

Homogenization of non-divergence form operators in i.i.d. random environments

Xiaoqin Guo ^{*1}, Timo Sprekeler², and Hung V. Tran ^{†3}

¹ Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Cincinnati, 2815
Commons Way, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA

² Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
77843, USA

³ Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 480
Lincoln Drive, Madison, WI 53706, USA

December 5, 2025

Abstract

We study random walks in a balanced, i.i.d. random environment in \mathbb{Z}^d for $d \geq 3$. We establish improved convergence rates for the homogenization of the Dirichlet problem associated with the corresponding non-divergence form difference operators, surpassing the $O(R^{-1})$ rate, which is expected to be optimal for environments with a finite range of dependence. In particular, the improved rates are $O(R^{-3/2})$ when $d = 3$, and $O(R^{-2} \log R)$ when $d \geq 4$.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the homogenization convergence rates of purely second-order non-divergence form difference operators in an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random environment on \mathbb{Z}^d for dimensions $d \geq 3$.

Large-scale behavior of random walks in i.i.d. environments has been intensively studied; see [9, 31, 8, 14, 24] and the references therein. Since the dynamics of random walks in random environments (RWRE) can be described by difference

2010 *Mathematics subject classification.* 35J15 35J25 35K10 35K20 60G50 60J65 60K37 74Q20 76M50.

Key words and phrases. random walks in a balanced random environment; non-divergence form difference operators; i.i.d. random environments; invariant measures; quantitative stochastic homogenization; optimal convergence rates.

^{*}The work of XG is supported by Simons Foundation through Collaboration Grant for Mathematicians #852943.

[†]HT is supported in part by NSF grant DMS-2348305.

equations, stochastic homogenization of difference equations in random environments is crucial for understanding the large-scale behavior of RWRE. For environments in which spectral-gap or Efron–Stein type inequalities are available, the strong concentration properties of the medium can be exploited to obtain quantitative homogenization results; see, for example, [16, 2, 20]. In this paper, we show that, for non-divergence form difference operators in the i.i.d. setting, the reflection symmetry of the law of the environment can in fact be used to extract additional cancellations. Somewhat unexpectedly, this yields homogenization rates for the Dirichlet problem that are strictly better than the standard optimal rate $O(R^{-1})$ obtained in [20]. To achieve this, we require a more delicate analysis of the fluctuations of the homogenization error, relying in particular on a deeper understanding of higher-order correctors.

1.1 Settings

Let $\mathbb{S}_{d \times d}$ denote the set of real $d \times d$ positive definite diagonal matrices. A map

$$\omega : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{d \times d}$$

is called an *environment*, and the set of all such environments is denoted by Ω . Let \mathbb{P} be a probability measure on Ω such that

$$\{\omega(x) = \text{diag}[\omega_1(x), \dots, \omega_d(x)], x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$$

are i.i.d. under \mathbb{P} . We denote the expectation with respect to \mathbb{P} by \mathbb{E} (or $E_{\mathbb{P}}$).

Definition 1. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ be the canonical basis for \mathbb{R}^d , and let

$$U := \{e \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |e| = 1\} = \{\pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_d\}$$

be the set of unit vectors in \mathbb{Z}^d . We define the difference operators $\nabla = (\nabla_e)_{e \in U}$ and $\nabla^2 = \text{diag}[\nabla_1^2, \dots, \nabla_d^2]$ by

$$\nabla_e u(x) := u(x + e) - u(x), \quad \nabla_i^2 u(x) := u(x + e_i) + u(x - e_i) - 2u(x) \quad (1)$$

for $e \in U$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Clearly, ∇ and ∇^2 are linear operators.

For $r > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write

$$\mathbb{B}_r(y) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - y| < r\}, \quad B_r(y) := \mathbb{B}_r(y) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$$

to denote the continuous and discrete ball with center y and radius r , respectively. When $y = 0$, we write $\mathbb{B}_r := \mathbb{B}_r(0)$ and $B_r := B_r(0)$ for simplicity. For any $B \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, its *discrete boundary* ∂B and *discrete closure* \bar{B} are defined as

$$\partial B := \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus B : |z - x| = 1 \text{ for some } x \in B\}, \quad \bar{B} := B \cup \partial B.$$

