

# Boundary Layer Estimates in Stochastic Homogenization

Peter Bella<sup>a</sup>, Julian Fischer<sup>b</sup>, Marc Josien<sup>c</sup>, and Claudia Raithel<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>TU Dortmund, DE-44227, Dortmund, Germany

<sup>b</sup>IST Austria, AT-3400, Klosterneuburg, Austria

<sup>c</sup>CEA, DES, IRESNE, DEC, Cadarache, F-13108, Saint-Paul-Lez-Durance, France

<sup>d</sup>TU Dresden, DE-01217, Dresden, Germany


## Abstract

We prove quantitative decay estimates for the boundary layer corrector in stochastic homogenization in the case of a half-space boundary. Our estimates are of optimal order and show that the gradient of the boundary layer corrector features nearly fluctuation-order decay; its expected value decays even one order faster. As a corollary, we deduce estimates on the accuracy of the representative volume element method for the computation of effective coefficients: our understanding of the decay of boundary layers enables us to improve the order of convergence of the RVE method for  $d \geq 3$ .

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Discussion of main results and strategy</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Setting of our results . . . . .	5
2.2	Theorem 1: Optimal decay estimate for the boundary layer . . . . .	6
2.3	Theorem 2: Improved error estimate for representative volume element method. . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Overview of our arguments</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Strategy for Theorem 1 . . . . .	8
3.2	Argument for Proposition 2: Iterative improvement of decay estimate for the boundary layer	10
3.3	Proof of Theorem 2 . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Argument for Proposition 1: A suboptimal decay estimate for the boundary layer</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1	Proof of Proposition 1 . . . . .	17
4.2	Proof of auxiliary lemmas for Proposition 1 . . . . .	22
<b>5</b>	<b>Argument for Proposition 5: Fluctuation estimates for the boundary layer corrector</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1	Identification of the Malliavin / Fréchet derivative . . . . .	24
5.2	Estimates on the auxiliary functions: A weighted Meyers estimate . . . . .	25
5.3	Proof of Proposition 5 . . . . .	29
5.4	Proofs of auxiliary lemmas for Proposition 5 . . . . .	34
<b>6</b>	<b>Argument for Proposition 6: Bound for expectation of weighted average of the boundary layer</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1	Proof of Proposition 6 . . . . .	35
6.2	Proof of auxiliary lemma for Proposition 6 . . . . .	36

---

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 948819). 

<b>7</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 1</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Regularity of random elliptic operators on <math>\mathbb{R}^d</math> and corrector estimates</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Regularity estimates for random elliptic operators on a domain</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Proof of the weighted Meyers estimate in Lemma 14</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Exponentially localized boundary layer</b>	<b>45</b>

## 1 Introduction

Both in periodic homogenization and in stochastic homogenization, the presence of a domain boundary should be expected to lead to intricate effects and substantial new challenges: In the periodic setting, the domain boundary breaks the periodic structure, while in stochastic homogenization, the domain boundary breaks the stationarity (invariance with respect to spatial shifts) of the problem.

Indeed, in particular in quantitative homogenization theory on bounded domains, it is important to understand the impact of boundary layers on the solution: For instance, for periodic coefficient fields  $a(\cdot) = a(\cdot + k)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , with  $a = a^*$ , solutions to the linear elliptic PDE on the whole space

$$-\nabla \cdot \left( a\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right) \nabla u_\varepsilon \right) = \nabla \cdot f \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \quad (1.1)$$

may be approximated by the solution to a constant-coefficient effective equation  $-\nabla \cdot (\bar{a} \nabla \bar{u}) = \nabla \cdot f$  up to an error of second order<sup>1</sup>

$$\|u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}\|_{H^{-1}(B_1)} \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (1.2)$$

In contrast, the analogous estimate *fails* for the Dirichlet problem on bounded domains, even for the homogeneous Dirichlet problem and even strictly in the interior of the domain: On bounded domains the estimate  $\|u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}\|_{L^p} \lesssim \varepsilon$  cannot be improved by passing to weak norms. The underlying reason for this failure is boundary layer effects that provide an  $\varepsilon$ -order contribution to the *effective boundary data* for  $\bar{u}$ .

On a mathematical level, the failure of the derivation of estimates like (1.2) in the case of the Dirichlet problem on domains may be seen as follows: In order to prove an estimate like (1.2), one attempts to approximate  $u_\varepsilon$  by the so-called two-scale expansion; written up to second order, it reads for periodic and symmetric  $a = a^*$

$$\bar{u}(x) + \varepsilon \phi_i\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \partial_i \bar{u}(x) + \varepsilon^2 \psi_{ij}\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \partial_i \partial_j \bar{u}(x), \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\phi_i$  and  $\psi_{ij}$  are the so-called first-order and second-order homogenization correctors. The homogenization corrector  $\phi_i$  is defined as the 1-periodic solution to the PDE  $-\nabla \cdot (a(e_i + \nabla \phi_i)) = 0$ ; note that it is unique up to additive constants. If we attempt to apply the two-scale expansion ansatz (1.3) on a bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , we immediately observe that it fails to attain the correct boundary data  $\bar{u}$  on the domain boundary. While the second-order term  $O(\varepsilon^2)$  does not affect the accuracy, the first-order contribution  $\varepsilon \phi_i(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}) \partial_i \bar{u}(x)$  must be corrected for. In other words, we would need to subtract a term of the form  $\varepsilon v(x)$  with  $v$  solving

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot \left( a\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right) \nabla v \right) &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ v(x) &= \phi_i\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \partial_i \bar{u}(x) && \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

This is an example of the so-called *oscillating Dirichlet problem*: The boundary data oscillates on the same scale as the coefficient field. As a consequence, the interactions of the oscillations in the boundary data and in the coefficient field give rise to quite nontrivial nonlinear interactions; it turns out that under suitable assumptions,  $v$  may be described in the interior in terms of a suitable  $\bar{a}$ -harmonic function with certain *effective boundary conditions* on  $\partial\Omega$ . Note that in particular, these effective boundary conditions are not given in terms of a simple average of the boundary data.

<sup>1</sup>Provided that the right-hand side  $f$  is sufficiently regular.

In the context of regularity theory for linear elliptic operators with oscillating coefficients, a particularly important instance of an oscillating Dirichlet problem is given by the *boundary layer corrector*  $\theta_i^\varepsilon$ , defined as the solution to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot \left( a\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right) \nabla \theta_i^\varepsilon \right) &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ \theta_i^\varepsilon(x) &= \phi_i\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) && \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

By its definition, subtracting the boundary layer corrector  $\theta_i^\varepsilon$  from the whole space corrector  $\phi_i^\varepsilon(x) := \phi_i\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)$  corrects the boundary conditions of  $\phi_i^\varepsilon$  while maintaining the defining corrector equation  $-\nabla \cdot (a(e_i + \nabla(\phi_i^\varepsilon - \theta_i^\varepsilon))) = 0$  – in other words,  $\phi_i^\varepsilon - \theta_i^\varepsilon$  yields a first-order homogenization corrector in  $\Omega$  with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on  $\partial\Omega$ .

In the case of periodic homogenization, the study of the oscillating Dirichlet problem has a long history and by now a relatively complete picture has emerged in the literature. On half-spaces with rationally aligned normals (with respect to the underlying periodic structure), Allaire and Amar [1] have shown exponential decay of the gradient of the boundary layer corrector away from the boundary; they subsequently used this result to homogenize the oscillating Dirichlet problem on polygonal domains with rationally aligned boundaries<sup>2</sup>. For half-spaces with Diophantine normals, Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi [14, 15] established superpolynomial decay of the boundary layer corrector gradients; as a consequence, they were able to formulate quantitative homogenization error estimates for the oscillating boundary data problem on uniformly convex domains, albeit with suboptimal rate. Recently, Armstrong, Kuusi, Mourrat, and Prange [2] have obtained optimal convergence estimates in  $L^p$  for  $p \geq 2$  for the oscillating Dirichlet problem on convex domains, employing also a subsequent regularity result for the effective boundary data by Shen and Zhuge [28]. The case of the Neumann problem has recently been treated by Shen and Zhuge [27].

In principle, similar issues arise in the homogenization of random media: For stationary and suitably decorrelating random coefficient fields  $a$  with  $a = a^*$ , an analogue of the higher-order error estimate (1.2) has been derived in [6]. More precisely, in the case of such random coefficient fields, solutions to the linear elliptic PDE (1.1) on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with smooth right-hand side  $f$  may be approximated by a constant-coefficient effective PDE  $-\nabla \cdot (\bar{a} \nabla \bar{u}) = \nabla \cdot f$  up to an error of order<sup>3</sup>

$$\|u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}\|_{H^{-1}(B_1)} \leq \mathcal{C} \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{3/2} & \text{for } d = 3, \\ \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon| & \text{for } d = 4, \\ \varepsilon^2 & \text{for } d \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

Again, in the case of the Dirichlet problem on bounded domains no analogue of this higher-order convergence result holds and the best possible homogenization error estimate for the Dirichlet problem is  $\|u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}\|_{L^p} \leq \mathcal{C}\varepsilon$  (for  $d \geq 3$ ).

While the periodic homogenization problem with fluctuating boundary data is by now well-studied, in the case of stochastic homogenization only few results on the boundary layer corrector have been available in the literature. For instance, in [13] boundary layer correctors have been constructed for half-spaces to develop a large-scale regularity theory; however, the available estimates on the boundary layer corrector are far from optimal for  $d \geq 3$ . In [23], correctors for harmonic functions around lower-dimensional features like cusps have been studied. For correctors for interface problems, we refer to [22]. For interface problems in periodic homogenization we refer to [9, 21, 29].

**Quantitative estimates on boundary layers in stochastic homogenization.** In the present work, we establish quantitative estimates on the decay of the boundary layer corrector  $\theta_i$  on a half-space  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , given as the solution to the PDE

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \theta_i) &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \\ \theta_i &= \phi_i && \text{on } \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

More precisely, we consider an ensemble  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  of coefficient fields  $a$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for  $d \geq 3$  (that is, a probability measure on the space of coefficient fields on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ) that is subject to a standard set of conditions of quantitative

<sup>2</sup>However, this homogenization result only holds along subsequences.

<sup>3</sup>Note that for  $d = 3$  and  $d = 4$  this error estimate is of fluctuation order and therefore optimal.

stochastic homogenization: We require uniform ellipticity and boundedness, stationarity (invariance of the law under spatial shifts), and quantitative decorrelation on scales larger than a microscale  $\varepsilon > 0$  in form of a spectral gap inequality. Under an additional small-scale regularity condition, we show that the boundary layer corrector decays as

$$|\nabla\theta_i(x)| \leq C \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x, \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right)^{d/2-\delta} \quad (1.5)$$

with a random prefactor  $C$  subject to uniform (stretched exponential) moment bounds (and with any  $\delta > 0$ ). One should expect this estimate to be of optimal order (up to the loss of  $\delta$ ), as the average of correctors on the boundary  $\int_{\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d \cap B_r} \phi_i dS$  displays fluctuations of order  $r^{1-d/2}$  and  $\theta_i$  is the  $a$ -harmonic extension of  $\phi_i|_{\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d}$  to  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ . For the expected value  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla\theta_i]$ , our arguments morally establish a higher-order decay

$$|\mathbb{E}[\nabla\theta_i(x)]| \leq C \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x, \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right)^{d/2+1-\delta},$$

although we make this rigorous only in a spatially averaged sense (see Proposition 6). To the best of our knowledge, the estimate (1.5) is the first optimal-order estimate on the decay of boundary layers in stochastic homogenization.

**Application to the representative volume approximation.** An interesting application of these estimates for boundary layers arises in the analysis of the representative volume element (RVE) method for the approximation of the effective coefficient  $\bar{a}$ . The RVE method proceeds by taking a sample of the random coefficient field – say, on a box  $[0, L]^d$  with side length  $L \gg \varepsilon$  – and approximates the effective coefficient  $\bar{a}$  as  $\bar{a} \approx a^{\text{RVE}}$  with

$$a^{\text{RVE}} e_i := \int_{[0, L]^d} a(e_i + \nabla\phi_i^L) dx.$$

Here,  $\phi_i^L$  solves the corrector equation  $-\nabla \cdot (a(e_i + \nabla\phi_i^L)) = 0$  on the representative volume  $[0, L]^d$ , for instance with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. It turns out that this RVE approximation with Dirichlet boundary data features random fluctuations of order  $|a^{\text{RVE}} - \mathbb{E}[a^{\text{RVE}}]| \sim (\frac{\varepsilon}{L})^{d/2}$  and a systematic error of order  $|\mathbb{E}[a^{\text{RVE}}] - \bar{a}| \sim \frac{\varepsilon}{L}$ . The fluctuations are of central limit theorem scaling and therefore of optimal order. Note, however, that for  $d \geq 3$  the systematic error dominates. It turns out that the reason for this rather large systematic error contribution is in fact a boundary layer phenomenon. Naively one might expect that by averaging only in the interior (“oversampling”), i. e. by setting

$$\tilde{a}^{\text{RVE}} e_i := \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a(e_i + \nabla\phi_i^L) dx \quad (1.6)$$

for some constant  $0 < \kappa \leq \frac{1}{4}$ , one may eliminate this issue of boundary layers. Interestingly, this turns out *not* to be the case: while this procedure of oversampling decreases the systematic error by a constant factor, the order of convergence remains the same. The underlying reason is that the Dirichlet corrector  $\phi_i^L$  differs from the whole space corrector  $\phi_i$  (the latter of which defines the effective coefficient as  $\bar{a}e_i := \mathbb{E}[a(e_i + \nabla\phi_i)]$ ) in terms of a boundary contribution: Indeed,  $\phi_i - \phi_i^L$  is an  $a$ -harmonic function in  $[0, L]^d$  with boundary data  $\phi_i$ , i. e. we need to understand a homogenization problem with fluctuating boundary data. The failure of higher-order convergence of (1.6) is due to *effective boundary conditions* imposed on  $\phi_i - \phi_i^L$  due to the interaction of the *fluctuating boundary data*  $\phi_i$  with the fluctuations of the coefficient field  $a$ . In Theorem 2, we show that the slight modification of the RVE approximation given by

$$a^{\text{RVE}, new} \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_i + \nabla\phi_i^L dx := \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a(e_i + \nabla\phi_i^L) dx \quad (1.7)$$

with overwhelming probability improves the overall error estimate to  $(\frac{\varepsilon}{L})^{d/2-\delta}$  for  $d = 3$  and  $d = 4$ . The underlying reason is that the new formula takes into account the slight change of the field gradient in the

interior that is caused by the effective boundary conditions of  $\phi_i - \phi_i^L$ . The new formula (1.7) is also rather natural, as the effective coefficient should provide the relation between a given macroscopic field gradient and the corresponding macroscopically averaged flux.

**Notation.** Throughout the paper, to simplify notation and without loss of generality we mostly consider the half-space of the form  $\mathbb{H}_+^d := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > 0\}$ . Thus, the natural (interior) unit normal vector is  $e_1 := (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ . For points  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we decompose their coordinate vector  $x$  as  $x := (x^\perp, x^\parallel)$  with  $x^\perp \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x^\parallel \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ . Occasionally, we denote a fixed point as  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$  –this should not be confused with the notation for the coordinates  $x_i := x \cdot e_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

We frequently use the convention that “ $\lesssim$ ” means “ $\leq C(d, \lambda)$ ,” where  $d$  denotes the dimension and where  $\lambda > 0$  is the ellipticity ratio of the coefficient field  $a$ .

By  $c$  and  $C$ , we denote generic constants whose value may change from appearance to appearance; typically,  $C$  is used to denote a large constant, while  $c$  denotes a small constant.

Similarly, we use the notation  $\mathcal{C}$  to denote a generic random constant (respectively,  $\mathcal{C}(x)$  to denote a generic random field) whose value may change from appearance to appearance. Unless otherwise specified, the constant  $\mathcal{C}$  (respectively the random field  $\mathcal{C}(x)$ ) will be subject to a uniform stretched exponential moment bound.

By  $B_r(x)$  we denote the ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $x$ , while by  $\mathcal{O}$  we denote a (typically  $C^{1,1}$ , but not necessarily bounded) domain.

Throughout the paper, we consider an ensemble  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  (a probability distribution) of elliptic and bounded coefficient fields  $a$ ; we denote the corresponding probability space as  $\Omega$  and the associated expected value of a random variable  $G$  by  $\langle G \rangle$ . Regarding terminology, a *quenched* estimate is a bound that holds almost surely, while an *annealed* estimate is a bound on suitable stochastic moments.

We also use standard notation for Sobolev spaces; in particular, by  $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)$  we denote the space of decaying functions with finite Dirichlet energy equipped with the norm  $\|v\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla v|^2 dx$ .

## 2 Discussion of main results and strategy

### 2.1 Setting of our results

To begin this section, we first list the assumptions on  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ , the ensemble of coefficient fields  $a$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , under which we obtain our results. Towards further illustrating our setting, we then give a few examples of ensembles on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfy these assumptions. Having clarified the setting of our results we then discuss, in turn, Theorem 1 on the decay of the boundary layer and Theorem 2 on the improved convergence rate for the representative volume approximation of effective coefficients.

**Assumptions on the ensemble.** Throughout this article we will assume that:

(A1) The ensemble  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is *uniformly elliptic and bounded*: There exists some  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -almost surely we have

$$\begin{aligned} |a(x)v| &\leq |v|, \\ a(x)v \cdot v &\geq \lambda|v|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and a. e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

(A2) The ensemble  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is *stationary*, that is, the law of  $a(\cdot + x)$  coincides with the law of  $a(\cdot)$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . In other words, the statistics of the coefficient field do not depend on the region in space.

(A3) The ensemble is subject to decorrelation on scales larger than the microscale in the sense that it satisfies a spectral gap inequality: For any random variable  $\xi(a)$  it holds that

$$\langle (\xi - \langle \xi \rangle)^2 \rangle \leq \varepsilon^d \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial a} \right| dy \right)^2 dx \right\rangle, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial a} \right| dy$  is used to denote

$$\sup_{\delta a} \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\xi(a + h\delta a) - \xi(a)}{h}$$

with the supremum taken over perturbations  $\delta a : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  that are supported in  $B_\varepsilon(x)$  and satisfy  $\|\delta a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1$ . The parameter  $\varepsilon > 0$  is the correlation length of the ensemble.

- (A4) The coefficient field  $a$  is Hölder continuous with stretched exponential moments for some Hölder exponent  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ . In particular, there exists a stationary random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\nu \mathcal{C}^\nu)] \leq 2$  for some  $\nu > 0$  such that the Hölder estimate

$$\sup_{y, z \in B_\varepsilon(x)} \frac{|a(y) - a(z)|}{|y - z|^\alpha} \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x) \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \quad (2.2)$$

holds.

Note that (A1)–(A3) are a standard set of assumptions in quantitative stochastic homogenization; in particular, assumption (A3) is a standard quantification of the qualitative ergodicity assumption that is used in classical qualitative stochastic homogenization results.

Assumption (A4) is a small-scale regularity assumption that we require mostly for convenience; it enables us to state pointwise gradient bounds (which may otherwise fail due to a possible failure of regularity on scales smaller than the microscale).

**Examples of ensembles satisfying (A1) - (A4).** We give two examples of random coefficient fields, both of which are standard examples used to illustrate the applicability of quantitative stochastic homogenization results.

