega} - \lambda)^{-1}$ is a compact operator on L^2 . Hence the spectrum of \mathcal{H}^{ω} is discrete and the eigenvalues converge to $-\infty$. By a classical result, see [45, Theorem 3.3], the semigroup generated by \mathcal{H}^{ω} , denoted by $e^{t\mathcal{H}^{\omega}}$, is compact. Moreover, as a consequence of strong maximum principle (in d = 2 such a result for singular stochastic PDEs is proven in [8, Theorem 5.1 and Remark 5.2]), the semigroup $e^{t\mathcal{H}^{\omega}}$ is strictly positive: that is, for any non-zero continuous function f that is positive (i.e. $f(x) \geq 0$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d$), it holds that $e^{t\mathcal{H}^{\omega}}f(x) > 0$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d$. Therefore since $e^{t\mathcal{H}^{\omega}}$ is a compact, strictly positive operator, the Krein-Rutman Theorem [18, Theorem 19.3] implies that the largest eigenvalue of \mathcal{H}^{ω} has multiplicity one and the associated eigenfunction is strictly positive. **Lemma 5.2.** Fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and consider the Anderson Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}^{ω} as in the previous lemma. Define the domain:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\omega} = \{ Finite \ linear \ combinations \ of \ \{e_k(\omega)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \}.$$

The domain \mathcal{D}_{ω} is dense in $C(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Moreover, for arbitrary $\zeta \in (0,1)$ and all $\varphi \in C^{\infty}$, there exists a sequence $\varphi^k \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega}$ with $\lim_{k \to \infty} \varphi^k = \varphi$ in \mathcal{C}^{ζ} .

Proof. Since $\omega \in \Omega$ is fixed, we avoid writing the dependence on it to lighten the notation. As the statement regarding the approximation of φ in \mathcal{C}^{ζ} implies density in $C(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we restrict to proving the approximation. First, we require some better understanding of the parabolic Anderson semigroup. Here we make use of some known regularization results.

Step 1. Consider the operator \mathcal{H} as in the previous lemma and the associated semigroup:

$$e^{t\mathcal{H}} \colon L^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \to L^2(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

This semigroup inherits some of the regularizing properties of the heat semigroup, namely, for T > 0 and $p \in [1, \infty]$ it can be extended so that:

$$\sup_{0 < t \le T} t^{\gamma} \| e^{t\mathcal{H}} \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim \| \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\beta}}, \tag{33}$$

for α, β and γ satisfying:

$$\gamma > \frac{\alpha - \beta}{2}, \qquad \beta + 2 > \frac{d}{2}, \qquad \alpha < 2 - \frac{d}{2}, \qquad \alpha > \beta.$$

The first constraint is essentially identical to the one appearing in Schauder estimates (cf. Proposition 4.7), the second one guarantees that the product $e^{t\Delta}\varphi\cdot\xi$ is a well-defined product of distributions, while the third constraint is due to the fact that $\int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \xi \, \mathrm{d}s$ has always worse regularity than $2 - \frac{d}{2}$. Similarly, for $\beta > 2 - \frac{d}{2}$ and $\zeta < 2 - \frac{d}{2}$ one has:

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \|e^{t\mathcal{H}}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\zeta}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\beta}}.$$
(34)

We will not prove these results. Instead we refer to [28, Section 6] for the study of singular SPDEs with irregular initial conditions.

Step 2. Applying iteratively Equation (33) and Besov embedding implies that $e_k \in \mathcal{C}^{2-\frac{d}{2}-\kappa}$ for any $\kappa > 0$. Hence the embedding $\mathcal{D}_{\omega} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{2-\frac{d}{2}-\kappa}$ holds. Now we prove the statement regarding the approximability of φ . For any $\varphi \in C^{\infty}$ and $\zeta = 1 - \kappa < 1$ (for some $\kappa > 0$) one has:

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t e^{s\mathcal{H}} \varphi \, \mathrm{d}s = \varphi \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{C}^{\zeta}$$

This result can be seen as follows: Equation (34) implies that

t-

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t e^{s\mathcal{H}} \varphi \, \mathrm{d}s \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\zeta'}} < \infty,$$

for $\zeta < \zeta' < 2 - \frac{d}{2}$. The estimate above implies compactness in \mathcal{C}^{ζ} . Projecting on the eigenfunctions e_k one sees that any limit point is necessarily φ . Hence fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $t(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\left\|\frac{1}{t(\varepsilon)}\int_0^{t(\varepsilon)}e^{s\mathcal{H}}\varphi\,\mathrm{d}s-\varphi\right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\zeta}}<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Define $\prod_{\leq N} \varphi = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \langle \varphi, e_k \rangle e_k$. Since the projection commutes with the operator, the proof is complete if we can show that there exists an $N(\varepsilon)$ such that:

$$\left\|\frac{1}{t(\varepsilon)}\int_0^{t(\varepsilon)} e^{s\mathcal{H}}(\Pi_{\leq N(\varepsilon)}\varphi - \varphi) \,\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\zeta}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

Here we use (33) to bound for general $\psi \in L^2$:

$$\begin{split} \left\| \frac{1}{t(\varepsilon)} \int_0^{t(\varepsilon)} e^{s\mathcal{H}} \psi \, \mathrm{d}s \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\zeta}} &\lesssim \frac{1}{t(\varepsilon)} \int_0^{t(\varepsilon)} \left(\frac{s}{2}\right)^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{4}\right)} \|e^{\frac{s}{2}\mathcal{H}} \psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \, \mathrm{d}s \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{t(\varepsilon)} \int_0^{t(\varepsilon)} \left(\frac{s}{2}\right)^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{4}\right)} \|e^{\frac{s}{2}\mathcal{H}} \psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\frac{d}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{2}}} \, \mathrm{d}s \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{t(\varepsilon)} \int_0^{t(\varepsilon)} s^{-1 + \frac{\kappa}{4} + \frac{\kappa}{8}} \, \mathrm{d}s\right) \|\psi\|_{L^2} \lesssim t(\varepsilon)^{-1 + \frac{3\kappa}{8}} \|\psi\|_{L^2} \end{split}$$

where we additionally applied Besov embedding. Choosing $N(\varepsilon)$ such that $\|\prod_{\leq N} \varphi - \varphi\|_{L^2} \lesssim t(\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{3\kappa}{8}} \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, the proof is complete.

5.2. Convergence of eigenfunctions. Before we move on to study semidiscrete approximations of the Anderson Hamiltonian, we recall and adapt a result by Kato concerning the convergence of eigenvalues and (in a generalized sense) the convergence of eigenfunctions of a sequence of closed linear operators on a Hilbert space H with norm $\|\cdot\| = \sqrt{\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle}$. We will denote with

$$\sigma(A), \varrho(A) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$$

the spectrum and the resolvent sets of a closed linear operator A on H respectively. If A is bounded, we denote with $||A|| = \sup_{||x||=1} ||Ax||$ its operator norm. We write B(H) for the space of bounded operators, endowed with operator norm. Moreover, we denote with $\operatorname{Rng}(A)$ the image A(H) of a closed operator on H.

Now, consider a bounded set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ such that the boundary $\Gamma = \partial \Omega$ is a smooth curve satisfying $\Gamma \subseteq \varrho(A)$. We write $R(A, \zeta) = (A - \zeta)^{-1}$ for the resolvent of A at $\zeta \in \varrho(A)$. Then we introduce the Riesz projection

$$P(\Omega, A) = -\frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \int_{\Gamma} R(A, \zeta) \,\mathrm{d}\zeta,$$

which for all our purposes coincides with the projection on certain eigenspaces, as described in the following lemma, which is proven for example in [32, Proposition 6.3].

Lemma 5.3. Let A be a selfadjoint operator on H. Suppose that Ω (with boundary Γ as above) contains only isolated points of the spectrum: $\Omega \cap \sigma(A) = \{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^m$. Then $P(\Omega, A)$ coincides with the orthogonal projection on the space:

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \operatorname{Ker}(A - \lambda_i).$$

Next we recall that Riesz projections are continuous with respect to convergence in the resolvent sense. This is a weaker version of a result by Kato [34, Theorem IV.3.16].

41

Proposition 5.4. Let A_n be a sequence of closed self-adjoint operators on H. Let A be a closed self-adjoint operator such that, for some $\zeta_0 \in \varrho(A)$:

$$\zeta_0 \in \varrho(A_n), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad and \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \|R(A^n, \zeta_0) - R(A, \zeta_0)\| = 0.$$

Let λ be an isolated eigenvalue of A and consider a smooth curve $\Gamma = \partial \Omega$ around λ , such that $\Gamma \subseteq \rho(A), \ \Omega \cap \sigma(A) = \{\lambda\}$. Then $\lim_{n \to \infty} \|P(\Omega, A_n) - P(\Omega, A)\| = 0$.

The previous result allows us to deduce the following.

Corollary 5.5. In the setting of the previous proposition, let $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{m(\lambda)}$ be orthonormal eigenfunctions associated to the eigenvalue λ of the operator A (here $m(\lambda)$ is the multiplicity of λ). There exists an $n(\lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n(\lambda)$ the following statements hold.

- i) dim(Rng($P(\Omega, A_n)$)) = dim(Rng($P(\Omega, A)$)) = $m(\lambda)$.
- ii) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, m(\lambda)\}$ there exists an $e_j^n \in \mathcal{D}(A_n)$ (the domain of A_n) satisfying:

$$e_j^n \to e_j \quad in \quad H, \qquad A_n e_j^n \to \lambda e_j \quad in \quad H.$$

iii) For every $j \in \{1, \ldots, m(\lambda)\}$, e_j^n has a representation of the form

$$e_j^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m(\lambda)} \alpha_{ij}^n \overline{e}_i^n, \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{m(\lambda)} (\alpha_{ij}^n)^2 = 1.$$

with $\{\overline{e}_i^n\}_{i=1,\ldots,m(\lambda)}$ a set of eigenfunctions of A_n . That is, for every $i \in \{1,\ldots,m(\lambda)\}$:

$$A_n \overline{e}_i^n = \lambda_i^n \overline{e}_i^n, \quad for \ some \quad \lambda_i^n \in \mathbb{R} \ s.t. \ \lim_{n \to \infty} \lambda_i^n = \lambda$$

iv) If λ is a simple eigenvalue, then e_1^n is an eigenfunction of A_n , with eigenvalue $\lambda_1^n \to \lambda$.

Proof. Consider $m_n(\lambda) = \dim(\operatorname{Rng}(P(\Omega, A_n)))$ and $\{\overline{e}_j^n\}_{j=1}^{m_n(\lambda)}$ an orthonormal basis for the subspace on which $P(\Omega, A_n)$ projects. In particular, in view of Lemma 5.3, we can choose \overline{e}_j^n to be eigenfunctions for A_n , each associated to an eigenvalue λ_j^n . According to the same lemma, one has:

$$P(\Omega, A_n)v = \sum_{i=1}^{m_n(\lambda)} \langle v, \overline{e}_j^n \rangle \overline{e}_j^n, \qquad \forall v \in H.$$

Define for $j = 1, ..., m(\lambda)$: $\tilde{e}_j^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m_n(\lambda)} \langle e_j, \overline{e}_i^n \rangle \overline{e}_i^n = P(\Omega, A_n) e_j$. From the convergence $||P(\Omega, A_n) - P(\Omega, A)|| \to 0$, which is the content of the previous proposition, we obtain that for $j = 1, ..., m(\lambda)$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{e}_j^n := \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n(\lambda)} \langle e_j, \overline{e}_i^n \rangle \overline{e}_i^n = e_j \quad \text{in} \quad H.$$

Hence we can assume that $n(\lambda)$ is sufficiently large, so that

. .

$$\left| \left\| \tilde{e}_j^n - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \langle \tilde{e}_j^n, \tilde{e}_i^n \rangle \tilde{e}_i^n \right\| - 1 \right| \ge \frac{1}{2} > 0, \qquad \forall j = 1, \dots, m(\lambda).$$

Then we can define (via a Gram-Schmidt procedure)

42

$$e_j^n = \frac{\tilde{e}_j^n - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \langle \tilde{e}_j^n, \tilde{e}_i^n \rangle \tilde{e}_i^n}{\left\| \tilde{e}_j^n - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \langle \tilde{e}_j^n, \tilde{e}_i^n \rangle \tilde{e}_i^n \right\|},$$

and we obtain a set $\{e_j^n\}_{j=1}^{m(\lambda)}$ of orthonormal functions with

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} e_j^n = e_j \quad \text{in} \quad H, \qquad P(\Omega, A_n) e_j^n = e_j^n.$$

In particular, $m_n(\lambda) \ge m(\lambda)$. Suppose $m_n(\lambda) > m(\lambda)$ on a subsequence n_k of n that converges to ∞ . Choose, along that subsequence, a unit element $e_{m(\lambda)+1}^{n_k} \in H$ with

$$P(\Omega, A_{n_k})e_{m(\lambda)+1}^{n_k} = e_{m(\lambda)+1}^{n_k}, \qquad \langle e_{m(\lambda)+1}^{n_k}, e_j^{n_k} \rangle = 0, \qquad \forall j = 1, \dots, m(\lambda).$$

We can then assume for arbitrary δ (provided n_k is large enough), that $\sum_{j=1}^{m(\lambda)} \|e_j^{n_k} - e_j\| < \delta$. Then

$$\|P(\Omega, A_{n_k})(e_{m(\lambda)+1}^{n_k}) - P(\Omega, A)(e_{m(\lambda)+1}^{n_k})\| \ge 1 - \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{m(\lambda)} \langle e_{m(\lambda)+1}^{n_k}, e_j^{n_k} - e_j \rangle e_j\right\| \ge 1 - \delta$$

Since δ is arbitrarily small this contradicts the convergence of the projections. Let us pass to the convergence of $A_n e_j^n$. Observe that $A_n \tilde{e}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m(\lambda)} \lambda_i^n \langle e_j, \overline{e}_i^n \rangle \overline{e}_i^n$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n \tilde{e}_j^n - \lambda e_j\| &\leq \|A_n \tilde{e}_j^n - \lambda \tilde{e}_j^n\| + \lambda \|\tilde{e}_j^n - e_j\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m(\lambda)} (\lambda - \lambda_i^n)^2 \langle e_j, \overline{e}_i^n \rangle^2} + \lambda \|\tilde{e}_j^n - e_j\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (\lambda - \lambda_i^n)^2} + \lambda \|\tilde{e}_j^n - e_j\|, \end{aligned}$$

and the last two terms converge to zero, provided that for each $i \lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_i^n = \lambda$. This follows from the upper semicontinuity of the spectrum proven in [34, Theorem IV.3.1]. If we now use the definition of e_j^n we obtain similarly that:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} A_n e_j^n = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{A_n \tilde{e}_j^n - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \langle \tilde{e}_j^n, \tilde{e}_i^n \rangle A_n \tilde{e}_i^n}{\left\| \tilde{e}_j^n - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \langle \tilde{e}_j^n, \tilde{e}_i^n \rangle \tilde{e}_i^n \right\|} = \lambda e_j.$$

To conclude the proof, note that the representation of e_j^n in terms of the basis $\{\overline{e}_i^n\}$ follows from the fact that the latter consists of orthonormal functions and that $\|e_j^n\| = 1$. Clearly, if $m(\lambda) = 1$ we can choose $e_1^n = \overline{e}_1^n$.