**Example 1:** We consider a Gaussian ensemble that satisfies a certain decorrelation estimate. In particular, let  $\tilde{a}(x)$  be a scalar Gaussian field that is centered and stationary and, furthermore, satisfies a decorrelation estimate of the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{|x|=|y|} |\langle \tilde{a}(x) \tilde{a}(0) \rangle| dy \leq 1.$$

Defining  $a := g(\tilde{a}(x))$ , where  $g$  is a bounded Lipschitz map from  $\mathbb{R}$  into the uniformly elliptic matrices  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , it is shown that (A1)–(A3) are satisfied e.g. in [11]. For sufficiently regular covariances  $\langle \tilde{a}(x) \tilde{a}(0) \rangle$ , the ensemble also satisfies (A4).

**Example 2:** The second example involves random spherical inclusions. More precisely, we consider a Poisson point process on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)$ . Let  $(X_i, h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a realization; then consider the points  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  in the order of their coordinate  $h_i$  and for each point  $X_i$  place a ball of radius 1 around  $X_i$  if the ball does not intersect with any of the previously placed balls. Denote the union of the balls obtained by this procedure by  $U$ . Then define a coefficient field as  $a(x) := \lambda \chi_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus U} + \chi_U$ . While such ensembles of coefficient fields consisting of random high-conductivity inclusions do not satisfy the spectral gap inequality (A3), they have been shown to satisfy a slightly different version of a spectral gap inequality in [11]. We expect that a relatively straightforward adaption of our arguments would make our results applicable also to ensembles satisfying such an “oscillation spectral gap” estimate, though it would involve some additional work to obtain the necessary small-scale (microscopic) regularity theory (as derived from assumption (A4) below in our present work).

## 2.2 Theorem 1: Optimal decay estimate for the boundary layer

In our first main result we show that if the ensemble  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  of coefficient fields on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfies (A1)–(A4), then we are able to obtain an almost-optimal decay estimate for the gradient of the boundary layer corrector  $|\nabla \theta_i|$  away from the boundary  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . We remark that this estimate is *quenched*, in the sense that it is stated for a. e. coefficient field  $a$  and includes a random constant. Here is our first main result:

**Theorem 1.** Let  $d \geq 3$  and  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  be an ensemble of coefficient fields on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfies the assumptions (A1)-(A4). Denote by  $\theta_i \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$  the half-space corrector, that is, the unique<sup>4</sup> weak solution to (1.4) with the property that  $\nabla \theta_i$  decays away from  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  –in the sense that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx = 0.$$

Then there exists a random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$ , defined on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , that is stationary with respect to tangential shifts and has stretched exponential moments –in the sense that there exists  $C = C(d, \lambda, \nu, \alpha, \delta)$  with

$$\left\langle \exp \left( \frac{\mathcal{C}(a, x)^{1/C}}{C} \right) \right\rangle \leq 2, \quad (2.3)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$  – such that the gradient of the boundary layer corrector satisfies the decay estimate

$$|\nabla \theta_i(x)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x) \left( 1 + \frac{x^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2} + \delta}, \quad (2.4)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$  and  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ .

We remark that the decay of  $|\nabla \theta_i|$  away from  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  that is shown in (2.4) is, up to the  $\delta$ -loss, the optimal scaling that may be expected. This can be seen in the following heuristic argument: Now fixing  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , let  $h$  solve the divergence form equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla h) &= \nabla \cdot (\delta_{x_0}) && \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \\ h &= 0 && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

and rewrite  $\nabla \theta_i(x_0)$  as

$$\nabla \theta_i(x_0) = \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} -\nabla \cdot (\delta_{x_0}) \theta_i dx = \int_{\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \phi_i \mathbf{n} \cdot a^* \nabla h dS, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\mathbf{n}$  is the outward unit normal vector on  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . Notice that to obtain the above relation we have used the equation (1.4), that  $h = 0$  on  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , and the identity  $\theta_i = \phi_i$  on  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . Now, we expect the right-hand side of (2.6) to have the same asymptotic scaling behaviour as the corresponding quantity with the Green's function  $h$  replaced by its homogenized counterpart  $\bar{h}$  solving  $-\nabla \cdot (\bar{a}^* \nabla \bar{h}) = \nabla \cdot (\delta_{x_0})$  in  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ . Using that  $|\nabla \bar{h}(\cdot)| \leq C |\cdot - x_0|^{-d}$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \phi_i \mathbf{n} \cdot \bar{a} \nabla \bar{h} dS \sim (x_0^\perp)^{-1} \int_{B_{x_0^\perp}(x_0^\parallel)} \phi_i dS, \quad (2.7)$$

where we have used  $B_{x_0^\perp}(x_0^\parallel)$  to denote the  $d - 1$  dimensional ball with radius  $x_0^\perp$  centered around  $x_0^\parallel$  in  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . Since under the assumptions (A1) – (A3) volume averages of the gradient of the whole space corrector display central limit theorem scaling [19], one expects that

$$\int_{B_{x_0^\perp}(x_0^\parallel)} \phi dS \sim |x_0^\perp| \left( \frac{|x_0^\perp|}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}}.$$

Combining this observation with (2.6) and (2.7) suggests that (2.4) cannot be improved –aside from the  $\delta$ -loss.

---

<sup>4</sup>Uniqueness follows from the Liouville principle for random elliptic operators on half-spaces proven in [13].

## 2.3 Theorem 2: Improved error estimate for representative volume element method.

In the second main result of our paper we use Theorem 1 to obtain an improved error estimate for the representative volume element method, which is the standard method used to approximate the homogenized coefficients  $\bar{a}$ . The error in the representative volume element method can be split into two contributions, the *random* error and the *systematic* error. While the former is well-understood to be of central limit theorem scaling, without additional modifications such as “screening” terms in the corrector equation [8, 17, 20] the systematic error would dominate (for  $d \geq 3$ ). As discussed above, our understanding of boundary layers enables us to propose a minor modification of the RVE method that improves the bound on the systematic error, thereby improving the overall rate of convergence for  $d \geq 3$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $d \geq 3$  and let  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  be an ensemble of coefficient fields on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfies the assumptions (A1)-(A4) with  $\varepsilon = 1$ . Let  $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be the corresponding effective coefficient. Denote by  $\phi_i^L$  the homogenization corrector with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on the box  $[0, L]^d$ , i. e. let  $\phi_i^L$  satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a(e_i + \nabla \phi_i^L)) &= 0 && \text{in } (0, L)^d, \\ \phi_i^L &= 0 && \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d. \end{aligned}$$

Given any  $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ , define the RVE approximation  $\bar{a}^L \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  for the effective coefficient as the solution to the system of linear equations

$$\bar{a}^L \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_i + \nabla \phi_i^L \, dx = \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a(e_i + \nabla \phi_i^L) \, dx \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d. \quad (2.8)$$

Then for any  $\delta > 0$  and any  $0 < s \leq c(d, \lambda, \nu) (\frac{L}{\varepsilon})^{\min\{d/2, 2\} - \delta}$ , we have the error estimate

$$\mathbb{P}[|\bar{a}^L - \bar{a}| > s (\frac{\varepsilon}{L})^{\min\{d/2, 2\} - \delta}] \leq 2 \exp(-s^{1/C}/C).$$

In particular, with at least this probability  $\bar{a}^L$  is well-defined, i. e. the defining linear system has a unique solution.

Overall, in dimensions 3 and 4 we see that with overwhelming probability, the error  $|\bar{a}^L - \bar{a}|$  is at most of order  $(\frac{\varepsilon}{L})^{d/2 - \delta}$ , improving the error estimate of the standard RVE approximation to (nearly) the fluctuation scaling.

Note that as a slight downside of the formula (2.8), in principle we cannot rule out that there may be a small probability that the linear system for  $\bar{a}^L$  given by (2.8) may fail to be invertible; thus, we cannot make a statement on the error of the expected value  $\mathbb{E}[\bar{a}^L]$ . However, the probability for this to happen is exceedingly low, as shown by our stretched exponential estimate.

## 3 Overview of our arguments

### 3.1 Strategy for Theorem 1

Recall that a random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$ , defined on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , having stretched exponential moments is equivalent to there existing constants  $m, C > 0$  such that  $\langle |\mathcal{C}(a, x)|^q \rangle^{1/q} \leq Cq^m$  for any  $q \geq 1$  and  $x \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . (By Jensen’s inequality it is, in fact, sufficient to obtain the previous moment bound on  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  only for  $q \geq q_0$  for some  $q_0 > 1$ .) For (2.4) it is, therefore, sufficient to show that there exist constants  $m, C > 0$  and  $q_0 \geq 1$  such that

$$\langle |\nabla \theta_i(x)|^q \rangle^{1/q} \leq Cq^m (1 + x^\perp)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \quad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{H}_+^d \text{ and } q \geq q_0. \quad (3.1)$$

Notice that, while Theorem 1 is a *quenched* result, the estimate (3.1) is *annealed*, which is more convenient for using the spectral gap inequality (2.1) from (A3). We also remark that, since in this contribution Theorem 1 is only stated for  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$  (rather than for a general domain), we may w.l.o.g. set  $\varepsilon = 1$  –since the result for a general correlation length follows from rescaling  $a$ .



Our argument for (3.1) comes in three main steps:

**Step 1:** We show a quenched suboptimal decay of  $|\nabla\theta_i(x)|$  away from  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$  –this is contained in Proposition 1. The argument is deterministic, relying on already available estimates for the whole space corrector  $\phi_i$  and a Campanato-iteration type argument. The result of Proposition 1 is slightly post-processed to obtain a corresponding suboptimal annealed decay of a spatial average of  $|\nabla\theta_i|^2$  (around  $x$ ).

**Step 2:** We show that a decay estimate on moments of a spatial average of  $|\nabla\theta_i|^2$  (around  $x$ ) is self-improving (but saturates at the desired decay  $-d/2 + \delta$  in Theorem 1) –this is contained in Proposition 2.

Proposition 2 is the workhorse of our strategy: For notational convenience we now fix  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . To prove Proposition 2 we control the moments of  $\int_{B_{x_0^\perp/\delta}(x_0)} |\nabla\theta_i|^2 dx$  in terms of moments of suitable weighted averages  $F := \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} g \cdot \nabla\theta_i dx$ . To control the moments of the  $F$ , we control the moments of the fluctuations  $F - \langle F \rangle$  (Proposition 5) and the expected value  $\langle F \rangle$  (Proposition 6). Proposition 5 relies on the spectral gap inequality (A3) and sensitivity estimates –the arguments are contained in Section 5. The argument for Proposition 6 is contained in Section 6; it relies on a careful two-scale expansion argument, which exploits the stationarity of  $\theta_i$  and the standard correctors with respect to shifts tangential to  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$ .

Initializing the use of Proposition 2 with the result of Step 1, we iteratively apply Proposition 2 –this yields Corollary 3.

**Step 3:** To finish, we post-process the result of Corollary 3 using the whole space large-scale regularity theory from random linear elliptic operators contained in [18] and the assumption (A4) on the regularity of the coefficient field  $a$ . This post-processing is performed in Section 7 –and yields (3.1).

We now discuss Steps 1 and 2 in a bit more detail:

**Step 1: A suboptimal quenched decay for  $|\theta_i(x)|$  away from  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$ .** As already mentioned above, the result of this step is used to initialize the iterative application of Proposition 2 in Step 2. For this purpose, we show the following:

**Proposition 1.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, there exists a random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$ , defined on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , that is stationary with respect to shifts tangential to  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$  and with stretched exponential moments in the sense of (2.3) such that*

$$|\nabla\theta_i(x)| \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha} \mathcal{C}(a, x) \left(1 + \frac{x^\perp}{\varepsilon}\right)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (3.2)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ .

The proof of Proposition 1 is given in Section 4 and, while relying on stochastic ingredients from [18] –which are summarized in Appendix A–, is entirely deterministic here. The argument, in particular, relies on the comparison of  $\theta$  to the solution of the homogenized problem with the same boundary data (on a half-ball) via a homogenization-inspired Campanato iteration. This strategy is quite standard, having been introduced by Avellaneda and Lin in the setting of periodic homogenization in the 80s (see e.g. [5]). More recently, this strategy has also been fruitfully exploited in stochastic homogenization (see e.g. [3, 18, 4]). The version of these techniques that we use in this contribution is closest to those in [18, Theorem 1].

**Step 2: Iterative improvement of the decay estimate.** The workhorse of our iterative strategy for proving Theorem 1 is the following proposition:

**Proposition 2.** *Let assumptions (A1)–(A4) hold and assume that there exist constants  $m, n > 0$  such that*

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_{\frac{x_0^\perp}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla\theta_i|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha} q^m \left(1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon}\right)^{-n}, \quad (3.3)$$

for any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$  and  $q \geq 1$ . Then there exists a constant  $\tilde{m} > 0$  such that

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_{\frac{x_0^\perp}{8}}(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha} q^{\tilde{m}} \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-\min\{n+1-\delta, \frac{d}{2}-\delta\}}, \quad (3.4)$$

for any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ ,  $q \geq 1$ , and  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ .

Slightly postponing a thorough outline of the proof of Proposition 2 to Section 3.2, we first discuss how we apply this result. To initiate the iterative application of Proposition 2, we require access to an estimate like (3.3). As already mentioned above, for this we post-process (3.2) of Proposition 1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left( \int_{B_{\frac{x_0^\perp}{8}}(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} &\leq \left( \int_{B_{\frac{x_0^\perp}{8}}(x_0)} \langle |\nabla \theta_i|^q \rangle dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\stackrel{(3.2)}{\lesssim} \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \left( \int_{B_{\frac{x_0^\perp}{8}}(x)} \langle \mathcal{C}(a, x_0)^q \rangle dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\lesssim q^m \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

for any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$  and  $q \geq 1$ . Using (3.5), we can initialize the use of Proposition 2 with  $n = \frac{1}{3}$ . Proposition 2 then yields:

**Corollary 3.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, there exists a constant  $m > 0$  such that*

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_{\frac{x_0^\perp}{8}}(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim q^m \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2} + \delta}, \quad (3.6)$$

for any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ ,  $q \geq 1$ , and  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ .

Since the argument for Corollary 3 is obvious given the discussion preceding its statement, we forgo a formal proof.

### 3.2 Argument for Proposition 2: Iterative improvement of decay estimate for the boundary layer

As elaborated on in the previous section, the core of our argument for Theorem 1 is the iterative application of Proposition 2. In this section we state the other results required for our proof of Proposition 2 and, assuming that these hold, give the proof of the proposition.

The first ingredient that we require is an estimate that controls the gradient of an  $a$ -harmonic function in terms of linear functionals of the gradient, plus a small remainder term.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $a$  be a uniformly elliptic and bounded coefficient field in the sense of Assumption (A1). Let  $u$  be  $a$ -harmonic in a ball  $B_R$ ,  $R \geq 1$ . Then for any  $\delta > 0$  and any  $A < \infty$  there exists a set of functions  $g_{m,k}$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq M = M(\lambda, \delta, p)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor \log_2 \frac{R}{R^{1-\delta}} \rfloor$ , subject to the bounds*

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{k,m}| &\leq (2^k R^{1-\delta})^{-d}, \\ |\nabla g_{k,m}| &\leq (2^k R^{1-\delta})^{-1-d}, \\ \text{supp } g_{k,m} &\subset B_{2^k R^{1-\delta}}, \end{aligned}$$

and such that the estimate

$$\int_{B_{R^{1-\delta}}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq R^{-A} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 \frac{R}{R^{1-\delta}} \rfloor} (2^k)^{-A/\delta} \sum_{m=1}^M \left| \int_{B_R} g_{k,m} \cdot \nabla u dx \right|^2 \quad (3.7)$$

holds.

As the proof is rather short, we directly provide it here.

*Proof.* We first notice that for any  $\tilde{\delta} > 0$  there exists a finite set of functions  $g_m$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , supported in  $B_R$  and satisfying  $|g_m| \leq R^{-d}$ ,  $|\nabla g_m| \leq R^{1-d}$ , such that any  $a$ -harmonic function  $u$  on  $B_R$  satisfies

$$\int_{B_{R/2}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \tilde{\delta} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C \sum_{m=1}^M \left| \int_{B_R} g_m \cdot \nabla u dx \right|^2. \quad (3.8)$$

In fact, this may be obtained by a suitable variant of e. g. [6, Lemma 12].

Iterating this bound  $K := \lfloor \log_2 \frac{R}{R^{1-\tilde{\delta}}} \rfloor$  many times, we arrive at

$$\int_{B_{2^{-K}R}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq (2^d \tilde{\delta})^K \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^M (2^d \tilde{\delta})^{k-1} \left| \int_{B_R} g_{k,m} \cdot \nabla u dx \right|^2.$$

Choosing  $\tilde{\delta} > 0$  small enough, this implies the desired estimate.  $\square$

Lemma 4 reduces the proof of Proposition 2 to estimating linear functionals of  $\nabla \theta_i$ : The main challenge is to control the  $2q$ -th stochastic moments of the  $F_{k,m} := \int_{B_{x_0^\perp}(x_0)} g_{k,m} \cdot \nabla \theta_i dx$ . Towards this goal, we begin by applying the triangle inequality as

$$\langle |F_{k,m}|^{2q} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \leq \langle |F_{k,m} - \langle F_{k,m} \rangle|^{2q} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} + |\langle F_{k,m} \rangle|. \quad (3.9)$$

As already alluded to above, if we were deriving estimates for the whole space corrector  $\phi_i$  instead of  $\theta_i$ , that is, if we were considering  $F_{k,m} = \int g_{k,m} \cdot \nabla \phi_i dx$  instead of  $F_{k,m} = \int g_{k,m} \cdot \nabla \theta_i dx$ , the expected value  $\langle F_{k,m} \rangle$  would vanish due to the stationarity of  $\nabla \phi_i$  and the sublinear growth of  $\phi_i$  (see e. g. [26, 24]). Thus, the problem would entirely reduce to that of fluctuation bounds for the  $F_{k,m}$ . In our situation, however, since  $\nabla \theta_i$  is not stationary in the direction perpendicular to  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , we need to control both terms on the right-hand side of (3.9): fluctuation bounds for  $F_{k,m}$  are obtained in Proposition 5 and the expected value  $\langle F_{k,m} \rangle$  is treated in Proposition 6.

The statements of Propositions 5 and 6 are given below, where we remark that, for use in future work, we have proven Proposition 5 not only on  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , but also on a generic bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain. Since the our treatment of the expectations  $\langle F_{k,m} \rangle$  in Proposition 6 depends quite heavily on our estimate being on the half-space, we do not generalize this statement to a generic domain in this contribution.

**Proposition 5.** *For  $d \geq 3$ , let  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  be an ensemble of coefficient fields on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfies the assumptions (A1)-(A4). Furthermore, let  $\mathcal{O}$  denote either a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain or  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ ; let  $f \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be smooth such that, in the case that  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$ ,  $f \equiv 1$  and, if  $\mathcal{O}$  is bounded,  $f$  is supported in a bounded neighborhood of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Let  $p$  satisfy  $0 < p - 1 \ll 1$ ,  $r \geq \varepsilon$ , and  $x_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ . Let  $g \in L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfy  $\text{supp}(g) \subset B_r(x_0)$  with  $\text{dist}(B_r(x_0), \partial \mathcal{O}) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  and*

$$\left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq r^{-d}. \quad (3.10)$$

Consider  $u$  solving

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla u) &= 0 && \text{in } \mathcal{O} \\ u &= f \phi_i && \text{on } \partial \mathcal{O} \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

and the random variable  $F$  defined as

$$F := \int_{\mathcal{O}} g \cdot \nabla u dx. \quad (3.12)$$

Then there exists a constant  $m = \kappa(d, \lambda, \mathcal{O}, f) < \infty$  such that

$$\left\langle |F - \langle F \rangle|^{2q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f} q^\kappa \left( \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \right)^{\beta \frac{d}{2}} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial \mathcal{O}) + \varepsilon} \right)^{(1-\beta) \frac{d}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial \mathcal{O}) + \varepsilon} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \right), \quad (3.13)$$

for any  $q \geq 1$  and  $0 < \beta \ll 1$ .

As already mentioned, to prove Proposition 5 we rely on the spectral gap inequality (2.1) –in particular, for  $\xi = F$ , we express the Malliavin derivative on the right-hand side of (2.1) in terms of auxiliary functions  $h$ ,  $\hat{h}$ ,  $v_1$ , and  $v_2$  solving (5.2), (5.3), (5.4), and (5.5) respectively. We then proceed to estimate these auxiliary functions via elliptic regularity estimates. The argument is contained in Section 5 and is similar to e.g. [19, 12, 6, 7].

Here is the statement of Proposition 6, which we use to treat the expected values  $\langle F_{k,m} \rangle$  on the right-hand side of (3.9):

**Proposition 6.** *For  $d \geq 3$ , let  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  be an ensemble of coefficient fields that satisfies the assumptions (A1)–(A4). Suppose that there exists  $n > 0$  such that*

$$\left\langle |\nabla \theta_i(x)|^2 \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda} \left( 1 + \frac{x^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-n}, \quad (3.14)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . Let  $r \geq \varepsilon$ ,  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , and  $g \in L^{2p}(\mathbb{H}_+^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfy  $\text{supp}(g) \subset B_r(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d$  with  $\text{dist}(B_r(x_0), \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  and

$$\left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq r^{-d} \quad (3.15)$$

as well as

$$\left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla g|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq r^{-(d+1)}. \quad (3.16)$$

Then the expected value  $\langle F \rangle$  of the linear functional  $F := \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} g \cdot \nabla \theta dx$  satisfies the improved decay estimate

$$\left| \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot g dx \right\rangle \right| \lesssim_{d,\lambda} \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-n}. \quad (3.17)$$

We argument for Proposition 6 is given in Section 6. The underlying idea is to use a two-scale expansion approximation for the ‘‘Greens function analogue’’  $-\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla h) = \nabla \cdot g$  to reduce – up to the higher-order error term resulting in the right-hand side of (3.17) – the expression for  $F$  to a corresponding expression involving only the correctors and the homogenized analogue  $-\nabla \cdot (\bar{a}^* \nabla \bar{h}) = \nabla \cdot g$ . One then exploits stationarity in the tangential direction to conclude that the remaining expressions in fact vanish.

With all of the ingredients for the proof of Proposition 2 ready, we now proceed to its proof.

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Set  $R := \frac{x_0^\perp}{8}$ . Inserting our assumption (3.3) into Lemma 4 (applied for  $A = 1$ ), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{B_{R^{1-\delta}}(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha} q^m \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-n-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 \frac{R}{R^{1-\delta}} \rfloor} (2^k)^{-1/\delta} \left\langle \left( \sum_{m=1}^M \left| \int_{B_R} g_{k,m} \cdot \nabla \theta_i dx \right|^2 \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the fluctuations of the functionals on the right-hand side, we apply Proposition 5 with  $r = 2^k R^{1-\delta}$  and  $g = g_{k,m}$ . Furthermore, to bound the expected values of these functionals we apply Proposition 6 with  $g = g_{k,m}$  and  $r = 2^k R^{1-\delta}$ ; note that we obtain the pointwise bound (3.14) required for its application from our hypothesis (3.3) and a down-propagation to a pointwise bound via (B.3). Inserting the resulting

estimates into the previous bound, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left( \int_{B_{R^{1-\delta}}(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} &\lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha} q^m \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-n-1} \\ &+ q^\kappa \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 \frac{R}{R^{1-\delta}} \rfloor} (2^k)^{-1/\delta} \left( \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k R^{1-\delta}} \right)^{\beta \frac{d}{2}} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{x_0^\perp + \varepsilon} \right)^{(1-\beta) \frac{d}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{x_0^\perp + \varepsilon} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 \frac{R}{R^{1-\delta}} \rfloor} (2^k)^{-1/\delta} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k R^{1-\delta}} \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Estimating the sums, inserting the definition of  $R$ , and choosing  $\beta$  sufficiently small (depending on  $\delta$ ), we obtain

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_{R^{1-\delta}}(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha} q^m \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-n-1+\delta} + q^\kappa \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-d/2+\delta}.$$

Letting  $x_0$  vary over a ball of radius  $x_0^\perp/8$  around  $x_0$  and integrating proves Proposition 2.  $\square$

### 3.3 Proof of Theorem 2

As the proof of our second main result Theorem 2 on the accuracy of the representative volume approximation is rather short, we directly state it here.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Without loss of generality, in the proof we assume  $\varepsilon = 1$ .

*Step 1: Representation formula for  $\phi_i^L$ .* Denote by  $\mathbb{H}_m$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq 2d$ , the half-spaces  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x_m > 0\}$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq d$ , and  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x_{m-d} < L\}$ ,  $d+1 \leq m \leq 2d$ . Denote by slight abuse of notation by  $\theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m}(\infty)$  the constants that the boundary layer correctors  $\theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m}$  converge to (almost surely) as the distance to the half-space boundary becomes infinite. Furthermore, denote by  $E := (\{0, L\} \times \{0, L\} \times [0, L]^{d-2}) \cup \dots \cup ([0, L]^{d-2} \times \{0, L\} \times \{0, L\})$  the set of all edges in case  $d = 3$  respectively for  $d \geq 4$  the set of all  $d - 2$ -dimensional hyperedges of the cube.

Note that by the defining equations, we may write

$$\phi_i^L = \phi_i - \sum_{m=1}^{2d} (\theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m} - \gamma_{i,m}^L - \tau_{i,m}^L), \quad (3.18)$$

where  $\gamma_{i,m}^L$  is defined as the solution to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \gamma_{i,m}^L) &= 0 && \text{in } (0, L)^d, \\ \gamma_{i,m}^L &= \theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m}(\infty) && \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d \setminus \partial \mathbb{H}_m, \\ \gamma_{i,m}^L &= 0 && \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d \cap \partial \mathbb{H}_m, \end{aligned}$$

and where  $\tau_{i,m}^L$  solves  $-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L) = 0$  in  $(0, L)^d$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{i,m}^L &= \theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m} - \theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m}(\infty) && \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d \setminus \partial \mathbb{H}_m, \\ \tau_{i,m}^L &= 0 && \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d \cap \partial \mathbb{H}_m. \end{aligned}$$

Observe in particular that  $\theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m} - \gamma_{i,m}^L - \tau_{i,m}^L \equiv 0$  on  $\partial[0, L]^d \setminus \partial \mathbb{H}_m$  and  $\theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m} - \gamma_{i,m}^L - \tau_{i,m}^L = \phi_i$  on  $\partial[0, L]^d \cap \partial \mathbb{H}_m$ . Notice that the boundary conditions for  $\tau_{i,m}^L$  in particular implies in view of (2.4) from Theorem 1 that

$$|\tau_{i,m}^L|(x) \leq \mathcal{C}(1 + \text{dist}(x, E))^{1-d/2+\delta} \quad \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d. \quad (3.19)$$

Note also that some mathematical issues may arise due to the discontinuity of the boundary data for  $\gamma_{i,m}^L$  and  $\tau_{i,m}^L$  at the edges; to maintain strict mathematical rigor, a smoothing argument on a small scale would

be required. However, none of the below arguments will be affected by the smoothing procedure, hence we omit details of this technicality.

The representation (3.18) enables us to split

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a(e_i + \nabla \phi_i^L) dx &= \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a(e_i + \nabla \phi_i) dx - \sum_{m=1}^{2d} \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a \nabla \theta_i^{\mathbb{H}_m} dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^{2d} \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a \nabla \gamma_{i,m}^L dx + \sum_{m=1}^{2d} \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L dx. \end{aligned}$$

While the first term on the right-hand side is the desired one and the second term may be estimated by (2.4) from Theorem 1, it in particular remains to account for the contributions of the last two terms.

*Step 2: Estimate on  $\int \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L dx$ .* Our first goal is to bound the contributions

$$\left| \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L dx \right| + \left| \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L dx \right| \leq \mathcal{C} L^{-3/2}. \quad (3.20)$$

Heuristically, by the Poisson kernel formula, we expect (except at the corners)

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \tau_{i,m}^L|(x) &\leq \mathcal{C}(x) \int_{\partial[0,L]^d} \frac{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{x})}{|x - \tilde{x}|^d} |\tau_{i,m}^L(\tilde{x})| dS(\tilde{x}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}(x) \text{dist}(x, E)^{1-d/2+\delta} \text{dist}(x, \partial[0, L]^d)^{-1} + \mathcal{C}(x) \text{dist}(x, E)^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

However, this is in fact a more precise estimate than actually required for our conclusion. To make the required estimates rigorous without too much effort, we define  $h$  as the solution to  $-\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla h) = \nabla \cdot (\chi_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_k)$  in  $(0, L)^d$  with  $h = 0$  on  $\partial[0, L]^d$ . Using the equations for  $h$  and (in the second step) for  $\tau_{i,m}^L$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_k \cdot \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L dx \\ &= (1 - 2\kappa)^{-d} L^{-d} \int_{[0,L]^d} \tau_{i,m}^L \mathbf{n} \cdot a^* \nabla h dS \\ &\quad - (1 - 2\kappa)^{-d} L^{-d} \int_{[0,L]^d} a \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L \cdot \nabla h dx \\ &= (1 - 2\kappa)^{-d} L^{-d} \int_{[0,L]^d} \tau_{i,m}^L \mathbf{n} \cdot a^* \nabla h dS. \end{aligned}$$

A regularity theory estimate for  $\nabla h$  (being  $a$ -harmonic in a neighborhood of the boundary) yields (see for instance [23] for the two-dimensional case, the higher-dimensional case being analogous)

$$|\nabla h|(x) \leq \mathcal{C}(x) \left( \int_{[0,L]^d} |\nabla h|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{C}(x).$$

Plugging this into the previous bound and using the estimate (3.19) for the boundary data of  $\tau_{i,m}^L$ , we arrive at

$$\left| \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_k \cdot \nabla \tau_{i,m}^L dx \right| \leq \mathcal{C}(L^{-d/2+\delta} + L^{-2}).$$

Proceeding analogously for the flux (simply inserting a factor of  $a^*$  in the right-hand side of the equation for  $h$ ), we obtain (3.20).

*Step 3: Estimate on  $\int \nabla \gamma_{i,m}^L dx$ .* Concerning  $\gamma_{i,m}^L$ , we employ a two-scale expansion ansatz

$$\gamma_{i,m}^L = \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L + \phi_j^L \partial_j \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L + w_{i,m}^L$$

with  $\bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L$  solving

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\bar{a} \nabla \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L) &= 0 && \text{in } (0, L)^d, \\ \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L &= \theta_i^{\mathbb{H}^m}(\infty) && \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d \setminus \partial\mathbb{H}_m, \\ \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L &= 0 && \text{on } \partial[0, L]^d \cap \partial\mathbb{H}_m, \end{aligned}$$

and with  $w_i^L$  solving

$$-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla w_{i,m}^L) = \nabla \cdot ((a \phi_j^L - \sigma_j) \partial_j \nabla \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L) + a (\nabla \phi_j^L - \nabla \phi_j) \cdot \nabla \partial_j \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data. Note that the equation satisfied by  $w_{i,m}^L$  is obtained by the usual property of the two-scale expansion

$$-\nabla \cdot \left( a \nabla \left( \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L + \sum_j \phi_j \partial_j \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L \right) \right) = -\nabla \cdot ((a \phi_j - \sigma_j) \partial_j \nabla \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L).$$

Due to the piecewise constant boundary data we have  $|D^2 \bar{\gamma}_j^L|(x) \leq C \text{dist}(x, E)^{-2}$ .

Defining the function  $h$  as the solution to the equation  $-\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla h) = \nabla \cdot (\chi_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_k)$  in  $(0, L)^d$  with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data, we deduce using first this equation and then the equation for  $w_{i,m}^L$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_k \cdot \nabla w_{i,m}^L dx &= -(1-2\kappa)^{-d} L^{-d} \int_{(0,L)^d} a^* \nabla h \cdot \nabla w_{i,m}^L dx \\ &= (1-2\kappa)^{-d} L^{-d} \int_{(0,L)^d} (a \phi_j^L - \sigma_j) \partial_j \nabla \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L \cdot \nabla h dx \\ &\quad - (1-2\kappa)^{-d} L^{-d} \int_{(0,L)^d} h a (\nabla \phi_j^L - \nabla \phi_j) \cdot \nabla \partial_j \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L dx. \end{aligned}$$

Again, by regularity theory we have  $|\nabla h|(x) \leq \mathcal{C}(x)$  and thus  $|h(x)| \leq \mathcal{C}(x) \text{dist}(x, \partial[0, L]^d)$ . Furthermore, applying Lemma 25 to  $\zeta(\phi_j^L - \phi_j)$  for a suitable cutoff  $\zeta$  and inserting the bound from Theorem 4, we see that  $|\nabla \phi_j^L - \nabla \phi_j| \leq \mathcal{C}(x) L^{-1+\delta}$  on  $[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d$ . We thus obtain (using again an analogous argument for the flux contribution)

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} \nabla \gamma_{i,m}^L dx - \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} (e_j + \nabla \phi_j^L) \partial_j \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L dx \right| \\ &+ \left| \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a \nabla \gamma_{i,m}^L dx - \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a (e_j + \nabla \phi_j^L) \partial_j \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L dx \right| \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} L^{-2+\delta}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

*Step 4: Conclusion.* Using the splitting (3.18), the decay estimate for the boundary layer corrector gradient (2.4), the bounds (3.20) and (3.21), and the classical fluctuation estimate  $|\int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} \nabla \phi_i^L dx| \leq \mathcal{C} L^{-d/2}$ , we deduce

$$\int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_i + \nabla \phi_i^L dx = \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_i + \sum_{m=1}^{2d} \nabla \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L dx + \mathcal{R}_1 \tag{3.22a}$$

and

$$\int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a (e_i + \nabla \phi_i^L) dx \tag{3.22b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a (e_i + \nabla \phi_i) dx + \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a (e_j + \nabla \phi_j^L) \sum_{m=1}^{2d} \partial_j \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L dx + \mathcal{R}_2 \\ &= \bar{a} \int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} e_i + \sum_{m=1}^{2d} \nabla \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L dx + \mathcal{R}_3 \end{aligned} \tag{3.22c}$$

with random variables  $\mathcal{R}_k$  estimated as  $|\mathcal{R}_1| + |\mathcal{R}_2| + |\mathcal{R}_3| \leq \mathcal{C}(L^{-d/2+\delta} + L^{-2+\delta})$  for some random variable  $\mathcal{C}$  with uniformly bounded stretched exponential moments. Here in the last step we have used the (classical) result that

$$\int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} a(e_j + \nabla \phi_j) dx = \bar{a}e_j + \mathcal{R}$$

with  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq \mathcal{C}L^{-d/2}$ , see e. g. [19].

Note that if all the  $\mathcal{R}_j$  were zero, the equations (3.22) and the definition (2.8) together would imply  $\bar{a}^L = \bar{a}$ . In general, we see that the quantity  $\bar{a}^L$  is obtained by inverting a  $d^2$ -dimensional system of linear equations, and in fact this system is (with overwhelming probability) a perturbation of order  $L^{-\min\{d/2, 2\}+\delta}$  of well-conditioned deterministic system with solution  $\bar{a}$  (note that the deterministic system is well-conditioned since  $\int_{[\kappa L, (1-\kappa)L]^d} |\nabla \bar{\gamma}_{i,m}^L| dx \lesssim L^{-1}$ ). The perturbation series for linear systems of equations now yields the desired assertion.  $\square$

## 4 Argument for Proposition 1: A suboptimal decay estimate for the boundary layer

The main step towards proving Proposition 1 is the following lemma:

**Lemma 7.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, there exist random fields  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(a, x)$ , defined on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , that are stationary with respect with respect to tangential shifts and with stretched exponential moments –in the sense of (2.3)– such that*

$$\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \left(1 + \frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \quad (4.1)$$

for any  $x_0 \in \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  and  $r \geq \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(a, x_0)\varepsilon$ .

To obtain (4.1) we morally “transfer the regularity” from a corresponding homogenized solution (with the same boundary data as  $\theta_i$  on a ball) onto  $\theta_i$ . We do this via a homogenization-inspired Campanato iteration.

The argument for Lemma 7 uses four auxiliary lemmas, which are proven in Section 4.2. In the first auxiliary lemma, we state an estimate for the whole space corrector that is obtained by combining Theorem 4 of Appendix A with the maximal ergodic theorem.

**Lemma 8.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, there exists a stationary random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$ , defined on  $\Omega \times \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , with stretched exponential moments –in the sense of (2.3)–, such that*

$$\sup_{r \geq 1} \left( \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\phi|^2 + |\sigma|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda} \mathcal{C}(x_0, a)\varepsilon, \quad (4.2)$$

for any  $x_0 \in \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ .

The second auxiliary lemma is a weighted energy estimate that is a consequence of the classical Hardy inequality.

**Lemma 9.** *Let the assumption (A1) hold and  $x_0 \in \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . Then there exists  $\kappa = \kappa(d, \lambda) > 0$  such that, for any  $r > 0$  and  $w \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)$  a solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla u) &= \nabla \cdot g + f && \text{in } B_r^+(x_0), \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d \cap B_r^+(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

there holds

$$\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x - x_0|}{r}\right)^\kappa |\nabla u|^2 dx \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\kappa} \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x - x_0|}{r}\right)^\kappa (|g|^2 + r^2 f^2) dx \quad (4.3)$$



The last auxiliary lemma gives the constant-coefficient regularity results that we “transfer” onto the heterogenous solution  $\theta_i$ . Both Lemmas 9 and 10 are also used in the proof of Proposition 24.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $d \geq 2$  and  $x_0 \in \overline{\mathbb{H}}_+^d$ . Furthermore, let  $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be uniformly elliptic and bounded with ellipticity constant  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\|\bar{a}\| \leq 1$ . Let  $v$  be  $\bar{a}$ -harmonic in  $B_R^+(x_0)$  with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data on  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d \cap B_R^+(x_0)$ . Then, for any  $\rho \in (0, \frac{R}{2}]$ , we have that*

$$\sup_{B_{R-\rho}^+(x_0)} (\rho^2 |\nabla^2 v|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) \lesssim_{d,\lambda} \left(\frac{R}{\rho}\right)^d \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx. \quad (4.4)$$

This lemma follows from using the Sobolev embedding and iterating the Caccoppoli inequality in directions tangential to  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$ . To recover the desired estimate in the  $e_1$ -direction, one uses the equation solved by  $v$  –this strategy is also used in Step 3 of the proof of Lemma 22. The full proof can be found in [13, Lemma 4.2], we do not repeat it here.

Once we have access to Lemma 7, it remains to post-process (4.1) to obtain the pointwise estimate (3.2). For this we use the following lemma, which is also proved in Section 4.2 and is a simple consequence of standard Schauder theory.

**Lemma 11.** *Let the assumption (A4) be satisfied and  $u$  be a weak solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla u) &= \nabla \cdot g + f && \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\varepsilon(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \left[ \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \left( \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2\varepsilon}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} + \|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2\varepsilon}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  has stretched exponential moments –in the sense of (2.3)– which depend only on  $d, \lambda, \alpha, \nu$ .