5.3. Convergence in resolvent sense. This section describes the general idea behind the convergence that we will prove in the upcoming subsection.

Proposition 5.6. Consider a sequence of selfadjoint operators A_n on a Hilbert space H. Assume there exists a $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and an operator $B_{\lambda_0} \in B(H)$ such that:

$$\lambda_0 \in \varrho(A_n) \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \|R(A_n, \lambda_0) - B_{\lambda_0}\| = 0,$$

and satisfying $\text{Ker}(B_{\lambda_0}) = \{0\}$. Then there exists a unique selfadjoint operator A on H defined by:

$$D(A) = \operatorname{Rng}(B_{\lambda_0}), \quad and \quad A = B_{\lambda_0}^{-1}x + \lambda_0 x, \quad x \in D(A).$$

The domain D(A) and the operator A do not depend on the choice of λ_0 . Moreover, A satisfies $B_{\lambda_0} = R(A, \lambda_0)$.

Proof. First, note that if $x \in D(A) = \operatorname{Rng}(B_{\lambda_0})$, then the preimage $B_{\lambda_0}^{-1}x$ is uniquely defined, since we assumed that $\operatorname{Ker}(B_{\lambda_0}) = \{0\}$. It remains to check that A is a self-adjoint operator: for this we refer, for example, to [53, Proposition 8.2]. By construction we have that $B_{\lambda_0} = R(A, \lambda_0)$ and through the resolvent identity (for all $\lambda \in \varrho(A)$):

$$R(A,\lambda) = R(A,\lambda_0) + (\lambda - \lambda_0)R(A,\lambda_0)R(A,\lambda),$$

we see that the domain does not depend on the choice of λ_0 .

At this point, we can describe the structure of the proof of Theorem 4 as follows:

i) The crux of the argument is to show that for a fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ the resolvents $R(\mathcal{H}_n, \lambda)$ converge:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} R(\mathcal{H}_n, \lambda) = B_\lambda,$$

for some bounded injective B_{λ} .

- ii) The previous proposition then guarantees the existence of a selfadjoint operator \mathcal{H} such that $B_{\lambda} = R(\mathcal{H}, \lambda)$.
- iii) Finally, the convergence of eigenfunctions and eigenvalues follows from Corollary 5.5.

Remark 5.7. This argument does not require an explicit construction of the operator \mathcal{H} or of its domain $D(\mathcal{H})$. It will appear clearly from the proof that the limiting resolvent $R(\mathcal{H}, \lambda)$ coincides with the resolvent constructed in [2] (although the article treats only the case d = 2, a similar but simpler construction works also in d = 1). In particular, the latter article explicitly describes the range of the resolvent (i.e. the domain of the operator \mathcal{H}), as a space of strongly paracontrolled distributions and it provides an explicit representation of \mathcal{H} on this domain.

5.4. **Proof of Theorem 4.** The paracontrolled approach in [2] to construct the Anderson Hamiltonian in d = 2 follows the Ansatz that the solution ψ to the resolvent equation

$$(\nu_0 \Delta + \xi - \lambda)\psi = \varphi.$$

for $\varphi \in L^2$ is of the form $\psi = \psi' \otimes X_\lambda + \psi^{\sharp}$, the previous being a paraproduct as defined in Lemma 5.14, with X_λ solving $(-\nu_0 \Delta + \lambda)X_\lambda = \xi$, and $\psi^{\sharp} \in C^{1+2\kappa}$ (we will call a ψ of this form *paracontrolled*). This should be interpreted as a "Taylor expansion" in terms of functionals of the noise, and the reason why the rest term is expected to be of better regularity is encoded in the concept of subcriticality, introduced in [29]. Now, for paracontrolled ψ the previously ill-defined product can be rewritten as $\psi\xi = (\psi' \otimes X)\xi + \psi^{\sharp}\xi$. While the last term is now well-defined (recall that if $d = 2, \xi \in C^{-1-\kappa}$), a commutator estimate (see Lemma 5.16) guarantees that the resonant product can be approximated as $(\psi' \otimes X) \odot \xi \simeq \psi'(X \odot \xi)$. The latter resonant product $X \odot \xi$ remains still ill-defined in terms of regularity, but one can make sense of it through some Gaussian computations (since X_λ and ξ are both Gaussian fields), up to renormalisation. By this we mean that the product lives in two levels of the Wiener chaos. While the second chaos part turns out to be well-defined, the zeroth chaos is diverging. Eventually, one can rigorously define a distribution $X \diamond \xi$ that formally can be written as $X \odot \xi - \infty = X \odot \xi - \mathbb{E} [X \odot \xi]$, which lives in the second Wiener chaos and explains the ∞ appearing in the equation. This explains why in d = 2 the Hamiltonian can be written as $\nu_0 \Delta + \xi - \infty$, where the latter " ∞ " comes from the renormalisation.

In the cartoon we have just sketched, we hope to explain that theories for singular stochastic PDEs have two critical ingredients. First, some stochastic computations guarantee the existence of certain products of random distributions. Second, given a realization of these distributions, a purely analytic argument, based on regularity estimates and a Taylor-like expansion guarantees the existence of a solution to the PDE.

In the present setting we concentrate on semidiscrete approximations of the Anderson Hamiltonian, that is we will prove that ψ as above is the limit $\psi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi_n$, with $(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)\psi_n = \prod_n^2 (\xi^n - c_n \mathbb{1}_{\{d=2\}}) \prod_n^2 \psi_n - \varphi$. Following the previous explanation we will first state some stochastic estimates and then pass to the main analytic result. The next definition introduces the space in which we will control the stochastic terms.

Definition 5.8. Consider d = 2 and fix any $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we will call an enhanced noise a vector of distributions

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_n = (\xi^n, Y_n) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^2) \times C([1, \infty); \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^2)),$$

where Y_n is a map $[1, \infty) \ni \lambda \mapsto Y_{n,\lambda} \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^2)$. For $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n$ we introduce the following norm, with $X_{n,\lambda} = (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|\|_{n,\kappa} &:= \sup_{\zeta \in [0,1]} \left\{ n^{-\zeta} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-(1-\zeta)-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \right\} + n^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^{n}\|_{L^{\infty}} + n^{-1-\kappa} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &+ \sup_{\lambda \ge 1} \left\{ n \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}X_{n,\lambda}\|_{L^{\infty}} + \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|Y_{n,\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We can immediately bound some further quantities related to $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n$.

Lemma 5.9. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \ge 1$ consider an enhanced noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n$ as in Definition 5.8. Then we can bound, for any $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \delta \in [0, 1]$ and uniformly over n, λ :

$$\sup_{\zeta\in[0,1]}\lambda^{\delta}n^{-\zeta}\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_{n}X_{n,\lambda}\right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-(1-\zeta)+2(1-\delta)-\frac{\kappa}{2}}}+n^{2(1-\delta)}\left\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}X_{n,\lambda}\right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-(1-\zeta)-\frac{\kappa}{2}}}\right\}\lesssim\left\|\left|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\right\|\right\|_{n,\kappa}$$

Proof. This is a consequence of the elliptic Schauder estimates of Proposition 4.6. \Box

Now, the following stochastic estimates hold true.

Proposition 5.10. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space supporting a sequence of random functions $\xi^n \colon \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ as in Assumption 1.6. In dimension d = 2, for $\lambda \ge 1$, define

$$X_{n,\lambda} = (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \xi^n, \qquad \xi^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} = \xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} - c_n,$$

where

$$c_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{\widehat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k)\widehat{\chi}_Q(n^{-1}k)}{-\vartheta_n(k) + 1}, \quad with \quad c_n \simeq \log n.$$

If d = 1 one can bound for any $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$:

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \Big[\sup_{\zeta \in [0,1]} n^{-\frac{\zeta}{2}} \| \xi^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\zeta)-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} + n^{-1} \| \xi^n \|_{L^{\infty}} \Big] < \infty.$$

If d = 2 define the enhanced noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n = (\xi^n, (\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} - c_n)_{\lambda \ge 1})$, taking values in the space of Definition 5.8. For any $\kappa > 0$ one can bound $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[||\boldsymbol{\xi}_n||_{n,\kappa}] < \infty$. Moreover, for any fixed $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ there exists a probability space $(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$, supporting space white noise ξ on \mathbb{T}^d , and a sequence of random functions $\overline{\xi}^n : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi^n = \overline{\xi}^n$ in distribution and such that for almost all $\omega \in \overline{\Omega}$:

$$\overline{\xi}^n(\omega) \to \xi(\omega) \quad in \quad \mathcal{C}^{-\frac{d}{2}-\kappa}$$

In dimension d = 2, for any $\lambda \ge 1$ there exists also a random distribution $\xi \diamond X_{\lambda}$ such that:

$$\mathcal{P}_n(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\overline{\xi}^n(\omega) \to (-\Delta+\lambda)^{-1}\xi(\omega) \qquad in \quad \mathcal{C}^{2-\frac{d}{2}-\kappa},$$
$$\overline{\xi}^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} \to \xi \diamond X_\lambda(\omega) \qquad in \quad \mathcal{C}^{-\kappa}.$$

Finally, again in d = 2 and for almost all $\omega \in \overline{\Omega}$, one an bound $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} ||| \boldsymbol{\xi}_n(\omega) |||_{n,\kappa} < \infty$.

The proof of this result is mostly technical, and for the sake of readability deferred to Apppendix A.2. In view of the previous result we will work under the following assumption.

Assumption 5.11. Consider $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ fixed. Up to changing the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, we assume that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ outside a null-set N the convergences in Proposition 5.10 hold true. If d = 2 in addition $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} ||\boldsymbol{\xi}_n(\omega)||_{n,\kappa} < \infty$.

Having fixed the correct probability space and having explained our method, we are now in position to prove Theorem 4. The next result proves that the operators \mathcal{H}_n converge in resolvent sense.

Proposition 5.12. Under Assumption 5.11 fix $\omega \in \Omega \setminus N$. Consider, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the bounded selfadjoint operators

$$\mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} \colon L^2 \to L^2, \qquad \mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} \psi = (\mathcal{A}_n + \Pi_n^2 (\xi^n - c_n) \Pi_n^2) \psi.$$

There exists a $\overline{\lambda}(\omega) \in [1, \infty)$ such that $-\mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} + \lambda(\omega)$ is invertible for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda(\omega) \geq \overline{\lambda}(\omega)$, and there exists an operator $B_{\lambda}(\omega) \in B(H)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} (-\mathcal{H}_n^{\omega} + \lambda(\omega))^{-1} = B_{\lambda}(\omega) \quad in \quad B(L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)).$$

Proof. The strategy of the proof is a perturbation of the proof in [2] and is based on a fixed point argument. In Step 1 we describe the space in which we can solve the resolvent equation through a fixed point argument, uniformly over n and λ large enough (throughout the proof the realization ω is fixed and omitted to keep the notation clean). The estimates that will allow us to apply Banach's fixed point theorem are discussed in Steps 2 through 4. The convergence as $n \to \infty$ is established in Steps 5 and 6. Throughout the proof the parameter $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ will be chosen small enough, so that all computations hold.

Step 1. Fix $p \in [1, \infty]$ as well as $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}$. In dimension d = 1, solving the resolvent equation $(-\mathcal{H}_n + \lambda)\psi = \varphi$ is equivalent to solving (with $c_n = 0$) the fixed point problem

$$\psi = M_{\varphi,\lambda}(\psi) := (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} [\Pi_n^2 [\xi^n - c_n] \Pi_n^2 \psi + \varphi].$$
(35)

In dimension d = 2 we will not prove directly that $M_{\varphi,\lambda}$ is a contraction (while in d = 1 this is possible: the arguments that follow are then superfluous and Proposition 4.6 allows to find a fixed point ψ). Instead, to find the fixed point we look for a paracontrolled solution. Consider a space $\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda} \subseteq \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ which consists of pairs (ψ', ψ^{\sharp}) and is characterized by the norm

$$\|(\psi',\psi^{\sharp})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}^{\lambda}} := \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}} + \|\mathcal{P}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1+\kappa}} + n^{2-\kappa}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}},$$

where we used the operators $\mathcal{P}_n, \mathcal{Q}_n$ as in Definition 4.3. The norm does not depend on λ , but to every pair $(\psi', \psi^{\sharp}) \in \mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}$ we associate a function ψ by

$$\psi = \Pi_n^2 \left\{ \psi' \otimes \left[(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \xi^n \right] \right\} + \psi^{\sharp}.$$

With an abuse of notation, we identify the pair (ψ', ψ^{\sharp}) with the function ψ and write $\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_{n}} = \|(\psi', \psi^{\sharp})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_{n}}$. Define the map $\overline{M}_{\varphi,\lambda} : \mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_{n} \to L^{p}$ as

$$\overline{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}(\psi) := (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} [\Pi_n^2 \xi^n \Pi_n^2 \psi - c_n \Pi_n^2 \psi' + \varphi].$$

The map $\overline{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}$ can be extended to a map from \mathcal{D}_n^{λ} into itself by defining:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}(\psi) = (M'_{\varphi,\lambda}(\psi), \ M^{\sharp}_{\varphi,\lambda}(\psi))$$

:= $(\Pi^{2}_{n}\psi, \ \overline{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}(\psi) - \Pi^{2}_{n}\{(\Pi^{2}_{n}\psi) \otimes [(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+1)^{-1}\xi^{n}]\}) \in \mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_{n}.$

Any fixed point of $\mathcal{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}$ is also a fixed point for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\varphi,\lambda}$ and since the fixed point satisfies $\psi' = \prod_n^2 \psi$, it solves also the fixed point equation (35) for $\mathcal{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}$. Similarly, if $\psi \in L^p$ solves Equation (35), then $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}$ (for fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the embedding $L^p \subseteq \mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}$ is continuous) and ψ is a fixed point for $\mathcal{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}$. We conclude that solutions $\psi \in L^p$ to $(-\mathcal{H}_n + \lambda)\psi = \varphi$ are equivalent to fixed points of $\mathcal{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}$. We will show that for λ sufficiently large $\mathcal{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}$ admits a unique fixed point for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}$.

Throughout the proof we will repeatedly make use of the elliptic Schauder estimates of Proposition 4.6, the regularization properties of Π_n of Corollary 4.14, the estimates on $X_{n,\lambda}$ of Lemma 5.9 which crucially allow us to gain powers of λ and n and the paraproduct estimates of Lemma 5.14, without stating them explicitly every time.