## 4.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Here is the Proof of Lemma 7:

*Proof of Lemma 7.* Let  $1 \leq i \leq d$  and assume w.l.o.g. that  $\varepsilon = 1$ . Our argument comes in three steps: First, in Step 1, we initialize the Campanato iteration. Then, in Step 2, we show the requisite excess decay. In Step 3, we conclude our argument by iterating the decay estimate obtained in the previous step.

Throughout this argument we use  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  to denote a generic random field on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{H}_+^d$  that is stationary with respect to tangential shifts and has stretched exponential moments –by tracking these random fields in the proof below, one finds that all of the random-fields that appear are polynomial in the random-field from Theorem 4.

**Step 1: Initiation of the iteration.** such that

We show that  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ -a.s. there exists a large enough radius  $r > 0$

$$\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{r^{\frac{2}{3}}}. \quad (4.6)$$

To show this, we introduce the event that (4.6) fails for all  $r > 0$  and denote it by  $\mathcal{B}$ . We then have that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[ \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{r^{\frac{2}{3}}} \right] \quad (4.7)$$

for any fixed  $r > 0$ . To estimate the right-hand probability, we notice that by the stationarity of  $\nabla\theta_i$  tangentially to  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$  we have

$$\left\langle \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla\theta_i|^2 dx \right\rangle \lesssim \frac{1}{r} \left\langle \int_0^\infty |\nabla\theta_i(x_0 + z)|^2 dz \right\rangle \lesssim \frac{1}{r}. \quad (4.8)$$

We then apply Chebyshev's inequality to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla\theta_i|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{r^{\frac{2}{3}}}\right] \lesssim \frac{1}{r^{\frac{2}{3}}}. \quad (4.9)$$

Since this is true for any  $r > 0$ , we find that  $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}] = 0$ .

**Step 2: Comparison to constant coefficient problem.** We will now show that there exist constants  $\nu > 0$  and  $C_q > 0$  such that the bound

We will now show that there exist constants

$$\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla\theta|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2}\nu^{-1} \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla\theta|^2 dx + \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{1}{r} + C_q \left( \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla\theta|^2 dx \right)^2 \quad (4.10)$$

holds for any  $R \geq r \geq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0)$  such that  $\frac{r}{R} = \nu$  -notice that  $C_q$  and also the random fields may depend on  $\nu$ .

We first set up our argument: notice that w.l.o.g.  $1 \leq r \leq \frac{R}{8}$ , as otherwise (4.10) is trivial. Let  $\zeta$  be a vertical cutoff along  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$  such that  $\zeta \equiv 1$  in  $\{x^\perp \leq 1\}$ ,  $\zeta \equiv 0$  in  $\{x^\perp \geq 2\}$ , and  $|\nabla\zeta| \lesssim 1$ ; and, for some  $\rho \leq R/8$  to be determined, we take  $\eta$  to be a smooth cutoff for  $B_{R/2-2\rho}(x_0)$  in  $B_{R/2-\rho}(x_0)$  such that  $|\nabla\eta| \leq 2/\rho$ . We then define the ‘‘homogenization error’’ as

$$w := \theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - (v + \eta(\phi_j - \theta_j)\partial_j v), \quad (4.11)$$

where  $v$  is the solution to the constant coefficient problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\bar{a}\nabla v) &= 0 && \text{in } B_{R/2}^+(x_0), \\ v &= \theta_i - \zeta\phi_i && \text{on } \partial B_{R/2}^+(x_0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Notice that  $w \equiv 0$  on  $\partial B_{R/2}^+(x_0)$  and satisfies the relation

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a\nabla w) &= -\underbrace{\nabla \cdot (a\nabla\theta_i)}_{=0} + \nabla \cdot (a\nabla(\phi_i\zeta)) + \nabla \cdot (a(\phi_j - \theta_j)\nabla(\eta\partial_j v)) \\ &\quad + \nabla \cdot (a(e_j + \nabla\phi_j - \nabla\theta_j)\eta\partial_j v) + \nabla \cdot ((1 - \eta)a\nabla v) \\ &= \nabla \cdot (a\nabla(\phi_i\zeta)) + \nabla \cdot (a(\phi_j - \theta_j)\nabla(\eta\partial_j v)) \\ &\quad + \underbrace{a(e_j + \nabla\phi_j - \nabla\theta_j) \cdot \nabla(\eta\partial_j v)}_{= \nabla \cdot (\bar{a}\eta\nabla v) + (\nabla \cdot \sigma_j - a\nabla\theta_j) \cdot \nabla(\eta\partial_j v)} + \nabla \cdot ((1 - \eta)a\nabla v) \end{aligned}$$

in  $B_{R/2}^+(x_0)$ . In particular, we find that  $w$  solves

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a\nabla w) &= \nabla \cdot (a\nabla(\zeta\phi_i) + (a(\phi_j - \theta_j) - \sigma_j)\nabla(\eta\partial_j v) + (1 - \eta)(a - \bar{a})\nabla v) \\ &\quad - a\nabla\theta_j \cdot \nabla(\eta\partial_j v) && \text{in } B_{R/2}^+(x_0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

$$w = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_{R/2}^+(x_0), \quad (4.14)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the whole space flux-corrector.

We now begin with our argument. Notice that

$$\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - v(x_0^\parallel) - \partial_j v(x_0^\parallel)(x_j + \phi_j - \theta_j) = \theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1),$$

thanks to the boundary data of  $v$ . Furthermore,  $\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1)$  solves the equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a\nabla(\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1))) &= \nabla \cdot (a\nabla(\zeta\phi_i)) \quad \text{in } B_{R/2}^+(x_0), \\ \theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1) &= 0 \quad \text{on } B_{R/2}^+(x_0) \cap \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d. \end{aligned}$$

Emulating the classical proof for the Caccioppoli estimate, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla\theta_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(e_1 + \nabla\phi_1 - \nabla\theta_1)|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\nabla(\zeta\phi_i)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1) - c|^2 dx \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Towards showing (4.10), we use the definition of  $w$  (see (4.11)) and the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality to obtain using also that  $R \geq 8r$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1) - c|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x - x_0|}{R}\right)^\kappa |\nabla w|^2 dx + r^{d-2} \sup_{x \in B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |v(x) - (v(x_0^\parallel) + \partial_j v(x_0^\parallel)x_j)|^2 \\ &\quad + r^{-2} \sup_{x \in B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\nabla v(x) - \nabla v(x_0^\parallel)|^2 \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} (|\phi|^2 + |\theta|^2) dx, \end{aligned}$$

for the choice  $c = \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} w dx$ ; note that in this computation we have also used the fact that the weight in the second line satisfies  $(1 - |x - x_0|/R) \geq \frac{1}{2}$  in  $B_{R/2}^+(x_0)$ . This implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1) - c|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim r^{-d} \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x - x_0|}{R}\right)^\kappa |\nabla w|^2 dx + \sup_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\nabla^2 v|^2 \left(r^2 + \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} (|\phi|^2 + |\theta|^2) dx\right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (4.3) from Lemma 9 to the function  $w$  in  $B_{R/2}^+(x_0)$  and using the equation (4.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(x_1 + \phi_1 - \theta_1) - c|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} |\nabla(\zeta\phi_i)|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \sup_{B_{R/2-\rho}^+(x_0)} (\rho^{-2} |\nabla v|^2 + |\nabla^2 v|^2) \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} (|\phi|^2 + |\theta|^2 + |\sigma|^2 + R^2 |\nabla\theta|^2) dx \\ &\quad + r^d \sup_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\nabla^2 v|^2 \left(r^2 + \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} (|\phi|^2 + |\theta|^2) dx\right) + \left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^\kappa \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Plugging the bound (4.16) into (4.15), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla\theta_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(e_1 + \nabla\phi_1 - \nabla\theta_1)|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\nabla(\zeta\phi_i)|^2 dx + \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} |\nabla(\zeta\phi_i)|^2 dx \\ &\quad + R^d \sup_{B_{R/2-\rho}^+(x_0)} (\rho^{-2} |\nabla v|^2 + |\nabla^2 v|^2) \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} (|\phi|^2 + |\theta|^2 + |\sigma|^2 + R^2 |\nabla\theta|^2) dx \\ &\quad + R^d \sup_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\nabla^2 v|^2 \left(r^2 + \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} (|\phi|^2 + |\theta|^2) dx\right) + \left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^\kappa \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

We now collect some ingredients: First, recall that

$$\sup_{r \geq 1} \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\phi_i|^2 dx \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0), \quad (4.18)$$

which comes from (A.2) of Theorem 4. Using this in conjunction with the Caccioppoli estimate applied to  $\phi_i + x_i$ , we obtain

$$\sup_{r \geq 1} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla \phi_i|^2 dx + \sup_{r \geq 1} \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla \phi_i|^2 dx \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0). \quad (4.19)$$

An estimate analogous to (4.18) also holds for  $\sigma$ . We also use the constant-coefficient regularity estimate (4.4) of Lemma 10 applied to  $v$ . Notice that when  $r \leq R/4$ , the estimate

$$\sup_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\nabla^2 v|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^d \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx \quad (4.20)$$

follows from (4.4) by taking  $\rho = 2r$ .

Using these tools and taking averages on both side and choosing  $0 < \rho \ll r$ , we rewrite (4.17) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i - \partial_1 v(x_0^\parallel)(e_1 + \nabla \phi_1 - \nabla \theta_1)|^2 dx \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^d \int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} |\nabla(\zeta \phi_i)|^2 dx + r^{-1} \\ & + \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^d \left( \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx \right) \left[ \left(\frac{R}{\rho}\right)^2 \left( \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) r^{-2} + R^{-2} \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} (|\theta|^2 + R^2 |\nabla \theta|^2) dx \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + r^{-2} \int_{B_{2r}^+(x_0)} |\theta|^2 dx + \left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^\kappa \right] \\ & + \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^2 \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

We continue to process the above expression by using the bound

$$\int_{B_{R/2}^+(x_0)} |\nabla(\zeta \phi_i)|^2 dx \lesssim \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{1}{R}, \quad (4.22)$$

which follows from (4.18), (4.19), and the definition of the cutoff  $\zeta$ . Furthermore, since  $\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i$  has homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data on  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , the Poincaré inequality and (4.22) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\theta_i|^2 dx & \lesssim \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i|^2 dx + \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\zeta \phi_i|^2 dx \\ & \lesssim R^2 \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla(\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i)|^2 dx + \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{1}{R} \\ & \lesssim R^2 \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx + \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) R. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

This bound is also valid for  $R$  replaced by  $2r$ .

We then finally notice that  $v - (\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i)$  solves the equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\bar{a} \nabla (v - (\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i))) & = \nabla \cdot (\bar{a} \nabla (\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i)) & \text{in } B_{R/2}^+(x_0), \\ v - (\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i) & = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{R/2}^+(x_0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

whereby the energy estimate yields

$$\int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{B_R^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 + |\nabla(\zeta \phi_i)|^2 dx. \quad (4.25)$$

Observe also that by the Caccioppoli inequality for  $x_1 + \phi_1$ , the estimate (4.18), and (4.20) (the latter for  $r = R/4$ ) we have for  $r \geq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0)$

$$\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\partial_1 v(x_0)| |e_1 + \nabla \phi_1 - \nabla \theta_1|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^d \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta_1|^2 dx \right]. \quad (4.26)$$

Combining (4.21) with (4.22), (4.23), (4.25), and (4.26) yields (4.10) after choosing  $\nu := r/R$  and  $\rho/R \ll \nu$  small enough.

**Step 3: Iteration to smaller scales.** The result (4.10) of the previous step implies that

$$\int_{B_{\nu^{k+1}R_0}^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \nu^{-1} \int_{B_{\nu^k R_0}^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta|^2 dx + \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{1}{r} + C_q \left( \int_{B_{\nu^k R_0}^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta|^2 dx \right)^2$$

for any  $R_0 > 0$  as long as  $\nu^{k+1}R_0 \geq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0)$ . This enables us to inductively propagate an estimate of the form

$$\int_{B_{\nu^k R_0}^+(x_0)} |\nabla \theta|^2 dx \leq \frac{4\mathcal{C}(a, x_0)}{(\nu^k R_0)^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

as long as

$$C_q \left( \frac{4\mathcal{C}(a, x_0)}{(\nu^k R_0)^{\frac{2}{3}}} \right)^2 \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}(a, x_0)}{(\nu^{k+1} R_0)^{\frac{2}{3}}},$$

or equivalently  $\nu^k R_0 \geq (16\mathcal{C}(a, x_0)C_q)^{3/2} \nu$ . The start of the induction is provided by (4.6). This directly entails our desired result.  $\square$

With the result of Lemma 7 in hand, the argument for Proposition 1 is now a simple matter of applying the regularity statement of Proposition 24.

*Proof of Proposition 1.* Without loss of generality we may assume  $\varepsilon = 1$ . Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}_+^d$  and  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . For  $x_0^\perp \geq 1$  the statement of Proposition 1 is an immediate consequence of (4.1) applied for  $r = 2x_0^\perp$  and the regularity estimate (B.3) applied with  $r := \frac{1}{2}x_0^\perp$ .

To see the statement in case  $x_0^\perp \leq 1$ , let  $\zeta$  be a cutoff with  $\zeta = 1$  on  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$  and  $\zeta \equiv 0$  outside of  $\{x : \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d) < \frac{1}{2}\}$ . Applying (B.3) to  $\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i$  solving  $-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla (\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i)) = \nabla \cdot (a \nabla (\zeta \phi_i))$ , we find by Lemma 23 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_{1/2}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla \theta_i(x)| &\leq \|\nabla \theta_i\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \\ &\lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha,\nu} \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \left[ \left( \int_{B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla(\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{x^\perp \leq 2} \|a \nabla \phi_i\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

To treat the first term on the right-hand side of (4.27) we notice that by Lemma 23 and Theorem 4, we have

$$\left( \int_{B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla(\theta_i - \zeta \phi_i)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda} \bar{r}(a, x_0)^{\frac{d}{2}} \left( \int_{B_{\bar{r}(a, x_0)}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \quad (4.28)$$

where we take  $\bar{r}(a, x_0) := \max(r^*(a, x_0), \tilde{C}(a, x_0^\parallel), 1)$  with  $r^*(a, x_0)$  taken from Proposition 24 and with  $\tilde{C}(a, x_0^\parallel)$  defined in the statement of Lemma 7—both have stretched exponential moments, which guarantees that  $\bar{r}(a, x_0)$  does as well.

To finish the argument we consider two cases: First, let  $x_0^\perp \leq \bar{r}(a, x_0)$ . Using (4.1) of Lemma 7, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla(\theta_i - \zeta\phi_i)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \bar{r}(a, x_0)^{\frac{d}{2}} \left( \int_{B_{2\bar{r}(a, x_0)}(x_0^\parallel) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla\theta_i|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0^\parallel) \bar{r}(a, x_0)^{\frac{d}{2}} (1 + 2\bar{r}(a, x_0))^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0^\parallel) \bar{r}(a, x_0)^{\frac{d}{2}} (1 + x_0^\perp)^{-\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

To control the second term on the right-hand side of (4.27), we use assumption (A4) to write

$$\|a\nabla\phi_i\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_2(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \lesssim_{\alpha,\nu} \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \|\nabla\phi_i\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_2(x_0))} \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\alpha,\nu} \mathcal{C}(a, x_0).$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 4.2 Proof of auxiliary lemmas for Proposition 1

*Proof of Lemma 9.* Letting  $\eta(x) = (1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r})^{\frac{\kappa}{2}}$ , we test the equation for  $u$  with  $\eta^2 u$ . Using the uniform ellipticity of  $a$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r}\right)^\kappa |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{\kappa^2}{r^2} \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r}\right)^{\kappa-2} u^2 dx + \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r}\right)^\kappa (|g|^2 + r^2 f^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

When  $x_0^\perp \geq r$ , then the first term on the right-hand side may be absorbed thanks to the Hardy inequality in [25, Theorem 1.6]. We use that  $x_0 \in \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$  to write the domain  $B_r^+(x_0)$  in terms of 1-dimensional filaments that originate at  $x_0$  and terminate on the round part of  $\partial B_r^+$ . On each of the rays we apply the 1-dimensional Hardy's inequality:

$$\int_0^{r'} \rho^{\kappa-2} h^2(\rho) d\rho \lesssim \frac{1}{(1-\kappa)^2} \int_0^{r'} \rho^\kappa (h'(\rho))^2 d\rho,$$

for  $r' > 0$ , which holds under the assumption  $h(0) = 0$ , to the effect of

$$\int_{B_r^+(x_0) \setminus B_{r/3}(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r}\right)^{\kappa-2} u^2 dx \lesssim \frac{r^2}{(1-\kappa)^2} \int_{B_r^+(x_0) \setminus B_{r/3}(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r}\right)^\kappa |\nabla u|^2 dx.$$

Notice that we have removed the ball  $B_{r/3}$  from the domain of integration on the left-hand side. To finish the argument we use the Poincaré-Wirtinger type inequality

$$\int_{B_{2r/3}^+(x_0)} u^2 dx \lesssim r^2 \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{B_{2r/3}^+(x_0) \setminus B_{r/3}(x_0)} u^2 dx,$$

combined with the fact that for  $|x-x_0| < 2r/3$  the weight  $(1 - |x-x_0|/r)^\kappa$  has values between  $1/2$  and  $1$  (for  $\kappa$  small enough), to obtain

$$\int_{B_r^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r}\right)^{\kappa-2} u^2 dx \lesssim r^2 \int_{B_r^+(x_0)} \left(1 - \frac{|x-x_0|}{r}\right)^\kappa |\nabla u|^2 dx.$$

$\square$

*Proof of Lemma 11.* By standard Schauder theory, see e.g. [16, Theorem 5.19], we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \\ &\leq C \left( d, \lambda, \|a\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right) \left[ \left( \int_{B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} + \|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which, via a simple scaling argument, becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} &\leq C\left(d, \lambda, \delta^\alpha \|a\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)}\right) \\ &\times \left[ \delta^{-\alpha} \left( \int_{B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} + \|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

for any  $\delta > 0$ . To ensure that the constant in (4.29) is uniform in  $x_0$ , we use the assumption (A4) and set  $\delta = \mathcal{C}(a, x_0)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varepsilon$  so that

$$\delta^\alpha \|a\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \leq 1.$$

We then use a covering argument and that  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  in (A4) is locally uniform in  $x$  to write

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\varepsilon(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in B_\varepsilon(x_0)} \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(y)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \\ &\leq C(d, \lambda) \sup_{y \in B_\varepsilon(x_0)} \left[ \delta^{-\alpha} \left( \int_{B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} + \|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\delta(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right] \\ &\leq C(d, \lambda) \left[ \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \mathcal{C}^{d/\alpha} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2\varepsilon}(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} + \|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2\varepsilon}(x_0)\cap\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which completes our argument.  $\square$

## 5 Argument for Proposition 5: Fluctuation estimates for the boundary layer corrector

In our proof of Proposition 5 we use that the spectral gap inequality (A3) entails a corresponding estimate on arbitrary polynomial moments.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  be an ensemble satisfying the assumption (A3). Then for any random variable  $F$  and  $q \geq 1$  the estimate*

$$\langle (F - \langle F \rangle)^{2q} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \leq C q^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial a} \right| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \quad (5.1)$$

holds.

This standard lemma has been shown e.g. in [10, Prop. 3.1]. Applying (5.1) to the random variable  $F$  defined in (3.12) and deriving an expression for the “vertical derivatives” on the right-hand side –we find that obtaining (3.13) reduces to estimating certain auxiliary functions that are used to describe  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a}$ .

We organize the argument into three parts: First, in Section 5.1, we derive an expression for  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a}$  in terms of auxiliary functions  $h$ ,  $v_1$ , and  $v_2$  –each solving an elliptic equation with coefficient field  $a^*$  on either  $\mathcal{O}$  with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data or on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with a decay condition. In Section 5.2, we prove a weighted Meyers estimate (Lemma 14) –this follows from the large-scale regularity theory for  $a$ -harmonic functions with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data on  $\mathcal{O}$ , which is obtained in Proposition 24. The result of Lemma 14, which has become a standard tool in stochastic homogenization, yields estimates for the auxiliary functions  $h$ ,  $v_1$ , and  $v_2$ . In Section 5.3, we finish our argument by combining these estimates with Lemma 12 and the expression for  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a}$  that has been derived in Section 5.1.

## 5.1 Identification of the Malliavin / Fréchet derivative

In this section we calculate  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a}$  in terms of auxiliary functions  $h$ ,  $v_1$ , and  $v_2$ .

**Lemma 13.** *We adopt the assumptions of Proposition 5. Let  $h \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{O})$  solve*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla h) &= \nabla \cdot g \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ h &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

and  $\hat{h} \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be the decaying solution of

$$-\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla \hat{h}) = \nabla \cdot g \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.3}$$

When  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$ ,  $h$  is the decaying solution of (5.2); when  $\mathcal{O}$  is a bounded  $C^{1,1}$  domain then  $h \in H^1(\mathcal{O})$ . We, furthermore, define  $v_1$  and  $v_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  as the decaying solutions of

$$-\nabla \cdot a^* \nabla v_1 = \nabla f \cdot a^* (\chi_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla h - \nabla \hat{h}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$-\nabla \cdot a^* \nabla v_2 = -\nabla \cdot (f a^* (\chi_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla h - \nabla \hat{h})) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{5.5}$$

respectively. Then, for  $F$  defined in (3.12), the vertical derivative  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a}$  is given by

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial a} = \chi_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h - (e_i + \nabla \phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2). \tag{5.6}$$

*Proof.* Calculating the sensitivity of  $u$  solving (3.11) to compactly supported perturbations of  $a$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \delta u) &= \nabla \cdot (\delta a \nabla u) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ \delta u &= f \delta \phi_i \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Similarly, for  $\phi_i$  we obtain

$$-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \delta \phi_i) = \nabla \cdot (\delta a (e_i + \nabla \phi_i)) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.8}$$

The relations (5.2) and (5.7) then allow us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \delta F &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} g \cdot \nabla \delta u \, dx \\ &= - \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla \delta u \cdot a^* \nabla h \, dx + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} \delta u \mathbf{n} \cdot a^* \nabla h \, dS \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} \delta a \nabla u \cdot \nabla h \, dx + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} f \delta \phi_i \mathbf{n} \cdot a^* \nabla h \, dS. \end{aligned}$$

Again using the equation (5.2) and now also that  $g$  is compactly supported in  $\mathcal{O}$ , the second term on the right-hand side may be rewritten as

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} f \delta \phi_i \mathbf{n} \cdot a^* \nabla h \, dS = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla (f \delta \phi_i) \cdot (a^* \nabla h + g) \, dx.$$

By (5.3) we see that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla (f \delta \phi_i) \cdot g \, dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla (f \delta \phi_i) \cdot a^* \nabla \hat{h} \, dx,$$

which then leads to

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} f \delta \phi_i \mathbf{n} \cdot a^* \nabla h \, dS = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla (f \delta \phi_i) \cdot a^* (\nabla h - \nabla \hat{h}) \, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{O}} \nabla (f \delta \phi_i) \cdot a^* \nabla \hat{h} \, dx.$$



Using the equations (5.4), (5.5) and (5.8), we rewrite the right-hand side as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla(f\delta\phi_i) \cdot a^*(\nabla h - \nabla\hat{h}) \, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{O}} \nabla(f\delta\phi_i) \cdot a^*\nabla\hat{h} \, dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta\phi_i \nabla f \cdot a^*(\chi_{\mathcal{O}}\nabla h - \nabla\hat{h}) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \nabla\delta\phi_i \cdot a^*(\chi_{\mathcal{O}}\nabla h - \nabla\hat{h}) \, dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla\delta\phi_i \cdot a^*(\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2) \, dx \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \delta a(\nabla\phi_i + e_i) \cdot (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2) \right) \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above identities, we obtain

$$\delta F = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \delta a \nabla u \cdot \nabla h \, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta a(\nabla\phi_i + e_i) \cdot (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2) \, dx,$$

which concludes our argument.  $\square$

## 5.2 Estimates on the auxiliary functions: A weighted Meyers estimate

Having calculated the derivative of  $F$  with respect to changes in the coefficient field  $a$  in the previous step, we now seek to control the terms on the right-hand side of (5.6) by obtaining suitable estimates for  $v_1, v_2$ , and  $h$ . For this, the main tool is the following weighted Meyers estimate:

**Lemma 14** (Weighted Meyers Estimate). *Let  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  be an ensemble of coefficient fields on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfies the assumptions (A1)-(A4). Furthermore, let  $x_0 \in \mathcal{O}$  –where  $\mathcal{O}$  is a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain,  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , or  $\mathbb{R}^d$ – and  $R \geq r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)$  (defined in Proposition 24). For  $f_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{O})$  and  $F_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , let  $v$  denote the unique solution of*

$$\begin{aligned}
-\nabla \cdot (a^*\nabla v) &= \nabla \cdot F_0 + f_0 && \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\
v &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

and introduce the weight

$$\omega_{\alpha,R}(x) := \left( \frac{|x - x_0|}{R} + 1 \right)^\alpha. \tag{5.10}$$

Then, in the case that  $f_0 = 0$ , there exists  $\bar{p}(\lambda, d, \mathcal{O}) > 1$  such that, for  $1 \leq p < \bar{p}$  and  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < d(2p-1)$ , the estimate

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla v|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0,R} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, p, \mathcal{O}, \alpha_0, \alpha_1) \left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |F_0|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1,R} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \tag{5.11}$$

holds. Likewise, in the case that  $F_0 = 0$ , there exists  $\bar{p}(\lambda, d, \mathcal{O}) > 1$  such that, for  $1 \leq p < \bar{p}$  and  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 - 2p < \alpha_1 < d(2p-1)$ , the estimate

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla v|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0,R} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, p, \mathcal{O}, \alpha_0, \alpha_1) R \left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |f_0|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1,R} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \tag{5.12}$$

holds. We emphasize that when  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{R}^d$  or  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , the boundary condition in (5.9) is augmented by a decay condition in the far-field of the infinite part of the domain.

In the case that  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{R}^d$ , the statement has already been shown in [6, Lemma 7]. For completeness, we give a proof of Lemma 14 in Appendix C –we remark that it depends on the use of the classical Meyers estimate on the contributions of a dyadic decomposition of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Since  $v$  solving (5.9) does not have Dirichlet boundary conditions on the various members of the decomposition, when we apply the classical Meyers estimate on each contribution, we pick up an additional term on the right-hand side (see e. g. (C.8)), the sum of which we may handle by employing the large-scale regularity theory for  $a$ -harmonic functions on  $\mathcal{O}$ .

An immediate consequence of Lemma 14 is the following estimate:

**Corollary 15.** *Adopt the assumptions of Proposition 5. Then, for  $h$  and  $\hat{h}$  solving (5.2) and (5.3) respectively, there exists  $\bar{p}(d, \lambda) > 1$  such that, for  $1 \leq p < \bar{p}$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < d(2p - 1)$ , the estimates*

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, p, \mathcal{O}, \alpha) \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \quad (5.13a)$$

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, p, \mathcal{O}, \alpha) \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \quad (5.13b)$$

hold.

Since this corollary follows easily from Lemma 14, we forego a formal proof –notice that to obtain the result one simply applies Lemma 14 to  $h$  and  $\hat{h}$  and uses the definition of the weight (5.10), along with the property that  $g$  is supported in  $B_r(x_0)$ .

To obtain satisfactory control of  $\nabla v_1$  and  $\nabla v_2$  (solving (5.4) and (5.5) respectively), we require a better estimate for  $\nabla(h - \hat{h})$  than that following from the triangle inequality and Corollary 15. Towards this end, we prove the following lemma:

**Lemma 16.** *Adopt the assumptions of Proposition 5, and let  $R := \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)$  and  $h$  and  $\hat{h}$  solve (5.2) and (5.3) respectively. Then there exists  $\bar{p} > 1$  such that, for all  $1 \leq p < \bar{p}$  and  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < d(2p - 1)$  additionally satisfying  $\alpha_1 > 2p$ , the estimate*

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla(h - \hat{h})|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, p, \mathcal{O}, \alpha_0, \alpha_1) \left( \frac{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})}{r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \quad (5.14)$$

holds.

We make use of Lemma 16, which is proven at the end of this section, in the form of the next corollary. In particular, combining the estimate (5.14) on  $\nabla(h - \hat{h})$  inside  $\mathcal{O}$  with (5.13b) for  $\nabla \hat{h}$  outside of  $\mathcal{O}$ , we obtain:

**Corollary 17.** *Adopt the assumptions of Proposition 5, and let  $R := \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)$  and  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  solve (5.4) and (5.5) respectively. Then, for  $1 \leq p < \bar{p}$  and  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 - 2p < \alpha_1 < d(2p - 1)$ , the estimate*

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla v_i|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq C(d, \lambda, p, \mathcal{O}, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, f) \left( \frac{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})}{r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \quad (5.15)$$

holds for  $i = 1, 2$ . In fact, in the case that  $i = 2$ , (5.15) holds for  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < d(2p - 1)$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that  $R \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{O})$ , since otherwise (5.15) follows from the energy estimate and the Meyers estimate applied to (5.4) and (5.5), for  $i = 1, 2$  respectively.

We then first consider the case that  $i = 1$ . To obtain (5.15), we apply the whole space version of the weighted Meyers estimate (5.12) from Lemma 14 to  $v_1$  solving (5.4). This yields that

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla v_1|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim R \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f \cdot a^*(\chi_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla h - \nabla \hat{h})|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, R} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}$$

for  $1 < p \leq \bar{p}$  and  $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 - 2p < \alpha_1 < d(2p - 1)$ . In the case that  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , the right-hand side vanishes since  $f \equiv 1$ . When alternatively  $\mathcal{O}$  is a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain, (5.15) follows from (5.14), (5.13b), and that  $|\nabla f| \leq C$ .

The estimate for  $i = 2$  is obtained in essentially the same way, with the application of (5.11) to  $v_2$  solving (5.5). Since we use (5.11) instead of (5.12), the result (5.15) holds for  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < d(2p - 1)$ .  $\square$

To complete this section, we now give the proof of Lemma 16. For this we use Lemma 14 applied to  $h^T - \eta \hat{h}^T$ , where the cut-off  $\eta$  ensures homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data on  $\mathcal{O}$ . Here comes the argument:

*Proof of Lemma 16.* Let  $L = \text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})$ . Since (5.14) follows from (5.13a) and (5.13b) by the triangle inequality when  $L \leq 2(r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0) + r)$ , we may assume that  $L \geq 2(r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0) + r)$ .

The main idea of our argument is to split  $h - \hat{h}$  into a function which vanishes on  $\partial\mathcal{O}$  and a remainder, and show that (5.14) holds for both of these functions. To this end, let  $\hat{\eta} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a smooth function satisfying  $\hat{\eta}(t) = 1$  for  $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ ,  $\hat{\eta}(t) = 0$  for  $t \geq \frac{5}{8}$ , and  $|\hat{\eta}'| \leq 9$ , and use it to define a cutoff function  $\eta(x) := \hat{\eta}(\frac{|x-x_0|}{L})$ . Since  $L \geq 2(r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0) + r)$  and  $g$  is supported in  $B_r(x_0)$ , we see that  $\eta \equiv 1$  on the support of  $g$ ; furthermore,  $\eta = 0$  in a neighborhood of the boundary  $\partial\mathcal{O}$  and  $\text{supp}(\nabla\eta) \subseteq B_{\frac{3L}{4}}(x_0) \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)$ .

Defining  $w := h - \eta\hat{h}$  and using the equations (5.2) and (5.3), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla w) &= -\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla h) + \nabla \cdot (a^* \hat{h} \nabla \eta) + \nabla \cdot (a^* \eta \nabla \hat{h}) \\ &= \nabla \cdot g + \nabla \cdot (\hat{h} a^* \nabla \eta) + \eta(-\nabla \cdot g) + \nabla \eta \cdot a^* \nabla \hat{h} \\ &= \nabla \cdot (\hat{h} a^* \nabla \eta) + \nabla \eta \cdot a^* \nabla \hat{h} \\ &= \nabla \cdot (\hat{h} a^* \nabla \eta + K) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{O}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $K = \chi(B_{2L}(x_0)) \nabla k$ , with  $k$  being the solution of  $\Delta k = \nabla \eta \cdot a^* \nabla \hat{h}$  on  $\mathcal{O} \cap B_{2L}(x_0)$  with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data on  $\partial\mathcal{O} \cap B_{2L}(x_0)$  and homogeneous Neumann boundary data on  $\mathcal{O} \cap \partial B_{2L}(x_0)$ . Since both  $h = 0$  and  $\eta = 0$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}$ , we see that  $w = 0$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}$  as well.

Applying Lemma 14 to  $w$  and using that  $L \geq r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)$ , the estimate (5.11) implies that

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla w|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\hat{h} \nabla \eta|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} + \left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |K|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \quad (5.16)$$

for  $1 < p < \bar{p}$  and  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < d(2p - 1)$ .

We then treat the two terms on the right-hand side of (5.16) separately, beginning with the second term. For this, we first notice that the standard Meyers estimate applied to  $k$  gives

$$\int_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{2L}(x_0)} |\nabla k|^{2p} dx \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{3L}{4}}(x_0) \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} dx,$$

where we have used that  $|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{9}{L}$ . Since  $\omega_{\alpha_1, L} \sim 1$  in the support of  $K$ , this implies that

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |K|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \int_{B_{\frac{3L}{4}}(x_0) \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (5.17)$$

In order to estimate the first integral on the right-hand side of (5.16), we again use  $|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{9}{L}$  and the definition of the weight (5.10) to write

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\hat{h} \nabla \eta|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \frac{1}{L} \left( \int_{B_{\frac{3L}{4}}(x_0) \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1 - 2p, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (5.18)$$

To further process the right-hand side we show that

$$\left( \int_{B_{\frac{3L}{4}}(x_0) \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1 - 2p, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim L \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \quad (5.19)$$

which, when combined with (5.18), yields

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\hat{h} \nabla \eta|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (5.20)$$

We now prove (5.19). Using that  $\omega_{\alpha_1-2p,L} \sim 1$  on  $B_{\frac{3L}{4}}(x_0) \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)$  and the critical Sobolev embedding along with Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{B_{\frac{3L}{4}}(x_0) \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1-2p,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} &\lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{\frac{2pd}{2p+d}} dx \right)^{\frac{2p+d}{2pd}} \\ &\lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\omega_{\alpha_1,L}|^{-\frac{d}{2p}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{d}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition (5.10) we see that

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\omega_{\alpha_1,L}|^{-\frac{d}{2p}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} \sim L$$

for any  $\alpha_1 > 2p$ .

Together (5.16), (5.17), and (5.20) give that

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla w|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \quad (5.21)$$

for  $1 < p < \bar{p}$  and  $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < d(2p-1)$  with  $\alpha_1 > 2p$  (observe that the latter two conditions require  $d \geq 3$ ). Now, since  $L \geq 2(r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0) + r)$ , from (5.13b) we obtain

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \frac{L}{r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}.$$

Having made this observation, (5.21) becomes

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla w|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \frac{L}{r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (5.22)$$

To go from (5.22) to (5.14), by the triangle inequality it is enough to show

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla((1-\eta)\hat{h})|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \frac{L}{r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (5.23)$$

For this, we use that  $\text{supp}(1-\eta) \subseteq \mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)$  and (5.13b) to write

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |(1-\eta)\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} &\leq C \left( \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} |\nabla \hat{h}|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1,L} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ &\leq C \left( \frac{L}{r + r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

### 5.3 Proof of Proposition 5

Applying the  $L^{2q}$ -version of the spectral-gap inequality, (5.1), to  $F$  as defined in (3.12) and using the expression for the vertical derivative  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a}$  derived in (5.6), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (F - \langle F \rangle)^{2q} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} &\lesssim q^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial a} \right| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim q^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \left[ \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |(e_i + \nabla \phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2)| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

With the help of the estimates on the auxiliary functions  $h$ ,  $v_1$ , and  $v_2$  that we have obtained in Section 5.2, we now estimate the two terms on right-hand side of (5.24).

For the first term on the right-hand side of (5.24), we show that:

**Lemma 18.** *Adopt the assumptions of Proposition 5, let  $h$  solve (5.2), and define  $L := \text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + \varepsilon$ . Then, for  $q \geq \frac{p}{4(p-1)}$ , we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim_{d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f,p,\beta} q^{C(d,\lambda,\mathcal{O})} \left( r^{-d/2} \left( \frac{r}{L} \right)^{(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{L} r^{-\frac{d}{2}} \right) \left\langle \left( \frac{r^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{\frac{4qd(p(2-\beta)-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

for  $0 < \beta \ll 1$ .

To prove Lemma 18, we require the bounds on  $h$  provided by Corollary 15 as well as the following two technical results. The first of these is a simple consequence of Hölder's inequality:

**Lemma 19.** *For any exponent  $p > 1$ , any pair of non-negative functions  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ , and any positive weight function  $\omega(x)$  with  $\text{osc}_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \omega \leq \frac{1}{2}\omega(x)$  we have that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \varphi \psi dy \right)^2 dx \lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi|^{2p} \omega dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\varphi|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \quad (5.26)$$

The second technical result is a decay estimate on the  $q$ -th moment of  $|\nabla u(x_0)|$  in terms of  $\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})$ , which we obtain by applying Lemma 25 to  $u$  and taking the expectation.

**Lemma 20.** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 5, we have that*

$$\langle |\nabla u(x_0)|^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f} q^{C(d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f)} \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + \varepsilon}, \quad (5.27)$$

for any  $q \geq 1$ .

We prove both Lemmas 19 and 20 in Section 5.4.

For now taking for granted Lemmas 19 and 20, here is the argument for Lemma 18:

*Proof of Lemma 18.* To obtain (5.25) we separately consider the ‘‘inner’’ and ‘‘outer’’ contributions of the integrand, corresponding to the domains  $B_{L/2}(x_0)$  respectively  $\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{L/2}(x_0)$ .