Step 2. Our aim is to control (paying particular attention to the dependence on λ and the uniformity over n) the quantity:

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\varphi,\lambda}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}} = \|\Pi_n^2\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}} + \|\mathcal{P}_n \ M_{\varphi,\lambda}^{\sharp}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} + \|\mathcal{Q}_n \ M_{\varphi,\lambda}^{\sharp}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}},$$

in terms on $\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}}$ and $\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}}$. As for the first term, $\|\Pi_n^2\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}}$, we observe that

$$\|\Pi_{n}^{2}\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}} = \|\Pi_{n}^{4}\left\{\psi'\otimes X_{n,\lambda}\right\} + \Pi_{n}^{2}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}}$$

$$\lesssim \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}}\left(\|\mathcal{P}_{n}X_{n,\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1-\kappa}} + n^{2}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}X_{n,\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\kappa}}\right)$$

$$+ \|\mathcal{P}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1+\kappa}} + n^{2-3\kappa}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}}$$

$$\lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}^{\lambda}}(1+\||\boldsymbol{\xi}\||_{n,\kappa}) + \|\mathcal{P}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1+\kappa}} + n^{2-\kappa}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}}.$$
(36)

To tackle the norms involving M^{\sharp} , first rewrite

$$M_{\varphi,\lambda}^{\sharp}(\psi) = M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi) + M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}(\psi),$$

where to clean the notation we have omitted the dependence on λ and with

$$M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi) = (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \Big\{ \varphi + \Pi_n^2 [\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 \psi^{\sharp}] + \Pi_n^2 \big\{ \xi^n \odot [\Pi_n^2(\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda})] - c_n \psi' \big\} + \Pi_n^2 \big\{ \xi^n \otimes \Pi_n^2 \psi \big\} \Big\}$$

47

 $\frac{\kappa}{2}$

and $M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}(\psi) = \prod_{n=1}^{2} C_{n,\lambda}(\prod_{n=1}^{2} \psi, \xi^{n})$, with $C_{n,\lambda}(\prod_{n=1}^{2} \psi, \xi^{n})$ the commutator

$$C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_n^2\psi,\xi^n) = (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1}[(\Pi_n^2\psi) \otimes \xi^n] - [(\Pi_n^2\psi) \otimes (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1}(\xi^n)].$$

For clarity we divide the estimates for the two terms $M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}, M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}$ in two distinct steps.

Step 3: Estimates for $M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}$. Combining the Schauder estimates with the smoothing properties of Π_n and the paraproduct estimates one finds that

$$\lambda^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \left(\left\| \mathcal{P}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi) \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} + n^{2-\kappa} \left\| \mathcal{Q}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi) \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} \right)$$

$$\lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} + \|\Pi_n^2 \psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} \|\xi^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} + \|\xi^n \odot [\Pi_n^2 (\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda})] - c_n \psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}}$$

To treat $\|\xi^n \odot [\Pi_n^2(\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda}) - c_n \psi']\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}}$, we introduce (cf. Definition 5.15) the commutators

$$C_n^{\Pi}(f,g) = \Pi_n^2(f \otimes g) - f \otimes \Pi_n^2 g, \qquad C^{\odot}(f,g,h) = f \odot (g \otimes h) - g(f \odot h).$$

Then the previous resonant product can be split into:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi^{n} \odot [\Pi_{n}^{2}(\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda}) - c_{n}\psi']\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} &\leq \|\xi^{n} \odot C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', X_{n,\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} \\ &+ \|C^{\odot}(\xi^{n}, \psi', \Pi_{n}^{2}X_{n,\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} + \|\psi'(\xi^{n} \odot \Pi_{n}^{2}X_{n,\lambda} - c_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}}. \end{aligned}$$

$$(37)$$

Starting with the first term, by Lemma 5.17

$$\begin{split} \|\xi^{n} \odot C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', X_{n,\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \|\xi^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \|\mathcal{P}_{n}C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', X_{n,\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1+\kappa}} + \|\xi^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+\kappa}} \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{P}_{n}X_{n,\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1}} \\ &+ \|\xi^{n} \odot \mathcal{Q}_{n}C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{Q}_{n}X_{n,\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}} \|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|\|_{n,\kappa}^{2} + \|\xi^{n} \odot \mathcal{Q}_{n}C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{Q}_{n}X_{n,\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}}. \end{split}$$

The last quantity requires a bit of attention, since at first sight none of the two terms involved in the product has positive regularity: while the commutator guarantees us powers of n, it does not guarantee regularization on small scales. For this we need the estimate of ξ^n in spaces of positive regularity. Since ξ^n is constant on boxes this is not possible in the L^{∞} scale of spaces, so we have to introduce an additional integrability parameter. For this we assume that κ is small enough so that $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + 2\kappa \leq 1$ and $-1 + 2\kappa \leq -\frac{7\kappa}{2}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi^{n} \odot \mathcal{Q}_{n} C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{Q}_{n} X_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} &\leq \|\xi^{n} \odot \mathcal{Q}_{n} C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{Q}_{n} X_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\frac{7\kappa}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \|\xi^{n} \odot \mathcal{Q}_{n} C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{Q}_{n} X_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{r}^{\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim \|\xi^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{n}^{\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \|\mathcal{Q}_{n} C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{Q}_{n} X_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we used Besov embedding and in the last step we used the resonant product estimate with arbitrary integrability parameters from Lemma 5.14. Overall:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi^{n} \odot \mathcal{Q}_{n} C_{n}^{\Pi}(\psi', \mathcal{Q}_{n} X_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} &\lesssim n^{1+\kappa} \|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|\|n^{-(1-2\kappa)}\|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n} X_{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}}\|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|\|^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

As for the second term in (37), by Lemma 5.16

$$\begin{aligned} \|C^{\odot}(\xi^{n},\psi',\Pi_{n}^{2}X_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} &\leq \|C^{\odot}(\xi^{n},\psi',\Pi_{n}^{2}X_{n})\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \|\xi^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}} \|\Pi_{n}^{2}X_{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|_{n,\kappa}^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

48 THE SPATIAL Λ-FLEMING-VIOT PROCESS IN A RANDOM ENVIRONMENT

Here we estimated, via Lemma 5.9:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} \|_{\mathcal{C}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} &\leq \|\Pi_n^2 \mathcal{P}_n X_{n,\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} + \|\Pi_n^2 \mathcal{Q}_n X_{n,\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_{n,\kappa} + n\|X_{n,\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim \|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_{n,\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the last term in (37). Here we recall that in the norm $\||\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\||_{n,\kappa}$ the term $Y_{n,\lambda} = \xi^n \odot \prod_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} - c_n$ is allowed to mildly explode for $\lambda \to \infty$. We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi'(\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} - c_n)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} &\lesssim \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}} \|\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_n - c_n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_{n,\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$
(38)

Step 4: Estimates for $M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}$. Here we apply the commutator estimate for $C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_n^2\psi,\xi^n)$ from Lemma 5.18. We start by estimating the large scales:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} &= \|\Pi_n^2 \mathcal{P}_n C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_n^2 \psi, \xi^n)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_n C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_n^2 \psi, \xi^n)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\Pi_n^2 \psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}} \|\xi^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}} (1+\||\xi_n\||_{n,\kappa})^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that, provided κ is sufficiently small, $(1-\kappa)+(-1-\kappa/2)+2(1-\kappa/2) > 1+\kappa$ together with the estimate (36) for $\prod_{n=1}^{2} \psi$. On small scales we find:

$$\begin{split} \lambda^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} n^{2-\kappa} \| \mathcal{Q}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}(\psi) \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} &\lesssim \lambda^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} n^{2-\kappa} \| \mathcal{Q}_n C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_n^2 \psi, \xi^n) \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim n^{-1} \big(\lambda^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} n^{1+2(1-\kappa/2)} \| \mathcal{Q}_n C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_n^2 \psi, \xi^n) \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} \big) \\ &\lesssim \| \Pi_n^2 \psi \|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}} (n^{-1} \| \xi^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+3\kappa}}) \lesssim \| \psi \|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}} (1 + \| \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \|_{n,\kappa})^2, \end{split}$$

where we once again used the estimates on $\Pi_n^2 \psi$ from (36).

Step 5: Collecting the estimates. The estimates of step 2 guarantee that there exists an increasing map $\mathfrak{c}: [0, \infty) \to [1, \infty)$ such that

$$\|M'_{\varphi}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}} \leq \mathfrak{c}(\|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|\|_{n,\kappa}) \big(\lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1-\kappa}} + \|\mathcal{P}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{1+\kappa}} + \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}}\big).$$
(39)

In addition, estimates of steps 3 and 4 guarantee that (up to choosing a larger \mathfrak{c}): $\|\mathcal{P}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} + n^{2-\kappa} \|\mathcal{Q}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} \leqslant \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \mathfrak{c}(\|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|\|_{n,\kappa}) (\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}} + \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}}).$ (40)

Observe that the factor $\lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}}$, instead of $\lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$, is not a type: it follows from (38), where we pay a factor $\lambda^{\frac{\kappa}{4}}$ to control the product $\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} - c_n$. Combined with the linearity of the map \mathcal{M}_{φ} we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\varphi}(\psi)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}} &\leq \mathfrak{c}(\|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|\|_{n,\kappa}) \Big[\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{-1+2\kappa}} + \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}} \\ &\|\left[\mathcal{M}_{\varphi}(\psi) - \mathcal{M}_{\varphi}(\tilde{\psi})\right]^{2} \Big\|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}} \leq \mathfrak{c}^{2}(\|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}\|\|_{n,\kappa}) \Big[\lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\psi - \tilde{\psi}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}}\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we take the second power of the map in the last estimate, because in (39) we do not have a small factor $\lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}}$ in front of the rest term with ψ^{\sharp} . In particular, we finally can conclude that there exists a $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(\sup_n ||| \boldsymbol{\xi}_n |||_{n,\kappa})$ (so it is independent of n) such that for $\lambda > \bar{\lambda}$ the map \mathcal{M}_{φ} admits a unique fixed point, which we denote by $\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi$. Moreover, by the Banach fixed point theorem

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{D}_n} \lesssim \|\mathcal{M}_{\varphi}^2(0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_n} \lesssim \mathfrak{c}^2(\|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|\|_{n,\kappa})\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}},\tag{41}$$

implying that $\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}, \mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda})$, with the norm bounded uniformly in n. Similar, but less involved calculations lead to a construction of the resolvent $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda}^{-1} = (\mathcal{H} - \lambda)^{-1}$ in the continuum for $\lambda \geq \overline{\lambda}$ (in the continuous case no division of scales is required). The resolvent is then a bounded operator $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda}^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}, \mathcal{D}^{\lambda})$, where the latter is the Banach space defined by the norm (for $\psi = \psi' \otimes (-\Delta + \lambda)^{-1} \xi + \psi^{\sharp})$:

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\lambda}} = \|\psi'\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}} + \|\psi^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}}$$

By linearity and computations on the line of those in the previous steps one can then show that:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa} \le 1}} \left\| (\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)' - (\mathcal{H}_{\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)' \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1-\kappa}} + \left\| \mathcal{P}_n (\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)^{\sharp} - (\mathcal{H}_{\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)^{\sharp} \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1+\kappa}} = 0.$$

$$\tag{42}$$

Since $\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}, \mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda})$, to prove convergence of the resolvents in $B(L^2, L^2)$ it would be sufficient to show, in the particular case p = 2, that $\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda} \hookrightarrow L^p$, in the sense that $\|\psi\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}}$. Unfortunately, this is not the case, because a priori $\mathcal{Q}_n \psi^{\sharp} \in \mathcal{C}_p^{-1+2\kappa}$. So we need a better control on the regularity of ψ^{\sharp} , which we will obtain by using that $\varphi \in L^2$.

Step 6: L^2 estimates. Let us fix p = 2. We want to improve our previous bound by showing that if $\varphi \in L^2$, then for every $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}$:

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp}(\psi)\|_{L^2} \lesssim n^{-\kappa} \mathfrak{c}(\||\boldsymbol{\xi}_n\||_{n,\kappa}) (\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}}).$$

$$\tag{43}$$

Let us start with estimating by Plancherel (using the same notation as in Section 4):

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\lambda)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{L^{2}}^{2} &\simeq \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{d}} \left|\frac{(1-\overline{\mathbf{n}})(n^{-1}k)}{\lambda+n^{2}(1-\hat{\chi}^{4}(n^{-1}k))}\right|^{2} |\hat{\varphi}(k)|^{2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{4}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{d}} |(1-\overline{\mathbf{n}})(n^{-1}k)\hat{\varphi}(k)|^{2} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{4}} \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\varphi\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\hat{\chi}^4(n^{-1}k) < 1 \forall k \neq 0$, together with the support properties of $(1 - \neg)(n^{-1}k)$. Hence we conclude that

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp}(\psi)\|_{L^2} \lesssim n^{-2} \|\mathcal{Q}_n \varphi\|_{L^2} + \|\mathcal{Q}_n \widetilde{M}_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi)\|_{L^2} + \|\mathcal{Q}_n M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}(\psi)\|_{L^2},$$

with $M^{\sharp,2}_{\varphi}(\psi)$ as in step 2 and

$$\widetilde{M}_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi) = (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \prod_n^2 \left\{ \xi^n \odot \prod_n^2 \psi^{\sharp} + \xi^n \odot \left[\prod_n^2 (\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda}) \right] - c_n \psi' + \xi^n \otimes \prod_n^2 \psi \right\}.$$

The smoothing effect of Π_n^2 and the elliptic Schauder estimates guarantee that

$$\begin{split} n^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \| \mathcal{Q}_n \widetilde{M}_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi) \|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ &= n^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \left\| \Pi_n^2 \mathcal{Q}_n (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \left(\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 \psi^{\sharp} + \xi^n \odot \left[\Pi_n^2 (\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda}) \right] - c_n \psi' + \xi^n \otimes \Pi_n^2 \psi \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim n^{2-\kappa} \left\| \mathcal{Q}_n (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \left(\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 \psi^{\sharp} + \xi^n \odot \left[\Pi_n^2 (\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda}) \right] - c_n \psi' + \xi^n \otimes \Pi_n^2 \psi \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{-1+2\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 \psi^{\sharp} + \xi^n \odot \left[\Pi_n^2 (\psi' \otimes X_{n,\lambda}) \right] - c_n \psi' + \xi^n \otimes \Pi_n^2 \psi \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{-1+2\kappa}}. \end{split}$$

Now we can follow verbatim the estimates of step 3 to obtain, up to slightly increasing \mathfrak{c} :

$$n^{\kappa} \| \mathcal{Q}_n \widetilde{M}_{\varphi}^{\sharp,1}(\psi) \|_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \leq \mathfrak{c}(\| \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \|_{n,\kappa}) \| \psi \|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda}}.$$
(44)

Similarly for $M^{\sharp,2}_{\varphi}(\psi)$, where we find:

50

$$n^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \| \mathcal{Q}_{n} M_{\varphi}^{\sharp,2}(\psi) \|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} = n^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \| \mathcal{Q}_{n} \Pi_{n}^{2} C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_{n}^{2}\psi,\xi^{n}) \|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}}$$

$$\lesssim n^{2-\kappa} \| \mathcal{Q}_{n} C_{n,\lambda}(\Pi_{n}^{2}\psi,\xi^{n}) \|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{-1+2\kappa}}$$

$$\leqslant \mathfrak{c}(\| \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n} \|_{n,\kappa}) \| \psi \|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}^{\lambda}}, \qquad (45)$$

where in the last step we followed verbatim the calculations in step 4. In particular, we have concluded the proof of (43). The bound (43) allows us in particular to conclude that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2} \leqslant 1} \|\mathcal{Q}_n \mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1} \varphi\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

Together with (42) we conclude that

$$\begin{split} \lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^{2}} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi - \mathcal{H}_{\lambda}^{-1}\varphi\|_{L^{2}} \\ & \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^{2}} \leq 1} \left\{ \|(\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)' \otimes X_{n,\lambda} - (\mathcal{H}_{\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)' \otimes (-\Delta + \lambda)^{-1}\xi\|_{L^{2}} \\ & + \|\mathcal{P}_{n}(\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)^{\sharp} - (\mathcal{H}_{\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)^{\sharp}\|_{L^{2}} + \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}(\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}^{-1}\varphi)^{\sharp}\|_{L^{2}} \right\} = 0. \end{split}$$

thus proving the convergence of the resolvents.