Starting with the inner contribution and, using (5.26) of Lemma 19 with  $\psi = |\nabla h|$ ,  $\varphi = |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u|$ , and  $\omega = \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}$  for  $\gamma > 0$  to be chosen later, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| dy \right)^2 dx \\ & \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the  $q$ -th moment of both sides, we again use Hölder's inequality to the extent of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ & \leq \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} dx \right)^{\frac{2q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of the weights (5.10), that  $r \geq \varepsilon$ , and applications of Hölder's and Jensen's inequalities (with the conditions  $q \geq p/4(p-1)$  and  $\gamma > d(p-1)$ ), we treat the second term on the right-hand side as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ & \lesssim \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{-\frac{\gamma}{p-1}, r} \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ & \leq r^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2p}} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4\gamma q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}} \left\langle \left( r^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{-\frac{\gamma}{p-1}, r} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{4q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}} \\ & \lesssim r^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2p}} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4\gamma q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}} \left\langle r^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{-\frac{\gamma}{p-1}, r} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u|^2 dy \right)^{4q} dx \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous estimates with (5.27) from Lemma 20 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ & \lesssim q^{C(d, \lambda, \mathcal{O})} r^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{\varepsilon}{L} \left\langle \left( r^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} dx \right)^{\frac{2q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4\gamma q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

notice that here we have used that we are on the ‘‘inner contribution’’. To finish this estimate, we use (5.13a) to write

$$\left( r^{-d} \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\gamma, r+r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim_\gamma \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}},$$

where we require that  $\gamma < d(2p-1)$ . Plugging this into (5.28) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ & \lesssim_\gamma q^{C(d, \lambda, \mathcal{O}, f)} r^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{\varepsilon}{L} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^{\mathcal{O}}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4\gamma q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

where the condition on  $\gamma$  is that  $d(p-1) < \gamma < d(2p-1)$ .

The estimate for the outer contribution proceeds in a similar fashion. Replacing the radius  $r + r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)$ , appearing in the weight with  $L + r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)$  and again applying (5.26) of Lemma 19 gives, using also again the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ & \leq \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\gamma, L+r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ & \quad \times \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} \omega_{\gamma, L+r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Writing  $L + r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0) = L \left( \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{L} + 1 \right)$  and using that  $L \geq \varepsilon$ , we get by the Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} \omega_{-\frac{\gamma}{p-1}, L+r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ & \lesssim \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} \omega_{-\frac{\gamma}{p-1}, L} \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ & \leq L^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2p}} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4q\gamma}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}} \\ & \quad \times \left\langle \left( L^{-d} \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} \omega_{-\frac{\gamma}{p-1}, L} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{4q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}}. \end{aligned}$$

We then apply Jensen's inequality and inject the estimate

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dy \right)^{4q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}} \lesssim q^{C(d, \lambda, \mathcal{O})}$$

(which follows from (5.27) of Lemma 20), which yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} \omega_{-\frac{\gamma}{p-1}, L+r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ & \lesssim q^{C(d, \lambda, \mathcal{O})} L^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2p}} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4q\gamma}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ & \lesssim q^{C(d, \lambda, \mathcal{O})} L^{\frac{d}{2}} \left\langle \left( L^{-d} \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\gamma, L+r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2q}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4q\gamma}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{8q}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

From (5.13a) we infer, using that  $r \geq \varepsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left( L^{-d} \int_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0) + B_\varepsilon} |\nabla h|^{2p} \omega_{\gamma, L+r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} &\lesssim_\gamma \left( \frac{r}{L} \right)^{\frac{d}{2p}} \left( \frac{r+r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{L} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ &\lesssim \left( \frac{r}{L} \right)^{\frac{d+\gamma}{2p}} \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2p}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (5.30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\chi_{\mathcal{O} \setminus B_{\frac{L}{2}}(x_0)} \nabla u \otimes \nabla h| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim_\gamma q^{C(d,\lambda,\mathcal{O})} L^{\frac{d}{2}} \left( \frac{r}{L} \right)^{\frac{d+\gamma}{2p}} \left\langle \left( 1 + \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{4q\gamma}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \left( \int_{B_r(x_0)} |g|^{2p} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\gamma := d(p(2-\beta) - 1)$  and combining this inequality with (5.29) and (3.10), we obtain (5.25) via the triangle inequality.  $\square$

To prove Proposition 5 it remains to bound the second term on the right-hand side of (5.24). For this term we obtain:

**Lemma 21.** *Adopt the assumptions of Proposition 5 and let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  solve (5.4) and (5.5) respectively. Then, for  $q \geq \frac{p}{2(p-1)}$ , we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |(e_i + \nabla \phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2)| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim_{d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f,\beta,p} r^{-\beta d/2} \left( \frac{1}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial \mathcal{O}) + r} \right)^{(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}} \left\langle \left( \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{\frac{2qd(3p-2)}{p-1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \left\langle \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} |\nabla \phi_i + e_i|^2 \, dx \right)^{2q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

for any  $1 \gg \beta > 0$ .

For the proof of this lemma we again use the Hölder-like estimate (5.26) from Lemma 19, now in conjunction with Corollary 17:

*Proof.* Throughout this argument we assume that  $p$ ,  $\alpha_0$ , and  $\alpha_1$  are subject to the assumptions in Corollary 17, i.e. that  $d(p-1) < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 - 2p < \alpha_1 < d(2p-1)$ . Furthermore, we use the convention  $R := \text{dist}(x_0, \partial \mathcal{O}) + r + r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)$ .

Using (5.26) with  $\psi = |\nabla(v_1 + v_2)|$ ,  $\varphi = |e_i + \nabla \phi_i|$ , and  $\omega = \omega_{\alpha_0, R}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |(e_i + \nabla \phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2)| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \\ &\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla(v_1 + v_2)|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{\alpha_0, R}^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |e_i + \nabla \phi_i|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the  $q$ -th moment of both sides, we infer by (5.15) and (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |(e_i + \nabla \phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2)| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle \\ &\lesssim_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1} r^{\frac{qd(1-2p)}{p}} \left\langle \left( \frac{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial \mathcal{O})}{r + r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{q\alpha_1}{p}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \omega_{\alpha_0, R}^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |e_i + \nabla \phi_i|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$



Taking into consideration the following two bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})}{r + r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)} + 1 \right)^{-1} &\leq \left( \frac{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})}{r} + 1 \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right), \\ \left( \frac{|x - x_0|}{R} + 1 \right)^{-1} &\leq \left( \frac{|x - x_0|}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r} + 1 \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

both being a consequence of  $r \geq \varepsilon$ , and then applying Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |(e_i + \nabla\phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2)| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1} r^{\frac{d(1-2p)}{2p}} (\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2p}} \left( \frac{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left\langle \left( \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{\frac{2q(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1)}{p-1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ &\quad \times \left\langle \left( (\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{|x - x_0|}{(\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_0}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla\phi_i + e_i|^2 \, dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2q(p-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we apply Jensen's inequality (using that  $\alpha_0 > d(p-1)$  and  $\frac{2q(p-1)}{p} > 1$ ), to the extent of

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |(e_i + \nabla\phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2)| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1} r^{\frac{d(1-2p)}{2p}} (\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2p}} \left( \frac{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})}{r} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{2p}} \left\langle \left( \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{\frac{2q(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1)}{p-1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\ &\quad \times \left\langle (\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{|x - x_0|}{(\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r)} + 1 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_0}{p-1}} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla\phi_i + e_i|^2 \, dy \right)^{2q} \, dx \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that, by the stationarity of  $\nabla\phi_i$ ,

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla\phi_i + e_i|^2 \, dy \right)^{2q} \right\rangle = \left\langle \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} |\nabla\phi_i + e_i|^2 \, dx \right)^{2q} \right\rangle$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we find by setting  $\alpha_0 := d(p-1) + \beta dp$  and  $\alpha_1 := d(2p-1) - \beta dp$  that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |(e_i + \nabla\phi_i) \otimes (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_2)| \, dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ &\lesssim_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1} r^{-\beta d/2} \left( \frac{1}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) + r} \right)^{(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}} \left\langle \left( \frac{r_*^\mathcal{O}(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{\frac{2qd(3p-2)}{p-1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \left\langle \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} |\nabla\phi_i + e_i|^2 \, dx \right)^{2q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \end{aligned}$$

for  $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$ . Note that to satisfy the condition  $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 - 2p$  one needs  $d > 2$ .  $\square$

With Lemmas 18 and 21 in-hand, we are now ready to prove Proposition 5:

*Proof of Proposition 5.* Combining (5.24) with (5.25) of Lemma 18 and (5.31) of Lemma 21, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle (F - \langle F \rangle)^{2q} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\
& \lesssim q^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial a} \right| dy \right)^2 dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\
& \lesssim_{d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f,\beta,p,f} q^{C(d,\lambda,\mathcal{O})} \left( \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \right)^{\beta d/2} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})} \right)^{(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \right) \\
& \quad \times \left\langle \left( \frac{r_{\mathcal{O}}^*(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{\frac{4qd(p(2-\beta)-1)}{p}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \\
& \quad + q^{C(d,\lambda,\mathcal{O})} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \right)^{\beta d/2} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O})} \right)^{(1-\beta)\frac{d}{2}} \\
& \quad \times \left\langle \left( \frac{r_{\mathcal{O}}^*(x_0)}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{\frac{2qd(3p-2)}{p-1}} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}} \left\langle \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} |\nabla\phi_i + e_i|^2 dx \right)^{2q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{4q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the bounds on  $r_{\mathcal{O}}^*$  (see e. g. (3) for the whole space case, which by [13] entails the corresponding result for  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ ; the case of bounded domains  $\mathcal{O}$  is somewhat analogous will be treated explicitly in a future work) this concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 5.4 Proofs of auxiliary lemmas for Proposition 5

We begin with the proof of Lemma 19, which is an easy consequence of the Hölder inequality.

*Proof of Lemma 19.* We apply Hölder's inequality twice:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \varphi\psi dy \right)^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\varphi|^2 \omega^{-\frac{1}{p}} dy \right) \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\psi|^2 \omega^{\frac{1}{p}} dy \right) dx \\
& \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\varphi|^2 \omega^{-\frac{1}{p}} dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\psi|^2 \omega^{\frac{1}{p}} dy \right)^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The claim then follows from Jensen's inequality.  $\square$

We now prove Lemma 20, which uses the gradient estimate (B.4) of Lemma 25 for  $u$  solving (3.11).

*Proof of Lemma 20. Step 1.* We start with the case when  $x_0$  is not close to the boundary, by assuming  $\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq 3\varepsilon$ . Let  $\eta$  be a smooth cut-off function for  $\partial\mathcal{O}$  in its  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood, i.e. a smooth function such that  $\eta = 1$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}$ ,  $\eta(x) = 0$  if  $\text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \varepsilon$ , and  $|\nabla\eta| \leq C(\mathcal{O})\varepsilon^{-1}$ . Then, letting  $w := u - \eta f\phi_i$ , we find that  $-\nabla \cdot (a\nabla w) = \nabla \cdot (a\nabla(\eta f\phi_i))$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $w = 0$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}$ . By (B.4), using the boundedness of  $a$  and the definition of  $\eta$  (which implies  $u = w$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ ) we get

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq C(a, x_0) \int_{\mathcal{O}} C(a, x) \frac{|\nabla(\eta f\phi_i)|}{|x - x_0|^d} dx, \quad (5.32)$$

with  $C(a, x)$  having stretched exponential moments. Using the notation  $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon := \{x \in \mathcal{O} : \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{O}) < \varepsilon\}$ , we obtain using Hölder's inequality

$$\langle |\nabla u(x_0)|^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim q^{C(d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f)} \left\langle \left( \int_{\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon} C(a, x) \frac{|\nabla(\eta f\phi_i)|}{|x - x_0|^d} dx \right)^{2q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}}.$$

By Theorem 4 and the Caccioppoli inequality applied to  $x_i + \phi_i$  we know that

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)} |\nabla\phi_i|^2 dx \leq C(a, x_0) \quad (5.33)$$

for some random field  $\mathcal{C}$  with bounded stretched exponential moments. Covering  $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon$  by balls of radius  $\varepsilon$  (of which at most  $C(d)$  cover any given point) and using  $|\nabla(\eta f \phi_i)| \leq C(f)|\nabla \phi_i| + C(f)|\phi_i|$ , we deduce

$$\langle |\nabla u(x_0)|^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim q^{C(d,\lambda,\mathcal{O},f)} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \text{dist}(x_0, \partial \mathcal{O})}.$$

*Step 2.* It remains to prove the result in case  $\text{dist}(x_0, \partial \mathcal{O}) \leq 3\varepsilon$ . Consider again  $w := u - \eta f \phi_i$ . Since in this case  $x_0$  is close to (or even contained in) the support of  $\nabla(\eta f \phi_i)$ , we now define  $w_0$  as the solution of  $-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla w_0) = \nabla \cdot (a \nabla(\eta f \phi_i) \chi_{B_{3\varepsilon}(x_0)})$  with  $w_0 = 0$  on  $\partial \mathcal{O}$ , and  $w_1 := w - w_0$ . Combining the energy estimate for  $w_0$  with (5.33) we get that

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla w_0^T|^2 \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \leq Cq^C,$$

which by Lemma 11 and the regularity of the corrector  $\phi$  contained in Lemma 23 implies that  $\langle |\nabla w_0(x_0)|^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq Cq^C$ . Since  $x_0$  is  $3\varepsilon$  away from the support of  $\chi_{B_{3\varepsilon}(x_0)}$ , an argument analogous to *Step 1* gives that  $\langle |\nabla w_1(x_0)|^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq Cq^C$ . Combining the two previous estimates then yields  $\langle |\nabla w(x_0)|^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq Cq^C$ . To complete the argument we then make use of Theorem 4 and Lemma 23.  $\square$

## 6 Argument for Proposition 6: Bound for expectation of weighted average of the boundary layer

### 6.1 Proof of Proposition 6

For our proof of Proposition 6 we first express  $\langle F_{k,m} \rangle$  in terms of  $\bar{h} \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)$ , which is the decaying solution of

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\bar{a}^* \nabla \bar{h}) &= \nabla \cdot g \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \\ \bar{h} &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Notice  $\bar{h}$  is the homogenized solution corresponding to the heterogeneous solution  $h$  solving  $-\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla h) = \nabla \cdot g$ . We, in particular, have the following identity:

**Lemma 22.** *Adopting the assumptions of Proposition 6 and letting  $\bar{h}$  solve (6.1), we have that*

$$\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot g \, dx \right\rangle = \int_{[x_0^\perp - 2r, x_0^\perp + 2r] \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \left\langle \nabla \theta_i \cdot \left( \phi_j^* a^* - \sigma_j^* \right) \right\rangle \nabla \partial_j \bar{h} \, dx, \tag{6.2}$$

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

We prove Lemma 22 in Section 6.2 below and first show how it entails Proposition 6.

*Proof of Proposition 6.* Using Lemma 22 and the Hölder estimate we obtain that

$$\left| \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot g \, dx \right\rangle \right| \leq \int_{[x_0^\perp - 2r, x_0^\perp + 2r] \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \langle |\nabla \theta_i|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle |\phi_j^* a^* - \sigma_j^*|^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} |\nabla \partial_j \bar{h}| \, dx. \tag{6.3}$$

Using our assumption (3.14) on the decay of  $|\nabla \theta_i|$  as well as the corrector bounds from Theorem 4, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot g \, dx \right\rangle \right| &\lesssim \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-n} \left( \int_{[x_0^\perp - 2r, x_0^\perp + 2r] \times Q_{4r}(x_0^\parallel)} |\nabla \partial_j \bar{h}| \, dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{[x_0^\perp - 2r, x_0^\perp + 2r] \times (\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus Q_{4r}(x_0^\parallel))} |\nabla \partial_j \bar{h}| \, dx \right) \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where  $Q_{4r}(x_0^\parallel)$  is the  $d-1$ -dimensional box in  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$  of side length  $4r$  centered at  $x_0^\parallel$ .

Treating the first term on the right-hand side of (6.4) is a simple matter of using the Hölder inequality and the energy estimate applied to a differentiated form of (6.1):

$$\int_{[x_0^\perp - 2r, x_0^\perp + 2r] \times Q_{4r}(x_0^\parallel)} |\nabla \partial_j \bar{h}| \, dx \lesssim r^{\frac{d}{2}} \left( \int_{[x_0^\perp - 2r, x_0^\perp + 2r] \times Q_{4r}(x_0^\parallel)} |\nabla \partial_j \bar{h}|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (6.5)$$

$$\lesssim r^{\frac{d}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla g|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{(3.16)}{\lesssim} r^{-1} \quad (6.6)$$

In order to handle the second term on the right-hand side of (6.4) we notice that, denoting by  $\bar{G}^*$  the Green's function associated with the operator  $-\nabla \cdot \bar{a}^* \nabla$  and letting  $\mathfrak{S}$  be the matrix associated with the reflection with respect to  $\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , *i.e.*

$$\mathfrak{S} = -e_1 \otimes e_1 + \sum_{j=2}^d e_j \otimes e_j,$$

we can write

$$\bar{h}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \left( \bar{G}^*(x-y) - \bar{G}^*(x-\mathfrak{S}y) \right) \nabla \cdot g(y) \, dy = \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \left( \nabla \bar{G}^*(x-y) - \mathfrak{S} \nabla \bar{G}^*(x-\mathfrak{S}y) \right) \cdot g(y) \, dy. \quad (6.7)$$

Using this in combination with the classical estimates on the homogenized Green function  $\bar{G}^*$  and its derivatives yields the following bound for  $x \notin \text{supp}(g)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ :

$$|\nabla^k \bar{h}(x)| \lesssim \frac{\|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)}}{\text{dist}(x, \text{supp}(g))^{d-1+k}}. \quad (6.8)$$

Therefore, using the Poincaré and the Hölder inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[x_0^\perp - 2r, x_0^\perp + 2r] \times (\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus Q_{4r}(x_0^\parallel))} |\nabla \partial_j \bar{h}| \, dx &\lesssim \|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)} r \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus Q_{4r}(x_0^\parallel)} |x^\parallel - x_0^\parallel|^{-d-1} \, dx^\parallel \\ &\lesssim r^{-1} \|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)} \lesssim r^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{(3.15)}{\lesssim} r^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

Inserting (6.5) and (6.9) into (6.4) yields (3.17).  $\square$

## 6.2 Proof of auxiliary lemma for Proposition 6

*Proof of Lemma 22.* The proof is divided in four Steps. In Step 1, we establish the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot g \, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot (\phi_j^* a^* - \sigma_j^*) \nabla \partial_i \bar{h} \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d} \left( \phi_j^* e_1 \cdot a \nabla \theta_i - \phi_i e_1 \cdot a^* (e_j + \nabla \phi_j^*) \right) \partial_j \bar{h} \, dS \\ &\quad - \int_{\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d} \phi_i e_1 \cdot \sigma_j^* \nabla \partial_j \bar{h} \, dS \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

Then, we show that  $\bar{h}$  satisfies the following identity:

$$\int_{Re_1 + \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla^k \bar{h} \, dS = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \text{ and } R \in [0, 2r) \cup (4r, +\infty). \quad (6.11)$$

For the proof of (6.11), we proceed in two steps: in Step 2, we only consider derivatives  $\partial_j \nabla^n \bar{h}$  for  $j = 2, \dots, d$ , and, in Step 3, we retrieve the case  $j = 1$ . In Step 4 we take the expected value and use stationarity in the tangential direction to conclude.