Having established convergence in resolvent sense of the operator \mathcal{H}_n we complete the proof of Theorem 4 by showing that the eigenfunctions of the operators converge in an appropriate sense.

Proof of Theorem 4. As usual, let us fix $\omega \in \Omega$, the latter satisfying Assumption 5.11 and to lighten the notation we avoid writing explicitly the dependence on ω in what follows. Also, as in the previous proof we restrict to discussing the case d = 2, which is more complicated.

To complete the proof of the theorem we collect all the previous results. Proposition 5.12 guarantees that \mathcal{H}_n converges to \mathcal{H} in the resolvent sense, as a sequence of operators on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. In particular, Corollary 5.5 guarantees that, for any eigenvalue λ of \mathcal{H} with multiplicity $m(\lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ and associated orthogonal eigenfunctions $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{m(\lambda)}$, there exists a sequence $\{e_j^n\}_{j=1}^{m(\lambda)} \subseteq L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, for $n \ge n(\lambda)$ with $n(\lambda)$ sufficiently large, such that:

$$e_j^n \to e_j, \qquad \mathcal{H}_n e_j^n \to \mathcal{H} e_j, \qquad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

Moreover any e_j^n can be represented as

$$e_j^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m(\lambda)} \alpha_{ij}^n \overline{e}_i^n, \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{m(\lambda)} (\alpha_{ij}^n)^2 = 1,$$

where \overline{e}_i^n are eigenfunctions for \mathcal{H}_n with eigenvalue λ_i^n such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_i^n = \lambda$. To conclude the proof we will show the following additional convergences, for any $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ sufficiently small:

$$\Pi_n e_j^n \to e_j, \qquad \Pi_n \mathcal{H}_n e_j^n \to \lambda e_j \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^d),$$

for $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small. In the previous discussion we already have explained the convergences above in $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. By compact embedding $\mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^d) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\kappa'}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $\kappa' < \kappa$, and since κ is arbitrary, it thus suffices to prove the bounds:

$$\sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} \left\{ \|\Pi_n e_j^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\kappa}} + \|\Pi_n \mathcal{H}_n e_j^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\kappa}} \right\} < \infty.$$

By our previous considerations, observing that $\mathcal{H}_n e_j^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m(\lambda)} \lambda_i^n \alpha_{ij} \overline{e}_i^n$, we can further reduce the problem to proving that

$$\sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} \|\Pi_n \overline{e}_i^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\kappa}} < \infty, \qquad \forall i = 1, \dots, m(\lambda).$$
(46)

51

Now we fix *i* and make use of the fact that \overline{e}_i^n is an eigenfunction of \mathcal{H}_n with eigenvalue $\lambda_i^n \to \lambda$. To lighten the notation, since *i* is fixed, let us write $e^n = \overline{e}_i^n$. We find that for $\mu > 1$ sufficiently large such that Proposition 5.12 applies (with λ replaced by μ , and following the notations introduced by the proposition and its proof) and defining $v^n = (\mu - \lambda_i^n)e^n$:

$$e^{n} = \mathcal{H}_{n,\mu}^{-1} v^{n} = \Pi_{n}^{2} \{ (e^{n})' \otimes X_{n,\mu} \} + (e^{n})^{\sharp}$$

The bound (41) now guarantees that

$$\|e^{n}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{n}^{\mu}} = \|(e^{n})'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{1-\kappa}} + \|\mathcal{P}_{n}(e^{n})^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{1+\kappa}} + n^{2-\kappa}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}(e^{n})^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{-1+2\kappa}} \lesssim \|e^{n}\|_{L^{2}} \lesssim 1.$$

This bound is sufficient for large scales, but small scales need more care. Here we observe that

$$(e^{n})^{\sharp} = (-\mathcal{A}_{n} + \mu)^{-1}v^{n} + \widetilde{M}_{v^{n}}^{\sharp,1}(e^{n}) + M_{v^{n}}^{\sharp,2}(e^{n}),$$

where $\widetilde{M}^{\sharp,1}, M^{\sharp,2}$ have been introduced in Step 6 of Proposition 5.12 and satisfy, following (44) and (45):

$$\left\|\mathcal{Q}_n\widetilde{M}_{v^n}^{\sharp,1}(e^n)\right\|_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} + \left\|\mathcal{Q}_nM_{v^n}^{\sharp,2}(e^n)\right\|_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim \|e^n\|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\mu}} \lesssim 1.$$

Now we are in position to conclude our estimate. By Besov embedding, since we are considering the case d = 2 (note that in d = 1 we loose less regularity, so the estimates simplify) we have

$$\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha-1}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_2^{\alpha}}, \qquad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_2^{\alpha}.$$

In particular we find that

$$\sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} \| (e^n)' \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\kappa}} \lesssim \sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} \| e^n \|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\mu}} < \infty,$$

so that (note that the term Π_n^3 appears because we want to estimate the norm of $\Pi_n e^n$: for this estimate the presence of the additional Π_n does not matter):

$$\sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} \left\| \Pi_n^3 \{ (e^n)' \otimes X_{n,\mu} \} \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1-3\kappa}} \lesssim \sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} n^{2-\kappa} \| (e^n)' \otimes X_{n,\mu} \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-2\kappa}}$$
$$\lesssim \sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} \| (e^n)' \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\kappa}} \| X_{n,\mu} \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\kappa}}$$
$$\lesssim \sup_{n \ge n(\lambda)} \| e^n \|_{\mathcal{D}_n^{\mu}} \| \| \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \|_{n,\kappa} < \infty.$$

Next we control the rest term:

$$\begin{split} \|\Pi_{n}(e^{n})^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\frac{\kappa}{2}}} &\lesssim \|\Pi_{n}(e^{n})^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_{n}\Pi_{n}(e^{n})^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} + \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\Pi_{n}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\mu)^{-1}v^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} + \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\Pi_{n}(\widetilde{M}^{\sharp,1}_{v^{n}}(e^{n})+M^{\sharp,2}_{v^{n}}(e^{n}))\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\Pi_{n}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\mu)^{-1}v^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} + \|\mathcal{P}_{n}(e^{n})^{\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} + \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}(\widetilde{M}^{\sharp,1}_{v^{n}}(e^{n})+M^{\sharp,2}_{v^{n}}(e^{n}))\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\Pi_{n}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\mu)^{-1}v^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}_{2}} + \|e^{n}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mu}_{n}}, \end{split}$$

where in the last step we used all the previous estimates. Observe that so far we did non use the smoothing effect of the additional term Π_n . We use this effect in the following last step, where we estimate the only remaining term:

$$\left\|\mathcal{Q}_{n}\Pi_{n}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\mu)^{-1}v^{n}\right\|_{\mathcal{C}_{2}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \lesssim \left\|(1+|\cdot|^{2})^{\frac{d+1}{4}}\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{n}\Pi_{n}(-\mathcal{A}_{n}+\mu)^{-1}e^{n}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{Z}^{d})}$$

Here we used that for κ sufficiently small and since d = 2: $1 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \leq \frac{d+1}{2}$. Then we used one of the many definitions of fractional Sobolev spaces, via the norm (for $\alpha > 0$):

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^{\alpha}} = \|(1-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\varphi\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \simeq \|(1+|\cdot|^{2})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\varphi\|_{L^{2}},$$

together with the embedding (see for example [55,Section 2.3.5]):

$$\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{2}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{H^{\alpha}}, \qquad \forall \varphi \in H^{\alpha}.$$

Hence we conclude with the following estimate (here we follow the notations of Section 4):

$$\begin{split} \left\| (1+|\cdot|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{4}} \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Big(\mathcal{Q}_n \Pi_n (-\mathcal{A}_n + \mu)^{-1} e^n \Big) \Big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left| \frac{(1+|k|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{4}}}{\mu + n^2 (1-\hat{\chi}^4(n^{-1}k)))} \right|^2 |\hat{\chi}(n^{-1}k)(1-\overline{\neg})(n^{-1}k))|^2 |\hat{e}^n(k)|^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{\mu + n^2} \right)^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1+|k|)^{d+1} |\hat{\chi}(n^{-1}k)(1-\overline{\neg})(n^{-1}k))|^2 |\hat{e}^n(k)|^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{\mu + n^2} \right)^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{(1+|k|)^{d+1}}{(1+|n^{-1}k|)^{d+1}} |(1-\overline{\neg})(n^{-1}k))|^2 |\hat{e}^n(k)|^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{\mu + n^2} \right)^2 n^{d+1} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \frac{(1+|k|)^{d+1}}{|k|^{d+1}} |\hat{e}^n(k)|^2 \\ &\lesssim n^{(d+1)-4} \|e^n\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|e^n\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim 1. \end{split}$$

Here we used the fact that $\hat{\chi}(k) < 1$ for $k \neq 0$ together with the support properties of \daleth to bound

$$\frac{1}{\mu + n^2(1 - \hat{\chi}^4(n^{-1}k))} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^2}$$

uniformly over n and k such that $(1 - \exists)(n^{-1}k) \neq 0$. We also applied the bound

$$|\hat{\chi}(k)| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|k|)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}$$

from Lemma 4.1. This concludes the proof of the theorem, since we have proven (46) with κ replaced by $\frac{\kappa}{2}$ (but this does not matter since κ is arbitrarily small).

Before we conclude, let us observe that in the last bound we used that d = 2 to bound $1 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \leq \frac{d+1}{2}$. If d = 1 this fails, but we actually need less, since by Besov embedding $\|\Pi_n e^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^1)} \lesssim \|\Pi_n e^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^1)}$. In particular, following all the previous steps we can bound, for κ sufficiently small such that $\frac{1}{2} + \kappa \leq \frac{d+1}{2} = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Q}_n \Pi_n (-\mathcal{A}_n + \mu) v^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\kappa}} &\lesssim \|\mathcal{Q}_n \Pi_n (-\mathcal{A}_n + \mu)^{-1} e^n \|_{\mathcal{C}_2^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \left\| (1 + |\cdot|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{4}} \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d} \big(\mathcal{Q}_n \Pi_n (-\mathcal{A}_n + \mu)^{-1} e^n \big) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \end{aligned}$$

and from here we can follow, for example, the same calculations as above.

Remark 5.13. We observe that in the last bound for $(e^n)^{\sharp}$ we used \prod_n to gain $\frac{d+1}{2}$ regularity. In dimension d = 2 this is crucially larger than 1. This statement is in apparent contradiction with Corollary 4.14, where we show a possible regularity gain of at most 1. While the latter corollary works for any integrability parameter p and extends to other characteristics functions (than just those of balls), the improvement we see in the proof depends on the choice p = 2 and our exact computations for the decay of the Fourier transform $\hat{\chi}$.

5.5. Commutator estimates. This section is devoted to products of distributions and commutator estimates, starting with the decomposition in paraproducts (through the symbol \otimes) and resonant products (\odot). For $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ set

$$S_i\varphi := \sum_{j=-1}^{i-1} \Delta_j\varphi, \qquad \varphi \otimes \psi := \sum_{i \ge -1} S_{i-1}\varphi \Delta_i\psi, \qquad \varphi \odot \psi := \sum_{|i-j| \le 1} \Delta_j\varphi \Delta_i\psi,$$

where the latter sum might not be well defined. Then, an *a priori* ill-posed product of φ and ψ can be written as $\varphi \cdot \psi = \varphi \otimes \psi + \varphi \odot \psi + \varphi \otimes \psi$. The following estimates are classical, see e.g. [3, Lemmata 2.82 and 2.85] and guarantee that the product is actually well-defined if the regularities α and β of φ and ψ satisfy $\alpha + \beta > 0$.

Lemma 5.14. Fix $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p, q, r \in [1, \infty]$ such that $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q}$. Then, for all $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the following estimates are satisfied:

$$\begin{split} \|\varphi \otimes \psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{r}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{L^{p}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{q}}, \qquad \|\varphi \otimes \psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+\beta}_{r}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}_{p}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{q}}, \quad if \quad \beta < 0, \\ \|\varphi \odot \psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+\beta}_{r}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}_{p}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{q}} \quad if \quad \alpha+\beta > 0. \end{split}$$

The rest of this subsection deals with the following commutators.

Definition 5.15. For distributions $\varphi, \psi, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we define the (a-priori illposed) commutators

$$C^{\odot}(\varphi,\psi,\sigma) := \varphi \odot (\psi \otimes \sigma) - \psi(\varphi \odot \sigma),$$

$$C_n^{\Pi}(\varphi,\psi) := \Pi_n^2(\varphi \otimes \psi) - \varphi \otimes \Pi_n^2 \psi,$$

$$C_{n,\lambda}(\varphi,\psi) := (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1}(\varphi \otimes \psi) - \varphi \otimes (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} \psi$$

The first commutator estimate is crucial, but by now well-known.

Lemma 5.16 ([27], Lemma 14). For $\varphi, \psi, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha + \beta + \gamma > 0$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$:

$$\|C^{\odot}(\varphi,\psi,\sigma)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\gamma}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\beta}} \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\gamma}}.$$

We pass to the second commutator. Recall the operators $\mathcal{P}_n, \mathcal{Q}_n$ as in Definition 4.3.