**Step 1 : Argument for (6.10)** By classical computations, denoting the two-scale expansion as

$$\tilde{h} := \bar{h} + \phi_j^* \partial_j \bar{h}, \quad (6.12)$$

we have that

$$-\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla \tilde{h}) = \nabla \cdot g + \nabla \cdot ((\sigma_j^* - \phi_j^* a^*) \nabla \partial_j \bar{h}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d. \quad (6.13)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot g \, dx &\stackrel{(6.13)}{=} - \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot (a^* \nabla \tilde{h} + (\sigma_j^* - \phi_j^* a^*) \nabla \partial_j \bar{h}) \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \theta_i e_1 \cdot (a^* \nabla \tilde{h} + (\sigma_j^* - \phi_j^* a^*) \nabla \partial_j \bar{h}) \, dS. \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

Also, we remark that, by (1.4), (6.1), and (6.12) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla \theta_i \cdot a^* \nabla \tilde{h} \, dx = - \int_{\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \phi_j^* e_1 \cdot a \nabla \theta_i \partial_j \bar{h} \, dS,$$

and

$$\int_{\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \theta_i e_1 \cdot (a^* \nabla \tilde{h} + (\sigma_j^* - \phi_j^* a^*) \nabla \partial_j \bar{h}) \, dS = \int_{\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \theta_i e_1 \cdot a^* (e_j + \nabla \phi_j^*) \partial_j \bar{h} \, dS + \int_{\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \theta_i e_1 \cdot \sigma_j^* \nabla \partial_j \bar{h} \, dS.$$

As a consequence, inserting the two above identities into (6.14) and recalling that  $\theta_i = \phi_i$  on  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  yields (6.10).

**Step 2 : Argument for (6.11) for tangential derivatives.** Let  $R \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, d$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . We show that

$$\int_{Re_1 + \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \partial_j \nabla^k \bar{h} \, dS = 0. \quad (6.15)$$

To show (6.15), we make use of the divergence theorem and the decay (6.8) to the extent of

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{Re_1 + \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \partial_j \nabla^k \bar{h} \, dS \right| &\leq \limsup_{l \uparrow \infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \partial_j \nabla^k \bar{h}(R, x^\parallel) \, dx^\parallel \right| \\ &= \limsup_{l \uparrow \infty} \left| \int_{\partial[-l, l]^{d-1}} \nabla^k \bar{h}(R, x^\parallel) (e_j \cdot \mathbf{n}) \, dS(x^\parallel) \right| \\ &\lesssim C(r) \limsup_{l \uparrow \infty} l^{d-2} l^{-d+1-k} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Step 3 : Argument for (6.11) for perpendicular direction.** Let  $R \in [0, 2r) \cup (4r, +\infty)$ . Notice that, since the support of  $g$  is isolated from  $Re_1 + \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , we have that  $\nabla \cdot \bar{a} \nabla \bar{h} = 0$  in a neighborhood of  $Re_1 + \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . Differentiating this equation  $k$  times yields

$$\bar{a}_{11} \partial_1 \partial_1 \nabla^k \bar{h}(x) = - \sum_{(i,j) \neq (1,1)} \bar{a}_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j \nabla^k \bar{h}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in Re_1 + \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d.$$

Using the previous result and that  $\bar{a}$  is uniformly elliptic, (6.15) entails

$$\int_{Re_1 + \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \partial_1 \partial_1 \nabla^k \bar{h} \, dS = 0. \quad (6.16)$$

Therefore, for establishing (6.11), it only remains to show that

$$\int_{Re_1 + \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d} \partial_1 \bar{h} \, dS = 0. \quad (6.17)$$

We retrieve this via an indirect argument, remarking that, by (6.15) and since  $\bar{a}^*$  is elliptic, it suffices to establish

$$\int_{Re_1 + \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d} (\bar{a}\nabla\bar{h}) \cdot e_1 \, dS = 0. \quad (6.18)$$

Here comes the argument for (6.18). Since  $g$  is compactly supported in the interior of  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , by the divergence theorem, we obtain

$$-\int_{[R, R+l] \times [-l, l]^{d-1}} \nabla \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dx = \int_{[R, R+l] \times [-l, l]^{d-1}} \nabla \cdot g \, dx = \int_{\partial([R, R+l] \times [-l, l]^{d-1})} g \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = 0,$$

for  $l \gg 4r$ . Using once more the divergence theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[R, R+l] \times [-l, l]^{d-1}} \nabla \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dx &= - \int_{\{R\} \times [-l, l]^{d-1}} e_1 \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dS \\ &\quad + \int_{[R, R+l] \times \partial[-l, l]^{d-1}} \mathbf{n} \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dS \\ &\quad + \int_{\{R+l\} \times [-l, l]^{d-1}} e_1 \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dS. \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

By (6.8), the second and third terms on the right-hand side are controlled as follows

$$\left| \int_{[R, R+l] \times \partial[-l, l]^{d-1}} \mathbf{n} \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dS + \int_{\{R+l\} \times [-l, l]^{d-1}} e_1 \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dS \right| \lesssim C(r)l^{d-1}l^{-d} \lesssim C(r)l^{-1}, \quad (6.20)$$

so that, letting  $l \uparrow \infty$  and using (6.2), we retrieve (6.18) as

$$\int_{Re_1 + \partial\mathbb{H}_+^d} e_1 \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dS = \lim_{l \uparrow \infty} \int_{\{R\} \times [-l, l]^{d-1}} e_1 \cdot \bar{a}\nabla\bar{h} \, dS = 0.$$

**Step 4 : Argument for (6.2)** Taking the expectation of (6.10), we get

$$\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \nabla\theta_i \cdot g \, dx \right\rangle =: \langle I_1 \rangle + \langle I_2 \rangle + \langle I_3 \rangle. \quad (6.21)$$

We first show that

$$\langle I_2 \rangle = \langle I_3 \rangle = 0, \quad (6.22)$$

and then that

$$\langle I_1 \rangle = \int_{[2r, 4r] \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \langle \nabla\theta_i \cdot (\phi_j^* a^* - \sigma_j^*) \rangle \nabla\partial_j\bar{h} \, dx. \quad (6.23)$$

Indeed, the identity (6.2) is obtained by inserting (6.22) and (6.23) into (6.21).

Here comes the argument for (6.22). Using the stationarity of  $a^*$ ,  $\nabla\theta_i$ ,  $\phi_i$ ,  $\phi_j^*$  and  $\sigma_j^*$  with respect to tangential shifts, we may define the (constant) tensors

$$\begin{cases} M_j := \langle (\phi_j^* e_1 \cdot a \nabla\theta_i - \phi_i e_1 \cdot a^* (e_j + \nabla\phi_j^*)) (0) \rangle, \\ N_{jk} := - \langle (\phi_i e_1 \cdot \sigma_j^* e_k) (0) \rangle, \end{cases}$$

and rewrite  $\langle I_2 \rangle$  and  $\langle I_3 \rangle$  as

$$\langle I_2 \rangle = M_j \int_{\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d} \partial_j\bar{h} \, dS \quad \text{and} \quad \langle I_3 \rangle = N_{jk} \int_{\partial\mathbb{H}_+^d} \partial_j\partial_k\bar{h} \, dS.$$

Hence, (6.11) immediately entails (6.22).

Last, we show (6.23). Taking the expectation of  $I_1$ , we obtain

$$\langle I_1 \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \langle \nabla \theta_i \cdot (\phi_j^* a^* - \sigma_j^*) \rangle \nabla \partial_j \bar{h} \, dx.$$

By (6.11), since  $\langle \nabla \theta_i \cdot (\phi_j^* a^* - \sigma_j^*) \rangle(x)$  only depends on  $x^\perp$  (by the stationarity of  $\nabla \theta_i, \phi_j^*, a^*$ , and  $\sigma_j^*$  in all directions but  $e_1$ ), we may rewrite the above integral as

$$\langle I_1 \rangle = \int_0^\infty \langle (\nabla \theta_i \cdot (\phi_j^* a^* - \sigma_j^*))(x^\perp, 0) \rangle \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla \partial_i \bar{h}(x^\perp, x^\parallel) dx^\parallel \right) dx^\perp.$$

Using (6.11) then yields (6.23).  $\square$

here

## 7 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Since our result is for  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , we may assume  $\varepsilon = 1$ . As already discussed in Section 3.1, it only remains to upgrade (3.6) of Corollary 3 into the desired (2.4). Throughout this proof,  $m > 0$  is generic and may change from line to line. We separately consider the two cases  $x_0^\perp \leq 8$  and  $x_0^\perp \geq 8$ —we start with the first case.

For  $x_0^\perp \leq 8$  we begin by applying (4.5) of Lemma 11 to  $\theta_i - \phi_i$ , also taking the  $q$ -th moment of both sides. After an additional application of Hölder's inequality this yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in B_{1/2}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} \langle |\nabla \theta_i(x)|^q \rangle^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \lesssim q^m \left[ \left\langle \left( \int_{B_2(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} + \left\langle \|a \nabla \phi_i\|_{(C^{0,\alpha} \cap L^\infty)(B_2(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)}^{2q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

In this case, Proposition 1 bounds the first term on the right-hand side as

$$\left\langle \left( \int_{B_2(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \lesssim q^m.$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (7.1) is bounded using Theorem 4 and Lemma 23 as

$$\left\langle \|a \nabla \phi_i\|_{(C^{0,\alpha} \cap L^\infty)(B_2^\perp(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d)}^{2q} \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \lesssim q^m.$$

This finishes our treatment of the case  $x_0^\perp \leq 8$ .

In the case  $x_0^\perp \geq 8$  we use the pointwise gradient bound for  $a$ -harmonic functions given in (B.3) of Proposition 24 (which we apply to  $\theta_i$  for  $r := R := \frac{1}{8}x_0^\perp$ , so that  $\theta_i$  is not required to satisfy any boundary conditions) to upgrade (3.6) of Corollary 3 to

$$\langle |\nabla \theta_i(x_0)|^q \rangle^{1/q} \lesssim \left\langle \left( \int_{B_{x_0^\perp/8}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{H}_+^d} |\nabla \theta_i|^2 \, dx \right)^q \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2q}} \lesssim q^m \left( 1 + \frac{x_0^\perp}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-d/2+\delta}.$$

This finishes our argument.  $\square$

# A Regularity of random elliptic operators on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and corrector estimates

Here we first summarize the contents of the large-scale regularity results Theorems 1 and 2 of [18], which hold under the assumptions (A1)-(A3).

**Theorem 3.** *Let Assumptions (A1) – (A3) be satisfied. Then there exists a random field  $r^* = r^*(a, x)$  such that  $\frac{r^*}{\varepsilon}$  has stretched exponential moments in the sense of (2.3) with the following property: Let  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be  $a$ -harmonic in  $B_R(x)$  for  $R > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , i. e. suppose that  $u$  satisfies*

$$-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla u) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_R(x).$$

Then for any  $r, R$  with  $R \geq r \geq r^*(x, a) > 0$  we have the estimate

$$\int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla u|^2 dy \leq C \int_{B_R(x)} |\nabla u|^2 dy. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In our argument, we have used the following estimate for the first-order homogenization corrector that has been proven in [19, Theorem 2] under the assumption that the ensemble satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality. The result can be found in the more general setting of homogenization for nonlinear uniformly elliptic systems under the assumption that the ensemble satisfies a spectral gap in [12, Corollary 15]. For the degenerate linear elliptic setting see [7].

**Theorem 4** (Corrector estimates in stochastic homogenization). *Under Assumption (A1)–(A3) and for  $d \geq 3$ , there exists a random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  with stretched exponential moments in the sense (2.3) such that*

$$\sup_{r \geq \varepsilon} \left( \int_{B_r(x)} |\phi|^2 + |\sigma|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x) \varepsilon \quad (\text{A.2})$$

holds for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Relying in addition on Assumption (A4), we also obtain small-scale regularity properties of the correctors.

**Lemma 23** (Regularity of the correctors on small scales). *Let Assumptions (A1)–(A4) be satisfied. Then for any  $0 < \gamma < \nu$  and any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  there exists a random constant  $\mathcal{C}(a, x_0)$  with a uniform bound on suitable stretched exponential moments*

$$\left\langle \exp \left( \mathcal{C}(a, x_0)^{1/C} / C \right) \right\rangle \leq 2$$

with  $C$  depending possibly on  $\gamma$  but not on  $x_0$  such that the following is true: The estimates

$$|\nabla \phi_i(x) - \nabla \phi_i(y)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{|x - x_0|^\gamma}{\varepsilon^\gamma}$$

and

$$|\nabla \sigma_{ijk}(x) - \nabla \sigma_{ijk}(y)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{|x - x_0|^\gamma}{\varepsilon^\gamma}$$

hold for any  $x, y \in B_\varepsilon(x_0)$ .

Furthermore, for any  $0 < \gamma < \nu$  and any  $y \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}$  there exists a random constant  $\mathcal{C}(a, y)$  with a uniform bound on suitable stretched exponential moments

$$\left\langle \exp \left( \mathcal{C}(a, y)^{1/C} / C \right) \right\rangle \leq 2$$

with  $C$  depending possibly on  $\gamma$  but not on  $y$  such that the following is true: The estimate

$$|\nabla \theta_i(x) - \nabla \theta_i(y)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, y) \frac{|x - y|^\gamma}{\varepsilon^\gamma}$$

holds for any  $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}$  with  $|x - x_0| \leq \varepsilon$ .



*Proof.* Relying on Assumptions (A1) and (A4), for any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  there exists a small enough radius  $\rho > 0$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\exp((\varepsilon/\rho)^{1/C}/C)] \leq 2$  such that by classical Schauder theory we have for any  $a$ -harmonic function  $u$  in  $B_\rho(x_0)$

$$\|\nabla u\|_{C^\alpha(B_\rho(x_0))} \leq C \left( \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right).$$

Applying this bound to the  $a$ -harmonic function  $x_i + \phi_i$  and using a covering argument to cover an  $\varepsilon$ -ball and inserting the bound (A.2), we arrive at our estimates for  $\phi_i$ . Given the regularity bound for  $\phi_i$ , the argument for  $\sigma_{ijk}$  is similar, though we now need to account for a right-hand side. The bounds for  $\theta_i$  are analogous to the case of  $\phi_i$ , possibly (depending on the location of  $x_0$ ) also making use of boundary regularity via Schauder theory as well as the bound on  $\nabla\theta_i$  from Proposition 7.  $\square$

## B Regularity estimates for random elliptic operators on a domain

In this section we establish regularity properties for  $a$ -harmonic functions on domains with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Recall that on large scales random elliptic operators are subject to a mean-value type property. Combining the large-scale regularity properties with classical Schauder theory on microscopic scales  $r \leq \frac{1}{c(x_0)}\varepsilon$ , we arrive at the following regularity result.

**Proposition 24.** *Adopt the assumptions (A1) - (A3) and let  $\mathcal{O}$  be either a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain or  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$  and, for  $0 < R < c(\mathcal{O}) \text{diam}(\mathcal{O})$  and  $x_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ , let  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{O})$  solve*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a\nabla u) &= 0 & \text{in } & B_R(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } & B_R(x_0) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

*Then there exists a random field  $r_{\mathcal{O}}^*(a, x)$ , defined on  $\Omega \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ , that is stationary with respect to tangential shifts and such that  $\frac{r_{\mathcal{O}}^*}{\varepsilon}$  has stretched exponential moments in the sense of (2.3) with  $C = C(d, \lambda, \mathcal{O})$  and*

$$\int_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \lesssim_{d, \lambda, \mathcal{O}} \int_{\mathcal{O} \cap B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \tag{B.2}$$

*for any  $R \geq r \geq r_{\mathcal{O}}^*(a, x_0) > 0$ .*

*If additionally the assumption (A4) holds, then there exists a random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$ , defined on  $\Omega \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ , with stretched exponential moments in the sense of (2.3) with  $C = C(d, \lambda, \nu, \alpha, \mathcal{O})$  such that*

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \left( \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{B.3}$$

*holds for any  $0 < r \leq R$ .*

*Proof.* As we do not require the result in bounded domains  $\mathcal{O}$  for our present work, we defer the proof in the case of bounded domains to a future paper and only provide the proof for  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{R}^d$  as well as  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$ .

Under the assumptions (A1)–(A3), in the whole space case  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{R}^d$  the mean value property (B.2) has been established e. g. in [18]; in the half-space case  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , the estimate was proven in [13]. It only remains to show (B.3). To this aim, note that Assumption (A4) entails that classical Schauder theory is applicable on scales  $r \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{c(x_0)}$ , where  $\mathcal{C}(x_0)$  again has stretched exponential moments. We obtain for  $r \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{c(x_0)}$

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \left( \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Applying this estimate for  $r = \frac{\varepsilon}{c(x_0)}$  and combining it with the bound (B.3) for  $r = r_{\mathcal{O}}^*(a, x_0)$ , we arrive at (B.3).  $\square$

For use in the proof of Proposition 5 (see Lemmas 14 and 20), we slightly post-process Proposition 24 to give the following gradient bound:

**Lemma 25.** *Let the assumptions (A1) – (A4) be satisfied and  $\mathcal{O}$  be a bounded  $C^{1,1}$  domain or  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$ , and  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{O})$  a weak solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla u) &= \nabla \cdot g + f && \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ u &= 0, && \text{on } \partial \mathcal{O} \end{aligned}$$

where for  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$  the homogeneous Dirichlet data in the far-field is meant as a decay condition. Then there exists a random field  $\mathcal{C}(a, x)$  that is stationary with respect to tangential shifts and with stretched exponential moments in the sense of (2.3) with constant  $C = C(d, \lambda, \alpha, \mathcal{O})$  such that

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \int_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{C}(a, x) \frac{|g| + |f| \text{dist}(x, \partial \mathcal{O})}{|x_0 - x|^d} dx, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

for all  $x_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $w$  be the solution to the dual problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla w) &= \nabla \delta_{x_0} && \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ w &= 0 && \text{on } \partial \mathcal{O}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

By standard arguments and using the Hölder regularity of  $a$  around  $x_0$ , it can be shown that (B.5) has a unique non-growing solution. We then have that

$$\nabla u(x_0) = \int_{\mathcal{O}} (g \cdot \nabla w - fw) dx, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

and hence just need to obtain appropriate estimates for  $w$ . For any  $y \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}$  with the notation  $r := \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(y, x_0)$ , estimate (B.3) provides the bound

$$|\nabla w(y)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, y) \left( \int_{B_r(y) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla w|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

In order to estimate the right-hand side we let  $\eta$  be a continuous vector-field supported in  $B_r(y) \cap \mathcal{O}$  and let  $v \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{O})$  be weak solution of

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla v) &= \nabla \cdot \eta && \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ v &= 0 && \text{on } \partial \mathcal{O}. \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} \eta \cdot \nabla w dx = - \int_{\mathcal{O}} a \nabla v \cdot \nabla w dx = - \int_{\mathcal{O}} a^* \nabla w \cdot \nabla v dx = \nabla v(x_0). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Again applying estimate (B.3), now to  $v$  which is  $a$ -harmonic in  $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x_0)$ , and using the energy estimate for  $v$ , we deduce

$$|\nabla v(x_0)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \left( \int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla v|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) r^{-\frac{d}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\eta|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Rewriting (B.7) using the dual formulation of the  $\dot{H}^1$ -norm and inserting (B.8) and (B.9), we infer

$$|\nabla w(y)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, y) r^{-d/2} \sup_{\eta: \text{supp } \eta \subset B_r(y), \int |\eta|^2 \leq 1} \int_{\mathcal{O}} \eta \cdot \nabla w dx \leq \mathcal{C}(a, y) \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{1}{|y - x_0|^d}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Furthermore, since  $w = 0$  on  $\partial \mathcal{O}$ , we get that

$$|w(y)| \leq \mathcal{C}(a, y) \mathcal{C}(a, x_0) \frac{\text{dist}(y, \partial \mathcal{O})}{|y - x_0|^d}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Inserting (B.10) and (B.11) in (B.6), we infer (B.4).  $\square$

## C Proof of the weighted Meyers estimate in Lemma 14

*Proof of Lemma 14.* As already mentioned, the lemma has already been shown in the case  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{R}^d$  in [6, Lemma 7]. Therefore, we only need to consider the cases  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$  or  $\mathcal{O}$  being an arbitrary bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain. Notice that for bounded domains  $\mathcal{O}$  we may assume that  $R \ll C(\mathcal{O})$ , since otherwise (5.11) and (5.12) hold trivially as a result of the energy estimate and the Meyers estimate for (5.9) and the definition (5.10). For our argument, for  $f, F \in L^2(\mathcal{O})$ , let  $v_0, v_1 \in H_0^1(\mathcal{O})$  be (if  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$ , decaying) solutions of

$$-\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla v_0) = \nabla \cdot F \text{ and } -\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla v_1) = f \quad \text{both on } \mathcal{O}, \text{ with } v_0, v_1 \equiv 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

We, furthermore, introduce a domain dependent dyadic decomposition: Choose  $\bar{r}$  such that  $\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) = 1.5 \times 2^{\tilde{k}} \times \bar{r}$  for some  $\tilde{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\bar{r} \sim R$ , and let  $H$  be the largest  $H$  such that  $\mathcal{O} \cap B_{2^j \bar{r}}(x_0)$  is either a ball or is approximately the intersection of a half-space with a ball for all  $0 \leq j \leq H$ . In the case that  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{H}_+^d$  we have that  $H = \infty$ , whereas  $H \sim -\log_2(\bar{r})$  when  $\mathcal{O}$  is a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain. We then introduce

$$A_j := \begin{cases} \{|x - x_0| \leq 2\bar{r}\} & \text{for } j = 0, \\ \{2^j \bar{r} < |x - x_0| \leq 2^{j+1} \bar{r}\} \cap \mathcal{O} & \text{for } 0 < j < H, \\ \mathcal{O} \setminus B_{2^j \bar{r}}(x_0) & \text{for } j = H. \end{cases}$$

The proof then proceeds in three steps:

*Step 1:* For  $v_0$  solving (C.1), the estimate

$$\left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v_0|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^H \left( 2^{-|k-j|d} \int_{A_k} |F|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

holds. As we will see, this follows via minor adaptations of [6, Lemma 7, (43)]: We makes use of the large-scale mean-value property for  $a$ -harmonic functions on the half-space [13, Theorem 2, (17)] or on a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain (the proof of the latter we defer to a future work).