Lemma 5.17. For $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \beta > 0, p \in [1, \infty]$ it holds for every $\delta \in [0, \beta \wedge 1)$:

$$\|\mathcal{P}_n C_n^{\Pi}(\varphi, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\delta}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\beta}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}}, \qquad \|\mathcal{Q}_n C_n^{\Pi}(\varphi, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim n^{-\delta} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\beta}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}}.$$

Proof. Note that for any $i \ge 0$ there exists an annulus \mathcal{A} (that is a set of the form $\{k \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid r \le |k| \le R\}$ for some 0 < r < R) such that the Fourier transform of

$$\Pi_n^2 [S_{i-1}\varphi \Delta_i \psi] - S_{i-1}\varphi \Pi_n^2 \Delta_i \varphi$$

is supported in $2^i \mathcal{A}$. It is therefore sufficient to show that

$$\left\|\Pi_n^2 [S_{i-1}\varphi \Delta_i \psi] - S_{i-1}\varphi \Pi_n^2 \Delta_i \varphi\right\|_{L^p} \lesssim n^{-\delta} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^\beta} \|\Delta_i \psi\|_{L^\infty},\tag{47}$$

since this implies the required bound by estimating $n^{-\delta} \leq 2^{-\delta i}$ for *i* such that $\mathcal{P}_n \Delta_i \neq 0$. To obtain (47), recall the Sobolev-Slobodeckij characterization of fractional spaces of Proposition 4.11, which implies that for $\delta \in [0, \beta \wedge 1)$

$$\begin{split} \|\Pi_n^2 [S_{i-1}\varphi\Delta_i \psi] - S_{i-1}\varphi\Pi_n^2 \Delta_i \varphi\|_{L^p} &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left| \int_{B_n(x)} [S_{i-1}\varphi(y) - S_{i-1}\varphi(x)] \Delta_i \psi(y) \,\mathrm{d}y \right|^p \,\mathrm{d}x \right)^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim n^{-\delta} \bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left| \int_{B_n(x)} \frac{[S_{i-1}\varphi(y) - S_{i-1}\varphi(x)]}{|y-x|^{\delta}} \Delta_i \psi(y) \,\mathrm{d}y \right|^p \,\mathrm{d}x \bigg)^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim n^{-\delta} \bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{B_n(x)} \frac{|S_{i-1}\varphi(y) - S_{i-1}\varphi(x)|^p}{|y-x|^{d+\delta p}} \,\mathrm{d}y \,\mathrm{d}x \bigg)^{1/p} \|\Delta_i \psi\|_{\infty} \lesssim n^{-\delta} \|S_{i-1}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^\beta} 2^{-\alpha i} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}, \end{split}$$

where the first inequality follows by Jensen and we have used the embedding $B_{p,\infty}^{\beta} \subset B_{p,p}^{\delta}$. Now the result follows since $\|S_{i-1}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\beta}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\beta}}$.

Lemma 5.18. For $\alpha \in (0,1), \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda \geq 1$ and $p \in [1,\infty]$ it holds that:

 $\|\mathcal{P}_n C_{n,\lambda}(\varphi,\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\beta+2}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}, \qquad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}, \psi \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}.$

In addition there exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge k$

$$n^{3} \| \mathcal{Q}_{n} C_{n,\lambda}(\varphi, \psi) \|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha+\beta-1}} \lesssim \| \varphi \|_{\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}} \| \mathcal{Q}_{n-k} \psi \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}, \qquad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{p}^{\alpha}, \psi \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}.$$

Proof. By the elliptic Schauder estimates in Proposition 4.6, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)\mathcal{P}_n C_{n,\lambda}(\varphi,\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\beta}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}},$$

$$n\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)\mathcal{Q}_n C_{n,\lambda}(\varphi,\psi)\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha+\beta-1}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \|\mathcal{Q}_{n-k}\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}.$$

In turn to obtain this bound, since the quantities below are supported in an annulus $2^{i}\mathcal{A}$, it suffices to estimate for a given sequence i(n) such that $2^{i(n)} \simeq n$:

$$\|S_{i-1}\varphi\Delta_i\psi - (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi]\|_{L^p} \lesssim 2^{-i(\alpha+\beta)}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}_p},$$
(48)

if $i \leq i(n)$, and similarly

$$\|S_{i-1}\varphi\Delta_i\psi - (-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi]\|_{L^p} \lesssim n^{-1}2^{-i(\alpha+\beta-1)}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^\alpha}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n-k}\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta},$$
(49)

if i > i(n). Moreover, we can choose k such that

$$\mathcal{Q}_{n-k}\Delta_i = \Delta_i, \forall i \ge i(n), n \in \mathbb{N},$$

so that we may replace ψ by $\mathcal{Q}_{n-k}\psi$ on small scales (hence we will no longer discuss the appearance of \mathcal{Q}_{n-k}). To obtain these estimates, let $B_n(\varphi, \psi)$ be defined as

$$B_n(\varphi,\psi)(x) = n^2 \oint_{B_n(x)} \oint_{B_n(y)} \oint_{B_n(z)} \oint_{B_n(r)} (\varphi(s) - \varphi(x))(\psi(s) - \psi(x)) \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}r \,\mathrm{d}z \,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Then \mathcal{A}_n acting on a product can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\varphi \cdot \psi) = \mathcal{A}_n(\varphi) \cdot \psi + \varphi \cdot \mathcal{A}_n(\psi) + B_n(\varphi, \psi),$$

Hence proving Equations (48) and (49) reduces to finding a bound for

$$\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi](-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}[\Delta_i\psi]\|_{L^p}+\|B_n(S_{i-1}\varphi,(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi)\|_{L^p}.$$

Starting with the first term, one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi](-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}[\Delta_i\psi]\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi]\|_{L^p}\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}[\Delta_i\psi]\|_{L^{\infty}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $i \leq i(n)$, since $\alpha < 2$, one can estimate via Proposition 4.2:

$$\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi]\|_{L^p} \le \sum_{j=-1}^{i-1} \|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[\Delta_j\varphi]\|_{L^p} \lesssim \sum_{j=-1}^{i-1} 2^{j(2-\alpha)} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \lesssim 2^{i(2-\alpha)} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}.$$

If i > i(n), following the previous calculations and using that $\alpha > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi]\|_{L^p} &\leq \sum_{j=-1}^{i(n)-1} \|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[\Delta_j\varphi]\|_{L^p} + \sum_{j=i(n)}^{i-1} \|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[\Delta_j\varphi]\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim n^{(2-\alpha)} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.7 moreover

$$\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi\|_{L^{\infty}} \lesssim \left(2^{-2i}\mathbf{1}_{\{i\leq i(n)\}} + n^{-2}\mathbf{1}_{\{i>i(n)\}}\right)2^{-\beta i}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}.$$

Together with the previous bounds we have proven that for $i \leq i(n)$:

$$\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi](-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}[\Delta_i\psi]\|_{L^p} \lesssim 2^{-i(\alpha+\beta)} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}},$$

and similarly (using that $\alpha < 1$) for i > i(n):

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)[S_{i-1}\varphi](-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}[\Delta_i\psi]\|_{L^p} &\lesssim n^{-\alpha}2^{-i\beta}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n-k}\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}\\ &\lesssim n^{-1}2^{-i(\beta+\alpha-1)}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\alpha}}\|\mathcal{Q}_{n-k}\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}},\end{aligned}$$

which are bounds of the required order for (48) and (49). Finally, we have to bound the term containing B_n . If $i \leq i(n)$, using $\alpha < 1$ we find

$$\begin{split} \|B(S_{i-1}\varphi,(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|\nabla S_{i-1}\varphi\|_{L^p}\|\nabla(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi\|_{L^\infty}\\ &\lesssim 2^{-i(\alpha-1)}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p}2^{-i(1+\beta)}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}} \lesssim 2^{-i(\alpha+\beta)}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_p}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}, \end{split}$$

whereas if i > i(n)

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_n(S_{i-1}\varphi,(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim n\|\nabla S_{i-1}\varphi\|_{L^p}\|(-\mathcal{A}_n+\lambda)^{-1}\Delta_i\psi\|_{L^\infty}\\ &\lesssim n^{-1}2^{-i(\alpha-1)}2^{-\beta i}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_n}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}.\end{aligned}$$

These bounds are again of the correct order for (48), (49) and hence the proof is complete. $\hfill \Box$

APPENDIX A.

A.1. Construction of the process. In this section we provide a rigorous construction of the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process (SLFV) in a random environment. We work under the following assumptions.

Assumption A.1. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathfrak{u} \in (0,1), d = 1, 2$ and let $w^0 \colon \mathbb{T}^d \to [0,1]$ and $s_n \colon \Omega \times \mathbb{T}^d \to (-1,1)$ be two measurable functions.

The natural state space of the spatial SLFV process is:

$$M = \{ w \colon \mathbb{T}^d \to [0, 1], w \text{ measurable} \},\$$

which is a metric space when endowed with the distance $d_M(u, w) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |u(x) - w(x)|$. Then under the assumption above, for $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, $\mathfrak{p} \in {\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{A}}$ and any function $w : \mathbb{T}^d \to [0, 1]$ define the operator $\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{p}} : M \to M$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_x^{\mathfrak{p}} w(y) &= w(y) \mathbf{1}_{\{B_n^c(x)\}}(y) + (\mathfrak{u} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{a}\}} + (1-\mathfrak{u})w(y)) \mathbf{1}_{\{B_n(x)\}}(y) \\ &= w(y) + \mathfrak{u}(\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{a}\}} - w(y)) \mathbf{1}_{\{B_n(x)\}}(y). \end{aligned}$$

In the discussion below, let $\mathcal{B}(E)$ be the Borel sigma-algebra associated to some metric space E. We say that a probability measure \mathbb{P}^{ω} on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$ indexed by $\omega \in \Omega$ is a Markov kernel, if for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ the map $\omega \mapsto \mathbb{P}^{\omega}(A)$ is measurable. Then one can build the semidirect product measure $\mathbb{P} \ltimes \mathbb{P}^{\omega}$ on $\Omega \times E$ (with the product sigma-algebra), characterized, for $A \in \mathcal{F}, B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$, by:

$$\mathbb{P} \ltimes \mathbb{P}^{\omega}(A \times B) = \int_{A} \mathbb{P}^{\omega}(B) \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

In the definition below we write:

$$s_+(x) = \max\{s(x), 0\}, \qquad s_-(x) = \max\{-s(x), 0\}$$

Lemma A.2. Under Assumption A.1, fix $\omega \in \Omega$. There exists a unique Markov jump process $t \mapsto w(t)$ in $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); M)$ started in $w(0) = w^0$, associated to the generator

$$\mathcal{L}(n, s_n(\omega), \mathfrak{u}) \colon C_b(M; \mathbb{R}) \to C_b(M; \mathbb{R}),$$

defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(f)(w) = \int_{M} (f(w') - f(w))\mu(w, \, \mathrm{d}w'), \qquad f \in C_{b}(M; \mathbb{R}),$$

where the transition function $\mu: M \times \mathcal{B}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ (depending on $s_n(\omega), \mathfrak{u}, n$) is defined by:

 $\mu(w, dw') = 0$ unless there exist $x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{p} \in {\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{A}}$ such that $w' = \Theta_x^{\mathfrak{p}} w$. And if $w' = \Theta_x^{\mathfrak{p}} w$ for some $x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{p} \in {\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{A}}$:

$$\begin{split} \mu(w, \,\mathrm{d}w') = & \left\{ (1 - |s_n(\omega, x)|) \Big[\Pi_n^3 w \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{a}\}} + (1 - \Pi_n^3 w) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{A}\}} \Big](x) \\ &+ (s_n)_-(\omega, x) \Big[\big(\Pi_n^3 w \big)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{a}\}} + \big(1 - \big(\Pi_n^3 w \big)^2 \big) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{A}\}} \Big](x) \\ &+ (s_n)_+(\omega, x) \Big[\Pi_n^3 w (2 - \Pi_n^3 w) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{a}\}} + (1 - \Pi_n^3 w)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{A}\}} \Big](x) \right\} \mathrm{d}x. \end{split}$$

The law \mathbb{P}^{ω} of w in $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); M)$ is a Markov kernel and induces the semidirect product measure $\mathbb{P} \ltimes \mathbb{P}^{\omega}$ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{D}([0,\infty); M)$.

Proof. Note that μ defined as above is a Markov kernel on $M \times \mathcal{B}(M)$ (to be precise, here we have to observe that for fixed w the set $\{\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{p}}w, x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{p} \in \{\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{A}\}\}$ is closed and hence measurable in M). Hence, the Markov process is constructed following [23, Section 4.2]. In addition, for $f \in C_b(M; \mathbb{R})$ measurable and bounded the map $\omega \mapsto \int_M f(w')\mu_{\omega}(w, dw')$ is measurable (we made explicit the dependence of μ on ω). This implies, e.g. by [23, Equation 4.2.8], that the map $\omega \mapsto \mathbb{P}^{\omega}(A)$ is measurable, for $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{D}([0,\infty); M))$. So the proof is complete.

Lemma A.3. Under Assumption A.1 fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and let w be the Markov process as in the previous result. For any $\varphi \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the process $t \mapsto \langle w(t), \varphi \rangle$ satisfies the martingale problem of Lemma 1.4.

Proof. In the discussion below we omit the dependence of $s_n(\omega)$ on n and ω , since such dependence is not relevant here. We will apply the generator to functions of the form $F_{\varphi}(w) = F(\langle w, \varphi \rangle)$, with $F \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}), \varphi \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. For simplicity we divide the operator $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(n, s, \mathfrak{u})$ in three parts:

$$\mathcal{L}(F_{\varphi})(w) := \mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{neu}}(F_{\varphi})(w) + \mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{sel}}(F_{\varphi})(w)$$
$$:= \mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{neu}}(F_{\varphi})(w) + \mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{sel}}_{<}(F_{\varphi})(w) + \mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{sel}}_{>}(F_{\varphi})(w)$$

(the first is the neutral part, the second two are the selective parts of the operator), where

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{neu}}(F_{\varphi})(w) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (1 - |s(x)|) \Big[\Pi_n^3 w [F_{\varphi}(\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{a}} w) - F_{\varphi}(w)] + (1 - \Pi_n^3 w) [F_{\varphi}(\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{A}} w) - F_{\varphi}(w)] \Big](x) \, \mathrm{d}x$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{sel}}_{<}(F_{\varphi})(w) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s_-(x) \Big[(\Pi_n^3 w)^2 [F_{\varphi}(\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{a}} w) - F_{\varphi}(w)] + (1 - (\Pi_n^3 w)^2) [F_{\varphi}(\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{A}} w) - F_{\varphi}(w)] \Big](x) \, \mathrm{d}x$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{sel}}_{>}(F_{\varphi})(w) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s_+(x) \Big[\Pi_n^3 w (2 - \Pi_n^3 w) [F_{\varphi}(\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{a}} w) - F_{\varphi}(w)] + (1 - \Pi_n^3 w)^2 [F_{\varphi}(\Theta_x^{\mathfrak{A}} w) - F_{\varphi}(w)] \Big](x) \, \mathrm{d}x$$

Now, in the special case of $F = \mathrm{Id}_{\varphi}$, the neutral part of the generator takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{neu}}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi})(w) = \mathfrak{u}n^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (1 - |s(x)|) [(\Pi_n^3 w)(\Pi_n \varphi) - \Pi_n(w\varphi)](x) \,\mathrm{d}x,$$

Analogously, the selective part can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{sel}}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi})(w) = \mathfrak{u}n^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s(x) [\Pi_n(w\varphi) - (\Pi_n^3 w)^2 \Pi_n \varphi](x) + 2s_+(x) [\Pi_n^3 w \Pi_n \varphi - \Pi_n(w\varphi)](x) \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Adding those two we conclude that

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi})(w) = \mathfrak{u}n^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} [(\Pi_n^3 w)(\Pi_n \varphi) - \Pi_n(w\varphi)](x) + s(x)[(\Pi_n^3 w)(\Pi_n \varphi) - (\Pi_n^3 w)^2 \Pi_n \varphi](x) \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

This justifies the drift in the required decomposition. To obtain the predictable quadratic variation of the martingale make use of Dynkin's formula, that is

$$\langle M^n(\varphi) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \mathcal{L}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi}^2) - 2 (\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi} \mathcal{L}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi}))(w_r) \,\mathrm{d}r.$$

Once again, it is natural to treat the terms involving \mathcal{L}^{neu} and \mathcal{L}^{sel} separately. For the neutral term:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{neu}}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi}^{2}) - 2F_{\varphi}\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{neu}}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi}) \right)(w) \\ &= \mathfrak{u}^{2}n^{-2d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} (1 - |s(x)|) \Big[\Pi_{n}^{3}w \big(\Pi_{n}\varphi - \Pi_{n}(w\varphi) \big)^{2} + \big(1 - \Pi_{n}^{3}w \big) \big(\Pi_{n}(w\varphi) \big)^{2} \Big](x) \, \mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned}$$

which can be written as

$$\mathfrak{u}^2 n^{-2d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (1-|s(x)|) \Big[\Pi_n^3 w \big[\big(\Pi_n \varphi \big)^2 - 2\Pi_n \varphi(x) \Pi_n(w\varphi) \big] + \big[\Pi_n(w\varphi) \big]^2 \Big](x) \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Analogous calculations for $\mathcal{L}^{sel}_{<}$ lead to

$$\left(\mathcal{L}_{<}^{\mathrm{sel}}(\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi}^{2}) - 2\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi}\mathcal{L}_{<}^{\mathrm{sel}}\mathrm{Id}_{\varphi} \right)(w) = \\ = \mathfrak{u}^{2}n^{-2d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} s_{-}(x) \left[(\Pi_{n}^{3}w)^{2} \left[(\Pi_{n}\varphi)^{2} - 2\Pi_{n}\varphi\Pi_{n}(w\varphi) \right] + \left[\Pi_{n}(w\varphi) \right]^{2} \right](x) \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Whereas for $\mathcal{L}^{sel}_{>}$ they lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathcal{L}_{>}^{\text{sel}}(\text{Id}_{\varphi}^{2}) - 2\text{Id}_{\varphi}\mathcal{L}_{>}^{\text{sel}}\text{Id}_{\varphi} \right)(w) \\ &= \mathfrak{u}^{2}n^{-2d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} s_{+}(x) \Big[(\Pi_{n}^{3}w)(2-\Pi_{n}^{3}w) \big(\Pi_{n}\varphi - \big(\Pi_{n}(w\varphi)\big)^{2} + \big(1-\Pi_{n}^{3}w\big)^{2} \big(\Pi_{n}w\big)^{2} \Big](x) \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \mathfrak{u}^{2}n^{-2d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} s_{+}(x) \Big[(\Pi_{n}^{3}w)(2-\Pi_{n}^{3}w) \big[\big(\Pi_{n}\varphi\big)^{2} - 2\Pi_{n}\varphi\Pi_{n}(w\varphi) \big] + \big[\Pi_{n}(w\varphi\big)\big]^{2}(x) \Big] \, \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Summing neutral and selective terms one obtains

$$\begin{split} \mathfrak{u}^{2}n^{-2d}\langle \Pi_{n}^{3}w,(1-|s|)\Big[\big(\Pi_{n}\varphi\big)^{2}-2\Pi_{n}\varphi\Pi_{n}(w\varphi)\Big]\rangle+\langle\big(\Pi_{n}(w\varphi)\big)^{2},(1-|s|)\rangle\\ &+\mathfrak{u}n^{-2d}\langle(\Pi_{n}^{3}w)^{2},s_{-}\Big[\big(\Pi_{n}\varphi\big)^{2}-2\big(\Pi_{n}\varphi\big)\big(\Pi_{n}(w\varphi)\big)\Big]+\langle\big(\Pi_{n}(w\varphi)\big)^{2},s_{-}\rangle\\ &+\mathfrak{u}^{2}n^{-2d}\langle\Pi_{n}^{3}w,s_{+}\Big[\big(2-\Pi_{n}^{3}w\big)\Big(\big(\Pi_{n}\varphi\big)^{2}-2\big(\Pi_{n}\varphi\big)\big(\Pi_{n}(w\varphi)\big)\Big)\Big]\rangle+\langle\big(\Pi_{n}(w\varphi)\big)^{2},s_{+}\rangle,\end{split}$$

which can be written in the form from the statement of the Lemma.

A.2. Stochastic bounds. This appendix is devoted to the control of the noise for approximations of the Anderson Hamiltonian. In particular, we prove Proposition 5.10.

Proof of Proposition 5.10. First we will prove the bounds for $\xi^n, X_{n,\lambda}$ and $\xi^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda}$. Eventually we address the convergence of these terms. Although only in the first case the dimension is allowed to be both d = 1 and d = 2, we will keep d as a parameter throughout the proof, for the sake of clarity. For convenience, let us indicate sums on \mathbb{Z}^d with integrals (for $m \in \mathbb{N}$):

$$\int_{(\mathbb{Z}^d)^m} f(k_1,\ldots,k_m) \,\mathrm{d}k_1 \cdots \,\mathrm{d}k_m = \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_m \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(k_1,\ldots,k_m).$$

Step 1: Bounds on ξ^n . First, observe that by Assumption 2.1:

$$|\xi^n(x)| \le 2n^{\frac{a}{2}}.$$

This explains both the L^{∞} bounds on ξ^n and the bound in $C^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$ (i.e. for $\zeta = 1$). If we show that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\big[\|\xi^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{d}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{2}}}\big]<\infty,$$

the bound for arbitrary ζ follows, since by interpolation, from the definition of Besov spaces, for any $\zeta \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\zeta\alpha+(1-\zeta)\beta}} \le \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}}^{\zeta} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\beta}}^{1-\zeta}.$$

Hence let us consider the case $\zeta = 0$. By Besov embedding, the required inequality follows if one can show that for any $p \in [2, \infty)$:

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\xi^n\|_{B^{-\frac{d}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{4}}_{p,p}} < \infty.$$

Here in view of Assumption 1.6, and by the discrete Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality as well as Jensen's inequality one finds that:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_j n^{\frac{d}{2}} s_n|^p(x)] \, \mathrm{d}x \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d} n^{-d} |\Delta_j \chi_{Q_n}|^2(z+x) \right)^{p/2} \, \mathrm{d}x$$
$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathrm{d}z \; |K_j(x+z)|^2 \right)^{p/2} \, \mathrm{d}x \lesssim \|K_j\|_{L^2}^p \lesssim 2^{j\frac{dp}{2}}$$

which is a bound of the required order.

Now, let us pass to the bound in $C_{\frac{1}{2\kappa}}^{\kappa}$. In fact we will prove that for any $p \in [1,\infty)$, $\zeta \in [0,\frac{1}{p})$ we have a bound on $\|\xi^n\|_{\mathcal{C}_p^{\zeta}}$. We use the Sobolev-Slobodeckij norm of Proposition 4.11 for the Besov space $B_{p,p}^{\zeta}$ (which embeds in \mathcal{C}_p^{ζ} , so finding a bound in the latter space is sufficient). Let us start by computing:

$$\begin{split} \|\xi^{n}\|_{B_{p,p}^{\zeta}} &\simeq \|\xi^{n}\|_{L^{p}} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \frac{|\xi^{n}(x) - \xi^{n}(y)|^{p}}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim n^{\frac{d}{2}} + \left(\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_{n}^{d} \cap \mathbb{T}^{d}} \int_{Q_{n}(z)} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \frac{|\xi^{n}(x) - \xi^{n}(y)|^{p}}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim n^{\frac{d}{2}} + \left(\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_{n}^{d} \cap \mathbb{T}^{d}} \int_{Q_{n}(z)} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d} \setminus Q_{n}(z)} \frac{|\xi^{n}(x) - \xi^{n}(y)|^{p}}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim n^{\frac{d}{2}} + n^{\frac{d}{2}} n^{\frac{d}{p}} \left(\int_{Q_{n}(0)} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d} \setminus Q_{n}(0)} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{d + \zeta p}} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{split}$$

where we have used in the last step that $\|\xi^n\|_{\infty} \leq n^{\frac{d}{2}}$. Now we can follow the same calculations as in the proof of Lemma 4.13 to obtain

$$\left(\int_{Q_n(0)}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\setminus Q_n(0)}\frac{1}{|x-y|^{d+\zeta p}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim n^{\zeta-\frac{d}{p}}.$$

Hence, overall for any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $\zeta \in [0, 1/p)$:

$$\|\xi^n\|_{\mathcal{C}_n^{\zeta}} \lesssim n^{\frac{d}{2}+\zeta}.$$

60 THE SPATIAL Λ-FLEMING-VIOT PROCESS IN A RANDOM ENVIRONMENT

Step 2: Bounds for $X_{n,\lambda}$. As for $X_{n,\lambda}$, we need to bound $n \| \mathcal{Q}_n X_{n,\lambda} \|_{L^{\infty}}$. Here:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}X_{n,\lambda}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} &= \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}^{-1}[(1-\mathsf{T})(n^{-1}\cdot)(-\vartheta_{n}+\lambda)^{-1}(\cdot)\widehat{\xi}_{n}(\cdot)]\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}^{-1}[(1-\mathsf{T})(n^{-1}\cdot)(-\vartheta_{n}+\lambda)^{-1}(\cdot)]\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{T}^{d})}\|\xi^{n}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \\ &\lesssim n^{-2}\|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1}[(1-\mathsf{T})(n^{-1}\cdot)(-\widehat{\chi}^{2}+1+n^{-2}\lambda)^{-1}(n^{-1}\cdot)]\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})}\|\xi^{n}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \end{aligned}$$

$$\tag{50}$$

where we applied the Poisson summation formula of Lemma 4.9. Note that

$$\begin{split} \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1}[(1-\overline{\mathsf{l}})(n^{-1}\cdot)(-\widehat{\chi}^{2}+1+n^{-2}\lambda)^{-1}(n^{-1}\cdot)]\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \\ &\leq \left\|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1}\left[\frac{1-\overline{\mathsf{l}}(n^{-1}\cdot)}{1+n^{-2}\lambda}+(1-\overline{\mathsf{l}})(n^{-1}\cdot)\left[\frac{1}{-\widehat{\chi}^{2}+1+n^{-2}\lambda}-\frac{1}{1+n^{-2}\lambda}\right](n^{-1}\cdot)\right]\right\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \\ &\leq \left\|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1}\left[\frac{1-\overline{\mathsf{l}}(n^{-1}\cdot)}{1+n^{-2}\lambda}\right]\right\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} + \left\|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1}\left[(1-\overline{\mathsf{l}})(n^{-1}\cdot)\left[\frac{1}{-\widehat{\chi}^{2}+1+n^{-2}\lambda}-\frac{1}{1+n^{-2}\lambda}\right](n^{-1}\cdot)\right]\right\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \end{split}$$

The first summand is bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ uniformly over n and λ (with some abuse of notation for the Dirac δ function). As for the second summand observe that, for some c > 0:

$$\begin{split} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}^{-1} \Big[(1 - \overline{\mathbf{1}}) (n^{-1} \cdot) \Big[\frac{1}{-\hat{\chi}^{2} + 1 + n^{-2}\lambda} - \frac{1}{1 + n^{-2}\lambda} \Big] (n^{-1} \cdot) \Big] \right\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}} (1 + |x|^{2})^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} e^{2\pi\iota\langle x, k \rangle} (1 - \overline{\mathbf{1}}(k)) \Big[\frac{1}{-\hat{\chi}^{2}(k) + 1 + n^{-2}\lambda} - \frac{1}{1 + n^{-2}\lambda} \Big] \mathrm{d}k \\ &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \left| \Big[\partial^{\alpha} \Big(\frac{1}{-\hat{\chi}^{2}(k) + 1 + n^{-2}\lambda} - \frac{1}{1 + n^{-2}\lambda} \Big) \Big] \mathbf{1}_{\{|k| \geq c\}} \Big| \mathrm{d}k, \end{split}$$

where with the sum we indicate all partial derivatives up to order 2d. Now this term can be bounded by Lemma 4.1. Let us show this for $\alpha = 0$ (the other cases are similar), where by a Taylor expansion:

$$\begin{split} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{1}{-\hat{\chi}^2(k) + 1 + n^{-2}\lambda} - \frac{1}{1 + n^{-2}\lambda} \right| \mathbf{1}_{\{|k| \ge c\}} \, \mathrm{d}k &\lesssim_c \left(\frac{1}{1 + n^{-2}\lambda} \right)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{\chi}^2(k) \mathbf{1}_{\{|k| \ge c\}} \, \mathrm{d}k \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{1 + |k|^{d+1}} \, \mathrm{d}k < \infty. \end{split}$$

Combining the last two observations with (50) leads to

$$\sup_{\lambda \ge 1} \|\mathcal{Q}_n X_{n,\lambda}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim n^{-2} \|\xi^n\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim n^{-2+\frac{d}{2}},$$

which is of the required order.

Step 3: Bounds on $\xi^n \odot \prod_n^2 X_{n,\lambda}$. We now consider the bound on $\xi^n \odot \prod_n^2 X_{n,\lambda}$, starting with $\lambda = 1$: at the end of this step we explain how to obtain a bound uniformly over λ at the cost of a small explosion in λ . In this computation it is important to note that d = 2.