To show the estimate (C.2), we proceed by duality: Let  $\rho \in L^2(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{R}^d)$  be supported in  $A_j$  and normalized in the sense that  $\|\rho\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})} = 1$ , and let  $w \in H_{loc}^1(\mathcal{O})$  solve

$$\nabla \cdot (a \nabla w) = \nabla \cdot \rho \quad \text{on } \mathcal{O}, \text{ with } \mathbf{n} \cdot a \nabla w = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Additionally using (C.1), we have that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla v_0 \cdot \rho dx = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla v_0 \cdot a \nabla w dx = \int_{\mathcal{O}} a^* \nabla v_0 \cdot \nabla w dx = - \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla w \cdot F dx,$$

whereby it only remains to show that

$$\left| \int_{A_k} F \cdot \nabla w dx \right| \lesssim \left( 2^{-d|k-j|} \int_{A_k} |F|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

We first treat the case that  $k \leq j + 1$ , which case showing that

$$\int_{A_k} |\nabla w|^2 dx \lesssim (2^{k-j})^d \quad (\text{C.5})$$

is enough. In the case that  $j \leq k \leq j + 1$  this follows directly from the energy estimate for (C.3). For the case that  $k < j$ , we use that  $w$  is  $a$ -harmonic in  $B_{2^{j-1}\bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}$ :

$$\int_{A_k} |\nabla w|^2 dx \leq \int_{B_{2^k \bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla w|^2 dx \lesssim \frac{|B_{2^k \bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}|}{|B_{2^{j-1}\bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}|} \int_{B_{2^{j-1}\bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla w|^2 dx \lesssim 2^{d(k-j)} \int_{A_k} |F|^2 dx.$$

Notice that in the first and second inequalities above we have used that neither  $k$  nor  $j - 1 = H$  –in the second inequality we have also used the appropriate mean-value property. In the last inequality we have used the definition of  $H$  and normalization of  $\rho$ .

We then consider the case that  $k > j + 1$ , and let  $w_k$  solve

$$\nabla \cdot (a^* \nabla w_k) = \nabla \cdot (\chi_{A_k} F) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{O}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{n} \cdot a \nabla w = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{O}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

In combination with (C.3), (C.6) implies that

$$\int_{A_j} \nabla w_k \cdot \rho \, dx = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla w_k \cdot \rho \, dx = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla w \cdot a^* \nabla w_k \, dx = \int_{A_k} \nabla w \cdot F \, dx.$$

Using the normalization of the vector-field  $\rho$ , we then obtain

$$\left| \int_{A_k} \nabla w \cdot F \, dx \right| \leq \left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla w_k|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since we have that  $w_k$  is  $a^*$ -harmonic on  $B_{2^{k-1}\bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}$ , we may apply the appropriate mean-value property to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla w_k|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \left( \int_{B_{2^j \bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla w_k|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left( \frac{|B_{2^j \bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}|}{|B_{2^{k-1} \bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}|} \int_{B_{2^{k-1} \bar{r}}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{O}} |\nabla w_k|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left( 2^{(j-k)d} \int_{A_k} |F|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we have again used that  $k \neq H$  and  $j - 1 \neq H$ , and also the definition of  $H$ .

*Step 2:* For  $v_1$  solving (C.1), the estimate

$$\left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v_1|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^H ((k-j)_+ + 1) |A_0|^{\frac{1}{d}} \left( 2^{-|k-j|d+2 \max k, j} \int_{A_k} |f| \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

holds. This follows via minor adaptations of the argument for [6, Lemma 7, (44)]. In particular, it follows from (C.2) and uses that  $|A_j| \sim |A_0| 2^{jd}$ —which is also true for  $A_H$ , thanks to how we have defined  $H$ .

*Step 3:* We now conclude. Beginning with the argument for (5.11), we assume that  $f_0 = 0$  and notice that the standard Meyers estimate applied on each  $A_j$  gives:

$$\left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v|^{2p} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \int_{A_j^+} |\nabla v|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \int_{A_j^+} |F_0|^{2p} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where we use the convention

$$A_j^+ := \begin{cases} A_0 \cup A_1 & \text{if } j = 0, \\ A_{j-1} \cup A_j \cup A_{j+1} & \text{if } 0 < j < H, \\ A_{H-1} \cup A_H & \text{if } j = H. \end{cases}$$

By the definition of  $\omega_{\alpha_0, R}$  and our choice of  $\bar{r}$ , we know that  $\omega_{\alpha_0, R} \lesssim 2^{\alpha_0(j+1)}$  on  $A_j$  and  $2^{\alpha_0(j-1)} \lesssim \omega_{\alpha_0, R}$  on  $A_j^+$  uniformly for  $j \neq 0, H$ . For  $j = 0$  we have that  $1 \lesssim \omega_{\alpha_0, R}$  on  $A_0$  and  $\omega_{\alpha_0, R} \lesssim 2^{\alpha_0}$  on  $A_0^+$ ; in the case that  $\mathcal{O}$  is a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain, for  $j = H$  we have that  $2^H \bar{r} \sim 1$  so that  $R^{-\alpha_0} \lesssim \omega_{\alpha_0, R}$  on  $A_H$  and  $\omega_{\alpha_0, R} \lesssim R^{-\alpha_0}$  on  $A_H^+$ , where we emphasize that the constants depends on  $\mathcal{O}$ . These observations allow us to smuggle-in the weight  $\omega_{\alpha_0, R}$  and sum (C.8) over  $j$  to the extent of

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla v|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} \, dx \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}} |F_0|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} \, dx + \sum_{j=0}^H (\max_{A_j} \omega_{\alpha_0, R}) |A_j|^{1-p} \left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v|^2 \, dx \right)^p.$$

To complete the argument one now observes that by (C.2), we have for any  $\tau > 0$  small enough

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^H (\max_{A_j} \omega_{\alpha_0, R}) |A_j|^{1-p} \left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v|^2 dx \right)^p \\
& \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^H 2^{\alpha_0 j} (2^j R)^{(1-p)d} \left( \sum_{k=0}^H \left( 2^{-|k-j|d} \int_{A_k} |F_0|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \right)^{2p} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^H 2^{\alpha_0 j} (2^j R)^{(1-p)d} \sum_{k=0}^H 2^{-|k-j|p(d-\tau)} (C2^k R)^{d(p-1)} \int_{A_k} |F_0|^{2p} dx \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^H 2^{\alpha_0 k} (2^k R)^{(1-p)d} (C2^k R)^{d(p-1)} \int_{A_k} |F_0|^{2p} dx \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}} |F_0|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, R} dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.9}$$

Here, in the penultimate estimate the bound  $pd > \alpha_0 + (1-p)d$  or equivalently  $\alpha_0 < d(2p-1)$  entered.

We move on to the argument for (5.12). For this we assume that  $F_0 = 0$  and apply the version of Meyers' estimate for non-divergence form equations on each  $A_j$ . This gives:

$$\left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \left( \int_{A_j^+} |\nabla v|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + |A_j|^{1/d} \left( \int_{A_j^+} |f_0|^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}},$$

where we use that  $|A_j|^{\frac{1}{d}} \sim |A_0|^{\frac{1}{d}} 2^j$  and  $2^j \lesssim \frac{|x|}{R} + 1$  to further write

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla v|^{2p} dx \lesssim |A_0|^{\frac{2p}{d}} \int_{\mathcal{O}} |f_0|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_0+2p, R} dx + \sum_{j=0}^H \left( \max_{A_j} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} \right) |A_j|^{1-p} \left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v|^2 dx \right)^p.$$

Showing that

$$\sum_{j=0}^H \left( \max_{A_j} \omega_{\alpha_0, R} \right) |A_j|^{1-p} \left( \int_{A_j} |\nabla v|^2 dx \right)^p \lesssim |A_0|^{\frac{2p}{d}} \int_{\mathcal{O}} |f_0|^{2p} \omega_{\alpha_1, R} dx \tag{C.10}$$

finishes the argument. The relation (C.10) follows from (C.7) and can be found in Step 2 of [6, Lemma 7] –the argument requires that  $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 - 2p$  and  $\alpha_1 < d(2p-1)$ .  $\square$

## D Exponentially localized boundary layer

We define the massive approximation for the boundary layer corrector  $\theta_i^T$  (with a localization parameter  $T < \infty$ , the boundary layer corrector  $\theta_i$  being recovered in the limit  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ) as

$$-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \theta_i^T) + \frac{1}{T} \theta_i^T = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \tag{D.1a}$$

$$\theta_i^T = \phi_i \quad \text{on } \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d. \tag{D.1b}$$

We remark that, thanks to the massive term  $\frac{1}{T} \theta_i^T$ , (D.1) is easily solvable. In particular, for any  $x_0 \in \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  one first solves (D.1) with the boundary data  $\theta_i^{T, R} = \phi_i^T \chi(B_R(x_0))$ , where  $B_R(x_0)$  is a  $d-1$ -dimensional ball in  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$ . To pass to the limit  $R \rightarrow \infty$  and to obtain the independence of the limit on the base point  $x_0$ , the following exponentially localized energy estimate is used:

**Lemma 26** (Exponentially localized energy estimate). *Assume that  $a$  satisfies the condition (A1) and  $T > 0$  and  $L \geq \sqrt{T}$ . Let  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)$  be a weak solution of*

$$\begin{aligned}
-\nabla \cdot (a \nabla u) + \frac{1}{T} u &= \nabla \cdot F \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \\
u &= g \quad \text{on } \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d,
\end{aligned} \tag{D.2}$$

where  $g$  is the trace of  $g \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)$  and  $F \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{H}_+^d)$ , such that  $u$ ,  $F$ , and  $g$  satisfy

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} R^{-k} \left( \int_{B_R^+} (|u| + |\nabla u| + |F| + |g| + |\nabla g|)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0 \quad (\text{D.3})$$

for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then for  $0 < \gamma < c(d, \lambda)$  we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} (|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{T}|u|^2) \exp(-\gamma|x|/L) \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} (|\nabla g|^2 + \frac{1}{T}|g|^2 + |F|^2) \exp(-\gamma|x|/L). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

*Proof.* Letting  $\eta = \exp(-\gamma|x|/L)$ , we test (D.2) with  $\eta(u - g)$ . We remark that testing with this function may be justified via approximation using (D.3). After making use of  $L \geq \sqrt{T}$  and Young's inequality, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} (|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{T}|u|^2) \eta \, dx \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \left( \eta \nabla u \cdot a \nabla g + (u - g) \nabla \eta \cdot a \nabla u \, dx + \frac{1}{T} \eta u g + (u - g) \nabla \eta \cdot F + \eta \nabla(u - g) \cdot F \right) \, dx \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{H}_+^d} \eta \left( \gamma |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{T} |u|^2 + \frac{C(\gamma)}{T} |g|^2 + C(\gamma) |\nabla g|^2 + C(\gamma) |F|^2 \right) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing a small enough  $\gamma$  and absorbing the terms involving  $u$  and  $\nabla u$  then yields the claim.  $\square$

We remark that the estimate (D.4) yields the uniqueness of a sublinear solution  $\theta_i^T$  to the localized boundary layer corrector problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \theta_i^T) + \frac{1}{T} \theta_i^T &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \\ \theta_i^T &= \phi_i & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d, \end{aligned}$$

which has the consequence that the stationarity of  $\theta_i^T$  with respect to shifts parallel to  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  follows from the stationarity of  $\phi_i$  and  $a$ . Passing to the limit  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , this observation can be used to prove the following:

**Lemma 27.** *Let  $d \geq 3$  and let  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  be a stationary ensemble of uniformly elliptic and bounded coefficient fields subject to assumptions (A1)–(A3); in particular, assume the spectral gap inequality of assumption (A3). Let  $\phi_i$  denote the (standard) homogenization corrector and let  $\mathbb{H}_+^d$  be a half-space. Then there exists a random field  $\theta_i$  that is stationary with respect to tangential shifts, whose realizations are almost surely of class  $H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{H}_+^d)$ , and that solves the boundary layer corrector equation*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla \theta_i) &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{H}_+^d, \\ \theta_i &= \phi_i & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for any  $x_0 \in \partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  the field  $\theta_i$  satisfies

$$\left\langle \int_0^\infty |\nabla \theta_i(x_0 + z)|^2 \, dz \right\rangle \lesssim 1. \quad (\text{D.5})$$

*Proof.* Observe that it suffices to show

$$\left\langle \int_0^\infty |\nabla \theta_i^T(x_0 + z)|^2 + \frac{1}{T} |\theta_i^T(x_0 + z)|^2 \, dz \right\rangle \lesssim 1, \quad (\text{D.6})$$

then (D.5) follows by passing to the limit  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . The equation (D.6) however is a straightforward consequence of taking the expected value in (D.4) for  $g = \zeta \phi_i$  ( $\zeta$  being a standard cutoff being equal to one on  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d$  and zero outside of  $\partial \mathbb{H}_+^d + B_1$ ), using stationarity as well as (4), and passing to the limit  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] G. Allaire and M. Amar. Boundary layer tails in periodic homogenization. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 4:209–243, 1999.
- [2] S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, J.-C. Mourrat, and C. Prange. Quantitative analysis of boundary layers in periodic homogenization. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 226:695–741, 2017.
- [3] S. Armstrong and C. Smart. Quantitative stochastic homogenization of convex integral functionals. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.*, 49(2):423–481, 2016.
- [4] S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, and J.-C. Mourrat. The additive structure of elliptic homogenization. *Invent. Math.*, 208(3):999–1054, 2017.
- [5] M. Avellaneda and F.-H. Lin. Méthodes de compacité en homogénéisation. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 305(4):113–116, 1987.
- [6] P. Bella, B. Fehrman, J. Fischer, and F. Otto. Stochastic homogenization of linear elliptic equations: Higher-order error estimates in weak norms via second-order correctors. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(6):4658–4703, 2017.
- [7] P. Bella and M. Kniely. Regularity of random elliptic operators with degenerate coefficients and applications to stochastic homogenization. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ.: Anal. Comput.*, pages 1–43, 2024.
- [8] X. Blanc and C. L. Bris. Improving on computation of homogenized coefficients in the periodic and quasi-periodic settings. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 5:1–29, 2010.
- [9] X. Blanc, C. L. Bris, and P.-L. Lions. Local profiles for elliptic problems at different scales: Defects in, and interfaces between periodic structures. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(12):2173–2236, 2015.
- [10] M. Duerinckx and A. Gloria. Multiscale functional inequalities: Concentration properties. *ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 2017.
- [11] M. Duerinckx and A. Gloria. Multiscale functional inequalities in probability: Constructive approach. *Annales Henri Lebesgue*, 3:825–872, 2020.
- [12] J. Fischer and S. Neukamm. Optimal homogenization rates in stochastic homogenization of nonlinear uniformly elliptic equations and systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 242:343–452, 2021.
- [13] J. Fischer and C. Raithel. Liouville principles and a large-scale regularity theory for random elliptic operators on the half-space. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(1):82–114, 2017.
- [14] D. Gérard-Varet and N. Masmoudi. Homogenization in polygonal domains. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 13(5):1477–1503, 2011.
- [15] D. Gérard-Varet and N. Masmoudi. Homogenization and boundary layers. *Acta Math.*, 209(1):133–178, 2012.
- [16] M. Giaquinta and L. Martinazzi. *An Introduction to the Regularity Theory for Elliptic Systems, Harmonic Maps and Minimal Graphs to the Regularity Theory for Elliptic Systems, Harmonic*. Appunti Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa, 2012.
- [17] A. Gloria. Reduction of the resonance error. Part 1: Approximation of homogenized coefficients. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 21(08):1601–1630, 2011.
- [18] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. A regularity theory for random elliptic operators. *Milan Journal of Mathematics*, 88:99–170, 2020.
- [19] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. Quantitative estimates in stochastic homogenization for correlated coefficient fields. *Analysis & PDE*, 8(4):2497–2537, 2021.

- [20] A. Gloria and F. Otto. An optimal error estimate in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(1):1–28, 2012.
- [21] M. Josien. Some quantitative homogenization results in a simple case of interface. *Commun. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 44(10):907–939, 2019.
- [22] M. Josien and C. Raithel. Quantitative homogenization for the case of an interface between two heterogeneous media. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(1):813–854, 2021.
- [23] M. Josien, C. Raithel, and M. Schäffner. Stochastic homogenization and geometric singularities: a study on corners. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 56(2), 2024.
- [24] S. M. Kozlov. The averaging of random operators. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 109(151)(2):188–202, 327, 1979.
- [25] J. Nėcas. Sur une m茅thode pour r茅soudre les 茅quations aux d茅riv茅es partielles du type elliptique, voisine de la variationnelle. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa*, 16(3):305–326, 1962.
- [26] G. C. Papanicolaou and S. R. S. Varadhan. Boundary value problems with rapidly oscillating random coefficients. In *Random Fields, Vol. I, II (Esztergom, 1979)*, volume 27 of *Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai*, pages 835–873. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.
- [27] Z. Shen and J. Zhuge. Boundary layers in periodic homogenization of Neumann problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 71(11):2163–2219, 2018.
- [28] Z. Shen and J. Zhuge. Regularity of homogenized boundary data in periodic homogenization of elliptic systems. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 22(9):2751–2776, 2020.
- [29] J. Zhuge. Regularity of a transmission problem and periodic homogenization. *J. Pure et Appl.*, 153:213–247, 2021.