Define $\psi_0(k_1, k_2)$ and $\widehat{\xi}_n(k)$ as

$$\psi_0(k_1,k_2) := \sum_{|i-j| \le 1} \varrho_i(k_1)\varrho_j(k_2), \qquad \widehat{\xi}_n(k) := \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^d}\xi^n(k).$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\xi}_{n}(k_{1})\widehat{\xi}_{n}(k_{2})] = \int_{(\mathbb{T}^{2})^{2}} e^{-2\pi\iota(k_{1}\cdot x_{1}+k_{2}\cdot x_{2})} \chi_{Q_{n}(x_{1})}(x_{2}) \,\mathrm{d}x_{1} \,\mathrm{d}x_{2}$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}} e^{-2\pi\iota(k_{1}+k_{2})\cdot x_{1}} \widehat{\chi}_{Q}(n^{-1}k_{2}) \,\mathrm{d}x_{1} = \widehat{\chi}_{Q}(n^{-1}k_{1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{k_{1}+k_{2}=0\}}.$$

Hence to compute the renormalisation constant observe that

$$c_n = \mathbb{E}[\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_{n,1}(x)] = \int_{(\mathbb{Z}^2)^2} e^{2\pi \iota (k_1 + k_2) \cdot x} \psi_0(k_1, k_2) \frac{\widehat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k_2)}{-\vartheta_n(k_2) + 1} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\xi}_n(k_1)\widehat{\xi}_n(k_2)] \, \mathrm{d}k_1 \, \mathrm{d}k_2$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{\widehat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k)\widehat{\chi}_Q(n^{-1}k)}{-\vartheta_n(k) + 1} \, \mathrm{d}k.$$

A similar calculation shows that actually $c_n = \mathbb{E}[\xi^n \Pi_n^2 X_{n,1}]$ and the asymptotic $c_n \simeq \log n$ follows from a manipulation of the sum. We turn our attention to a bound for $\|\xi^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,1}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}}$. As before, for $p \ge 2$,

 $\operatorname{consider}$

$$\mathbb{E} \|\xi^{n} \odot X_{n,1} - c_{n}\|_{B^{\alpha}_{p,p}}^{p} = \sum_{j \ge -1} 2^{\alpha j p} \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{j}(\xi^{n} \odot X_{n,1} - c_{n} \mathbf{1}_{j=-1})\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{T}^{d})}^{p} \\
= \sum_{j \ge -1} 2^{\alpha j p} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \mathbb{E} |\Delta_{j}(\xi^{n} \odot X_{n,1} - c_{n} \mathbf{1}_{j=-1})|^{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x.$$
(51)

It is now convenient to introduce the notation:

$$\mathcal{K}_m^n(x) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^2}^{-1} \bigg(\varrho_m(\cdot) \frac{\widehat{\chi}^2(n^{-1} \cdot)}{-\vartheta_n(\cdot) + 1} \bigg)(x).$$

Then the integrand in (51) can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[|\Delta_{j}(\xi^{n} \odot \Pi_{n}^{2} X_{n,1})(x) - c_{n} 1_{\{j=-1\}}|^{p}\Big] \\
= \mathbb{E}\Big[|\Delta_{j}(\xi^{n} \odot \Pi_{n}^{2} X_{n,1})(x) - \mathbb{E}\Delta_{j}(\xi^{n} \odot \Pi_{n}^{2} X_{n,1})(x)|^{p}\Big] \\
= \mathbb{E}\bigg|\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}} K_{j}(x-y) \sum_{|l-m|\leq 1} \left(\int_{(\mathbb{T}^{2})^{2}} K_{l}(y-z_{1})\mathcal{K}_{m}^{n}(y-z_{2})\xi^{n}(z_{1})\diamond\xi^{n}(z_{2}) \,\mathrm{d}z_{1} \,\mathrm{d}z_{2}\right) \,\mathrm{d}y\bigg|^{p}, \tag{52}$$

where, conveniently:

$$\xi^{n}(z_{1}) \diamond \xi^{n}(z_{2}) = \xi^{n}(z_{1})\xi^{n}(z_{2}) - \mathbb{E}[\xi^{n}(z_{1})\xi^{n}(z_{2})].$$

Now we can write (52) as a discrete stochastic integral and apply [40, Lemma 5.1] to obtain

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}} K_{j}(x-y) \sum_{|l-m| \leq 1} \sum_{x_{1}, x_{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{n}^{2} \cap \mathbb{T}^{2}} \left(\int_{Q_{n}(x_{1}) \times Q_{n}(x_{2})} K_{l}(y-z_{1}) \mathcal{K}_{m}^{n}(y-z_{2}) \mathrm{d}z_{1} \, \mathrm{d}z_{2} \right) \xi^{n}(x_{1}) \diamond \xi^{n}(x_{2}) \, \mathrm{d}y \right|^{p} \\ & \lesssim \left[\sum_{x_{1}, x_{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{n}^{2} \cap \mathbb{T}^{2}} n^{-2d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}} K_{j}(x-y) \sum_{|l-m| \leq 1} \left(\int_{Q_{n}(x_{1}) \times Q_{n}(x_{2})} K_{l}(y-z_{1}) \mathcal{K}_{m}^{n}(y-z_{2}) \mathrm{d}z_{1} \mathrm{d}z_{2} \right) \mathrm{d}y \right|^{2} \right]^{p/2} \\ & = \left[\sum_{x_{1}, x_{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{n}^{2} \cap \mathbb{T}^{2}} n^{-2d} \left| \int_{Q_{n}(x_{1}) \times Q_{n}(x_{2})} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}} K_{j}(x-y) \sum_{|l-m| \leq 1} K_{l}(y-z_{1}) \mathcal{K}_{m}^{n}(y-z_{2}) \, \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}z_{1} \, \mathrm{d}z_{2} \right|^{2} \right]^{p/2} \\ & \leq \left[\int_{(\mathbb{T}^{2})^{2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}} K_{j}(x-y) \sum_{|l-m| \leq 1} K_{l}(y-z_{1}) \mathcal{K}_{m}^{n}(y-z_{2}) \, \mathrm{d}y \right|^{2} \mathrm{d}z_{1} \, \mathrm{d}z_{2} \right]^{p/2}, \end{split}$$

where the last step is an application of Jensen's inequality. Now, via Parseval's Theorem, the latter is bounded by

$$\left[\int_{(\mathbb{Z}^2)^2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} K_j(x-y) \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} e^{2\pi \iota k_1 \cdot y} \varrho_l(k_1) e^{2\pi \iota k_2 \cdot y} \varrho_m(k_2) \frac{\hat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k_2)}{-\vartheta_n(k_2) + 1} \, \mathrm{d}y \right|^2 \mathrm{d}k_1 \, \mathrm{d}k_2 \right]^{p/2} \\ = \left[\int_{(\mathbb{Z}^2)^2} \left| e^{2\pi \iota (k_1+k_2) \cdot x} \varrho_j(k_1+k_2) \psi_0(k_1,k_2) \frac{\hat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k_2)}{-\vartheta_n(k_2) + 1} \right|^2 \mathrm{d}k_1 \, \mathrm{d}k_2 \right]^{p/2} .$$

By Lemma 4.1:

$$\frac{\widehat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k)}{-\vartheta_n(k)+1} \lesssim \frac{\widehat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k)}{|k|^2+1} \mathbf{1}_{\{|k \lesssim n|\}} + \frac{|k|^{-3}}{1} \mathbf{1}_{\{|k| \gtrsim n\}} \lesssim \frac{1}{1+|k|^2}.$$

Finally, taking into account the supports of the functions,

$$\left[\int_{(\mathbb{Z}^2)^2} \left| \varrho_j(k_1+k_2)\psi_0(k_1,k_2) \frac{1}{1+|k_2|^2} \right|^2 \mathrm{d}k_1 \,\mathrm{d}k_2 \right]^{p/2} \lesssim \left[2^{j2d} 2^{-4j} \right]^{p/2} \le 1,$$

which provides a bound of the required order. This concludes the proof of the required bound in the case $\lambda = 1$. For general $\lambda \ge 1$ we observe that

$$\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} - c_n = \xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 (X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1}) + \xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} - c_n.$$

To complete the proof of our result it now suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{\lambda \ge 1} \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 (X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1})\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} < \infty.$$

For this purpose we observe that by a resolvent identity:

$$X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1} = \left[(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} - (-\mathcal{A}_n + 1)^{-1} \right] \xi^n$$

= $(1 - \lambda)(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1}(-\mathcal{A}_n + 1)^{-1} \xi^n$

Now we can apply the elliptic Schauder estimates of Proposition 4.6 to obtain:

$$\lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\Pi_{n}^{2} \mathcal{P}_{n}(X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1})\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{4}}} \lesssim \lambda^{1-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|(-\mathcal{A}_{n} + \lambda)^{-1} X_{n,1}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{4}}} \\ \lesssim \|X_{n,1}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{4}}} \\ \lesssim \|\xi^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{4}}}.$$

63

And on small scales, using the regularizing properties of Π^2_n from Corollary 4.14:

$$\lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\Pi_n^2 \mathcal{Q}_n(X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1})\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{4}}} \lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} n^{2-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\mathcal{Q}_n(X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1})\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ \lesssim \lambda^{1-\frac{\kappa}{4}} n^{2-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\mathcal{Q}_n(-\mathcal{A}_n + \lambda)^{-1} X_{n,1}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ \lesssim n^{2-\frac{3\kappa}{4}} \|\mathcal{Q}_{n-k_0} X_{n,1}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ \lesssim n^{-\frac{3\kappa}{4}} \|\xi^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}}.$$

Here we have chosen a deterministic $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ (uniformly over *n*) such that $\mathcal{Q}_n \mathcal{Q}_{n-k_0} = \mathcal{Q}_n$. Hence overall we obtain:

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\lambda \ge 1} \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \| \xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 (X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1}) \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup_{\lambda \ge 1} \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \| \xi^n \odot \Pi_n^2 (X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1}) \|_{\mathcal{C}^{\frac{\kappa}{8}}} \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \| \xi^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{8}}} \sup_{\lambda \ge 1} \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \| \Pi_n^2 (X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1}) \|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+\frac{\kappa}{4}}} \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\| \xi^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{8}}} \left(\| \xi^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{4}}} + n^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \| \xi^n \|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim 1, \end{split}$$

where the last average is bounded by the same arguments presented in Step 1 (up to changing κ). With this we have concluded the proof of the regularity bound. We are left with a discussion of the convergence.

Step 4. What we established so far implies tightness of the following sequences of random variables in their respective spaces:

$$\xi^n \in \mathcal{C}^{-\frac{d}{2}-\kappa}, \qquad \mathcal{P}_n X_{n,\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{1-\kappa}, \qquad \xi^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{-\kappa}.$$

The next step is to show that the limiting points of ξ^n and $\xi^n \diamond \prod_n^2 X_{n,\lambda}$ are unique in distribution. In particular, in view of Proposition 4.6, this would imply weak convergence also of $\mathcal{P}_n X_{n,\lambda}$. In the last step we will address the almost sure convergence and the almost sure uniform bound.

Convergence of ξ^n to space time white noise ξ is an instance of central limit theorem (notice the normalization of variance in Assumption 1.6). We therefore focus our attention on the more involved Wick product $\xi^n \diamond X_{n,\lambda}$. Now, the deterministic bounds at the end of Step 3 show that the convergences

$$\xi^n \to \xi$$
 in $\mathcal{C}^{-1-\kappa}$, $\xi^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,1} \to \xi \diamond X_1$ in $\mathcal{C}^{-\kappa}$

for any $\kappa > 0$ imply also the convergence of $\xi^n \diamond \prod_n^2 X_{n,\lambda}$ for general $\lambda \ge 1$. Hence we can restrict to discussing the case $\lambda = 1$. For fixed $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^2)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \varphi, \xi^n \diamond X_{n,1} \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi(y) \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} \sum_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2 \cap \mathbb{T}^2} \left(\int_{Q_n(x_1) \times Q_n(x_2)} K_l(y-z_1) \mathcal{K}_m^n(y-z_2) \, \mathrm{d}z_1 \, \mathrm{d}z_2 \right) \xi^n(x_1) \diamond \xi^n(x_2) \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \sum_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2} \left\langle \varphi(\cdot), \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} \Pi_n K_l(\cdot - x_1) \Pi_n \mathcal{K}_m^n(\cdot - x_2) \right\rangle \xi^n(x_1) \diamond \xi^n(x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Consider a map $L_n: \left(\mathbb{Z}_n^2\right)^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$L_n(x_1, x_2) := \langle \varphi(\cdot), \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} \Pi_n^Q K_l(\cdot - x_1) \Pi_n^Q \mathcal{K}_m(\cdot - x_2) \rangle \mathbb{1}_{\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2\}}.$$

64 THE SPATIAL Λ-FLEMING-VIOT PROCESS IN A RANDOM ENVIRONMENT

This definition naturally extends to $n = \infty$, where L maps $(\mathbb{R}^2)^2$ to \mathbb{R} . Our goal is to show that

$$\sum_{(x_1,x_2)\in(\mathbb{Z}_n^2)^2} L_n(x_1,x_2)\xi^n(x_1)\diamond\xi^n(x_2) \to \int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^2} L(x_1,x_2)\xi(\,\mathrm{d}x_1)\diamond\xi(\,\mathrm{d}x_2), \quad (53)$$

where convergence holds in distribution and the limit is interpreted as an iterated stochastic integral in the second Wiener-Itô chaos. It is sufficient to verify the assumptions of [40, Lemma 5.4]. That is, we have to show that there exists a $g \in L^2((\mathbb{R}^2)^2)$ such that:

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbf{1}_{(n\mathbb{T}^2)^2} \mathcal{F}_{(\mathbb{Z}^2_n)^2} L_n| \le g, \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \|\mathbf{1}_{(n\mathbb{T}^2)^2} \mathcal{F}_{(\mathbb{Z}^2_n)^2} L_n - \mathcal{F}_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^2} L\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^2)^2)} = 0$$

For this purpose we calculate

$$\begin{split} &1_{(n\mathbb{T}^2)^2} \mathcal{F}_{(\mathbb{Z}^2_n)^2} L_n(k_1, k_2) \\ &= 1_{(n\mathbb{T}^2)^2} (k_1, k_2) \int_{(\mathbb{Z}^2_n \cap \mathbb{T}^2)^2} e^{2\pi \iota (k_1 \cdot x_1 + k_2 \cdot x_2)} \langle \varphi(\cdot), \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} \Pi_n^Q K_l(\cdot - x_1) \Pi_n^Q \mathcal{K}_m(\cdot - x_2) \rangle \, \mathrm{d}x_1 \, \mathrm{d}x_2 \\ &= 1_{(n\mathbb{T}^2)^2} (k_1, k_2) \int_{(\mathbb{T}^2)^2} e^{2\pi \iota (k_1 \cdot x_1 + k_2 \cdot x_2)} \langle \varphi(\cdot), \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} K_l(\cdot - x_1) \mathcal{K}_m(\cdot - x_2) \rangle \, \mathrm{d}x_1 \, \mathrm{d}x_2 \\ &= 1_{(n\mathbb{T}^2)^2} (k_1, k_2) \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi(y) e^{2\pi \iota (k_1 + k_2) \cdot y} \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} \varrho_l(-k_1) \varrho_m(-k_2) \frac{\hat{\chi}^2(-n^{-1}k_2)}{-\vartheta_n(-k_2) + 1} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &= 1_{(n\mathbb{T}^2)^2} (k_1, k_2) (\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi) (k_1 + k_2) \sum_{|l-m| \le 1} \varrho_l(k_1) \varrho_m(k_2) \frac{\hat{\chi}^2(n^{-1}k_2)}{-\vartheta_n(k_2) + 1}, \end{split}$$

so that the required assumptions are naturally satisfied. Since φ is smooth, the latter term is bounded in L^2 , uniformly over n. In particular (53) follows. Hence the distribution of any limit point of $\langle \varphi, \xi^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,1} \rangle$ is uniquely characterized and since φ is arbitrary this implies convergence in distribution of $\xi^n \diamond \Pi_n^2 X_{n,1}$.

Step 5. Above we have proven that ξ^n and $\xi^n \diamond \prod_n^2 X_{n,\lambda}$ converge in distribution in $\mathcal{C}^{-1-\kappa}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{-\kappa}$ respectively. Now let us prove almost sure convergence up to changing probability space (we discuss only the case of ξ^n , since the other term can be treated similarly). We would like to apply Skorohod's representation theorem, which requires the underlying space to be separable. Unfortunately the space $\mathcal{C}^{-1-\kappa}$ is not separable, but we can embed

$$\mathcal{C}^{-1-\kappa} \subseteq B^{-1-\kappa}_{p(\kappa),p(\kappa)} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{-1-2\kappa}$$

for some $p(\kappa) \in (1, \infty)$ sufficiently large. Now the space $B_{p(\kappa),p(\kappa)}^{-1-\kappa}$ is separable, so we can apply Skorohod's representation theorem to obtain almost sure convergence in $\mathcal{C}^{-1-2\kappa}$. Since κ is arbitrary this is sufficient for the required result. The last statement we have to prove is that in this new probability space (that we

The last statement we have to prove is that in this new probability space (that we call $(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$) we have a uniform bound for almost all $\omega \in \overline{\Omega}$:

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\left\|\left\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}(\omega)\right\|\right\|_{n,\kappa}<\infty$$

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n}(\omega)\|\|_{n,\kappa} &:= \sup_{\zeta \in [0,1]} \left\{ n^{-\zeta} \|\xi^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-(1-\zeta)-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \right\} + n^{-1} \|\xi^{n}\|_{L^{\infty}} + n^{-1-\kappa} \|\xi^{n}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{2\kappa}}_{\frac{1}{2\kappa}}} \\ &+ \sup_{\lambda \geqslant 1} \left\{ n \|\mathcal{Q}_{n}X_{n,\lambda}\|_{L^{\infty}} + \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|Y_{n,\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now following Steps 1 and 2 we see that the bounds on $\|\xi^n(\omega)\|_{\infty}, \|\xi^n(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\frac{1}{2\kappa}}^{\kappa}}$ and $\|X_{n,\lambda}(\omega)\|_{\infty}$ depend only on the deterministic bound $|\xi^n(\omega, x)| \leq 2n$ (in d = 2), so we are left with proving:

$$\begin{split} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup_{\zeta \in [0,1]} n^{-\zeta} \|\xi^{n}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-(1-\zeta)-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} + \sup_{\lambda \geqslant 1} \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\xi^{n} \diamond \Pi_{n}^{2} X_{n,\lambda}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \right\} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup_{\zeta \in [0,1]} (n^{-1} \|\xi^{n}(\omega)\|_{\infty})^{\zeta} \|\xi^{n}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2}(1-\zeta)}}^{1-\zeta} + \|\xi^{n} \diamond \Pi_{n}^{2} X_{n,1}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \right. \\ &\quad + \sup_{\lambda \geqslant 1} \lambda^{-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\xi^{n} \odot \Pi_{n}^{2} (X_{n,\lambda} - X_{n,1})(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \left\} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ 1 + \|\xi^{n}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}} + \|\xi^{n} \diamond \Pi_{n}^{2} X_{n,1}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \\ &\quad + \|\xi^{n}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{8}}} \left(\|\xi^{n}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{4}}}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{4}} \|\xi^{n}(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1+\frac{\kappa}{2}}}^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}} \right\}, \end{split}$$

where we used interpolation for the first term, as in Step 1, and the same bounds as in Step 3 for the last term. In particular now the uniform bound is a consequence of the convergence of ξ^n and $\xi^n \diamond \prod_n^2 X_{n,1}$ in the correct spaces.

A.3. Proof of Lemma 4.1.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let us start with the term involving the gradient. We have that for $i = 1, \ldots, d$:

$$(D\hat{\chi})_i(0) = -2\pi\iota \int_{B_1(0)} x_i e^{-2\pi\iota \langle k, x \rangle} \, \mathrm{d}x \Big|_{k=0} = 0.$$

For the term involving the Hessian, we observe that an analogous computation for $i \neq j$ shows that $(D^2 \hat{\chi})_{i,j}(0) = 0$. If i = j we find that

$$(D^2\widehat{\chi})_{i,i}(0) = -(2\pi)^2 \oint_{B_1(0)} x_i^2 e^{-2\pi\iota\langle k,x\rangle} \,\mathrm{d}x\Big|_{k=0} =: \frac{-(2\pi)^2}{4}\nu_0,$$

with the value of ν_0 as in the statement. The two-sided inequality follows by a Taylor approximation.

We are left with a bound on the decay of $\hat{\chi}$:

$$\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}^n}{\mathrm{d}x_{i_1}\ldots\,\mathrm{d}x_{i_n}}\hat{\chi}_B(k)\right| \lesssim (1+|k|)^{-\frac{d+1}{2}}$$

For this purpose let $J_{\nu}(\cdot)$ be the Bessel function of the first kind with parameter ν , that is

$$J_{\nu}(k) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{m!\Gamma(m+\nu+1)} \left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^{2m+\nu}$$

The Fourier transform of χ_B can be written, for some c, C > 0, as

$$\hat{\chi}_B(k) = c(d) \int_0^{\pi} \sin^d(t) e^{-2\pi\iota |k| \cos(t)/4} \, \mathrm{d}t = C|k|^{-d/2} J_{d/2}(\pi |k|/2).$$
(54)

In the last step we used one of the alternative representations of Bessel functions, see e.g. [57, Section 6.15, Equation (5)] (the author uses the notation K_n for the real part of J_{ν} , but in our case the Bessel function is real valued). Since $J_{\frac{1}{2}}(k) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi k}} \sin k$, the bound for d = 1 is immediate. For d = 2, we make use of an asymptotic bound for Bessel functions:

$$\sup_{\varrho \ge 1} \varrho^{1/2} |J_{\nu}(\varrho)| < +\infty.$$

We provide a proof of this bound in the next Lemma. The bound for the derivatives then follows from (54), the asymptotic result for Bessel functions, and the following pair of identities

$$\partial_x J_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} (J_{n-1}(x) + J_{n+1}(x)), \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z},$$
$$J_{-n}(\cdot) = (-1)^n J_n(\cdot) \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The following result is well-known (see e.g. [57], where many deeper results are presented). For completeness we provide a proof that satisfies all our purposes.

Lemma A.4. Fix $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\sup_{\varrho \ge 1} \varrho^{1/2} |J_{\nu}(\varrho)| < +\infty,$$

Proof. Through (54) and by changing variables x = cos(t) we rewrite the Bessel function as

$$\int_{-1}^{1} (1-x^2)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{\iota \varrho x} \, \mathrm{d}x = 2\mathrm{Re}\left(\int_{0}^{1} (1-x^2)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{\iota \varrho x}\right) \mathrm{d}x$$

A change variables $x = 1 - u^2$. yields

$$e^{i\varrho} \int_0^1 \left(u^2(2-u^2) \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{-\iota \varrho u^2} u \, \mathrm{d}u = \frac{e^{i\varrho}}{\varrho^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varrho}} \left(w^2(2-\frac{w^2}{\varrho}) \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{-\iota w^2} w \, \mathrm{d}w.$$

Observe that in order to obtain the desired bound it is now sufficient to show that the integral terms is bounded uniformly in ρ . After another change of variable $w = e^{-\iota \frac{\pi}{4}} z$ we obtain

$$\int_{0}^{e^{\frac{i\pi}{4}}\sqrt{\varrho}} \left(-\iota z^{2}(2+\iota z^{2}/\varrho)\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{-z^{2}} z \,\mathrm{d}z$$
$$= \int_{0}^{\sqrt{\varrho}} \left(-\iota z^{2}(2+\iota z^{2}/\varrho)\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{-z^{2}} z \,\mathrm{d}z + \int_{0}^{\pi/4} \left(-\iota \varrho e^{2\iota\varphi}(2+\iota e^{2\iota\varphi})\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{-\varrho e^{2\iota\varphi}} \varrho e^{2\iota\varphi} \,\mathrm{d}\varphi.$$

The first integral can be trivially bounded uniformly over ρ while the second one is tends to 0 as ρ tends to infinity since the exponential term dominates all the others.

References

- [1] D. Aldous. Stopping times and tightness. Ann. Probability, 6(2):335-340, 1978.
- [2] R. Allez and K. Chouk. The continuous Anderson hamiltonian in dimension two. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02718, 2015.

- [3] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin. Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations, volume 343 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [4] N. H. Barton, F. Depaulis, and A. Etheridge. Neutral evolution in spatially continuous populations. *Theor. Pop. Biol.*, 61:31–48, 2002.
- [5] N. H. Barton, A. M. Etheridge, and A. Véber. A new model for evolution in a spatial continuum. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 15:162–216, 2010.
- [6] N. H. Barton, A. M. Etheridge, and A. Véber. Modelling evolution in a spatial continuum. J. Stat. Mech., page PO1002, 2013.
- [7] N. Biswas, A. Etheridge, and A. Klimek. The spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot process with fluctuating selection. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26:Paper No. 25, 51, 2021.
- [8] G. Cannizzaro, P. K. Friz, and P. Gassiat. Malliavin calculus for regularity structures: The case of gPAM. J. Funct. Anal., 272(1):363–419, 2017.
- [9] F. Caravenna, R. Sun, and N. Zygouras. Polynomial chaos and scaling limits of disordered systems. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 19(1):1–65, 2017.
- [10] J. Chetwynd-Diggle and A. Etheridge. Superbrownian motion and the spatial lambda-flemingviot process. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 23:36 pp., 2018.
- [11] J. Chetwynd-Diggle and A. Klimek. Rare mutations in the spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot model in a fluctuating environment and SuperBrownian Motion. arXiv e-prints, January 2019.
- [12] K. Chouk, J. Gairing, and N. Perkowski. An invariance principle for the two-dimensional parabolic anderson model with small potential. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 5(4):520–558, Dec 2017.
- [13] K. Chouk and W. van Zuijlen. Asymptotics of the eigenvalues of the Anderson Hamiltonian with white noise potential in two dimensions. Ann. Probab., 49(4):1917–1964, 2021.
- [14] J. T. Cox, R. Durrett, and E. A. Perkins. Rescaled voter models converge to super-Brownian motion. Ann. Probab., 28(1):185–234, 2000.
- [15] J. T. Cox and E. A. Perkins. Rescaling the spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot process and convergence to super-Brownian motion. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:Paper No. 57, 56, 2020.
- [16] D. A. Dawson. Geostochastic calculus. Canad. J. Statist., 6(2):143–168, 1978.
- [17] D. A. Dawson, B. Maisonneuve, and J. Spencer. École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXI—1991, volume 1541 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993. Papers from the school held in Saint-Flour, August 18–September 4, 1991, Edited by P. L. Hennequin.
- [18] K. Deimling. Nonlinear functional analysis. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [19] D. Erhard and M. Hairer. Discretisation of regularity structures. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., 55(4):2209–2248, 2019.
- [20] A. M. Etheridge. An introduction to superprocesses, volume 20 of University Lecture Series. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [21] A. M. Etheridge. Drift, draft and structure: some mathematical models of evolution. Banach Center Publ., 80:121–144, 2008.
- [22] A. M. Etheridge, A. Véber, and F. Yu. Rescaling limits of the spatial lambda-Fleming-Viot process with selection. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:Paper No. 120, 89, 2020.
- [23] S.N. Ethier and T.G. Kurtz. Markov processes: characterization and convergence. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. Probability and mathematical statistics. Wiley, 1986.
- [24] R. Forien and S. Penington. A central limit theorem for the spatial lambda -fleming-viot process with selection. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 22, 2017.
- [25] M. Fukushima and S. Nakao. On spectra of the Schrödinger operator with a white Gaussian noise potential. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete, 37(3):267–274, 1976/77.
- [26] M. Gubinelli, P. Imkeller, and N. Perkowski. Paracontrolled distributions and singular PDEs. Forum Math. Pi, 3:e6, 75, 2015.
- [27] M. Gubinelli and N. Perkowski. Lectures on singular stochastic PDEs. arXiv e-prints, page arXiv:1502.00157, Jan 2015.
- [28] M. Gubinelli and N. Perkowski. KPZ reloaded. Comm. Math. Phys., 349(1):165–269, 2017.
- [29] M. Hairer. A theory of regularity structures. Invent. Math., 198(2):269–504, 2014.
- [30] P. Hedrick. Genetic polymorphism in heterogeneous environments: the age of genomics. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst., 37:67–93, 2006.

68 The spatial Λ-fleming-viot process in a random environment

- [31] D. Henry. Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations, volume 840 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1981.
- [32] P. D. Hislop and I. M. Sigal. Introduction to spectral theory, volume 113 of Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. With applications to Schrödinger operators.
- [33] A. Jakubowski. On the skorokhod topology. In Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques, volume 22, pages 263–285, 1986.
- [34] T. Kato. Perturbation theory for linear operators. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Reprint of the 1980 edition.
- [35] J. Kerr and L. Packer. Habitat heterogeneity as a determinant of mammal species richness in high-energy regions. *Nature*, 385(6613):252, 1997.
- [36] M. Kimura. Stepping stone model of population. Ann. Rep. Nat. Inst. Genetics Japan, 3:62– 63, 1953.
- [37] N. Konno and T. Shiga. Stochastic partial differential equations for some measure-valued diffusions. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 79(2):201–225, Sep 1988.
- [38] C. Labbé. The continuous Anderson Hamiltonian in $d \leq 3$. J. Funct. Anal., 277(9):3187–3235, 2019.
- [39] G. Malécot. Les Mathématiques de l'hérédité. Masson et Cie, Paris, 1948.
- [40] J. Martin and N. Perkowski. Paracontrolled distributions on Bravais lattices and weak universality of the 2d parabolic Anderson model. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., 55(4):2058–2110, 2019.
- [41] J.-C. Mourrat and H. Weber. Convergence of the two-dimensional dynamic Ising-Kac model to Φ⁴₂. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 70(4):717–812, 2017.
- [42] C. Mueller, L. Mytnik, and L. Ryzhik. The speed of a random front for stochastic reactiondiffusion equations with strong noise. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 384(2):699–732, 2021.
- [43] L. Mytnik. Superprocesses in random environments. Ann. Probab., 24(4):1953–1978, 1996.
- [44] J. Pausas, J. Carreras, A. Ferré, and X. Font. Coarse-scale plant species richness in relation to environmental heterogeneity. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 14(5):661–668, 2003.
- [45] A. Pazy. Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations, volume 44 of Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [46] E. Perkins. Dawson-Watanabe superprocesses and measure-valued diffusions. In Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1999), volume 1781 of Lecture Notes in Math., pages 125–324. Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [47] Nicolas Perkowski and Tommaso Rosati. A rough super-Brownian motion. Ann. Probab., 49(2):908–943, 2021.
- [48] P. B. Rainey and M. Travisano. Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment. *Nature*, 394(6688):69, 1998.
- [49] T. Shiga. Stepping stone models in population genetics and population dynamics. In Stochastic processes in physics and engineering (Bielefeld, 1986), volume 42 of Math. Appl., pages 345–355. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1988.
- [50] W. Sickel. Pointwise multipliers of lizorkin-triebel spaces. In J. Rossmann, P. Takáč, and G. Wildenhain, editors, *The Maz'ya Anniversary Collection*, pages 295–321, Basel, 1999. Birkhäuser Basel.
- [51] J. Simon. Compact sets in the space L^p(0, T; B). Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), 146:65–96, 1987.
- [52] A. Stein, K. Gerstner, and H. Kreft. Environmental heterogeneity as a universal driver of species richness across taxa, biomes and spatial scales. *Ecology letters*, 17(7):866–880, 2014.
- [53] M. E. Taylor. Partial differential equations I. Basic theory, volume 115 of Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.
- [54] J. Tews, U. Brose, V. Grimm, K. Tielbörger, M.C. Wichmann, and F. Schwager, M.and Jeltsch. Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. *Journal of biogeography*, 31(1):79–92, 2004.
- [55] H. Triebel. Theory of Function Spaces. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Springer Basel, 2010.
- [56] J. B. Walsh. An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations. In P. L. Hennequin, editor, École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XIV - 1984, pages 265–439, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [57] G. N. Watson. A treatise on the theory of Bessel functions. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Reprint of the second (1944) edition.
- [58] S. Wright. Isolation by distance. Genetics, 28:114–138, 1943.