By abuse of notation, we also use ∂A and \bar{A} to denote the usual continuous boundary and closure of $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, respectively, if there is no confusion. The interior of B_R is denoted by

$$B_R^\circ := \{x \in B_R : |x - y| \geq 1 \text{ for all } y \in \partial \mathbb{B}_R\}.$$

Note that for any $R \geq 1$, there holds

$$\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{R-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \subset B_R^\circ \subset B_R \subset \bar{B}_R^\circ \subset \bar{\mathbb{B}}_R \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \subset \bar{B}_R.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, a *spatial shift* is defined by

$$\theta_x : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega, \quad \theta_x \omega := \omega(x + \cdot).$$

In a random environment $\omega \in \Omega$ in dimensions $d \geq 2$, we consider the discrete *non-divergence form* elliptic Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(\omega(x) \nabla^2 u(x)) = \frac{1}{R^2} f\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \zeta(\theta_x \omega) & x \in B_R^\circ, \\ u(x) = g\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) & x \in \partial B_R^\circ, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $f, g \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1}$ are sufficiently regular, and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ satisfies suitable integrability conditions. As $R \rightarrow \infty$, it is expected that $|u - \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})|$ converges to 0, where \bar{u} solves

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(\bar{a} D^2 \bar{u}(x)) = f(x) \bar{\psi} & x \in \mathbb{B}_1, \\ \bar{u}(x) = g(x) & x \in \partial \mathbb{B}_1. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here, $D^2 \bar{u}$ denotes the Hessian matrix of \bar{u} , and $\bar{a} = \bar{a}(\mathbb{P}) \in \mathbb{S}_{d \times d}$ and $\bar{\psi} = \bar{\psi}(\mathbb{P}, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R}$ are *deterministic* and do not depend on the realization of the random environment; see Theorem A and Theorem D for formulas of \bar{a} and $\bar{\psi}$.

We remark that in the continuous PDE setting, one only needs a function $g \in C^{2,\alpha}(\partial \mathbb{B}_1)$ on the boundary $\partial \mathbb{B}_1$ to consider Dirichlet problems of types (2) and (3). However, in the discrete setting, the discrete and continuous boundaries do not agree, and therefore the function g in (2) should be extended to $\frac{1}{R} \partial B_R^\circ \not\subset \partial \mathbb{B}_1$. This discrepancy typically induces an error of order $\frac{1}{R}$ which automatically becomes the ceiling of the optimal homogenization error in the discrete setting, cf. [20]. Indeed, this $O(R^{-1})$ rate is the optimal rate obtained in [20] for $d \geq 3$. Whereas, when such a discretization issue is not present, e.g., in the continuous periodic setting [21, 30, 28], one needs to go deeper into higher order correctors to justify the optimality of the rate $O(R^{-1})$ for the homogenization of the Dirichlet problem. We refer to [11, 15, 29] for recent developments in numerical homogenization of PDEs in non-divergence form.

A goal of this article is to isolate and examine the homogenization rate that does **not** originate from boundary discretization. To this end, we assume that the

boundary data g is properly extended to be a function on $\frac{1}{R}\partial B_R^\circ$ in the Dirichlet problem (2).

The non-divergence form difference equation (2) is used to describe random walks in a random environment (RWRE) in \mathbb{Z}^d . To be specific, for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we set

$$\omega(x, x \pm e_i) := \frac{\omega_i(x)}{2 \operatorname{tr} \omega(x)} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\omega(x, y) := 0 \quad \text{if } |x - y| \neq 1,$$

that is, we normalize ω to get a transition probability. We note that the configuration of $\{\omega(x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ is also called a *balanced environment* in the literature [26, 22, 7, 13, 6, 12].

Definition 2. For each fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, the random walk $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ in the environment ω with $X_0 = x$ is a Markov chain in \mathbb{Z}^d with transition probability P_ω^x specified by

$$P_\omega^x(X_{n+1} = z | X_n = y) := \omega(y, z). \quad (5)$$

The *continuous-time* RWRE $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in ω is defined to be the Markov process on \mathbb{Z}^d with jump rates $\omega(x, y)$ from x to y . With abuse of notations, we still denote by P_ω^x the quenched law of (Y_t) if there is no ambiguity from the context.

The expectation with respect to P_ω^x is denoted by E_ω^x . When the starting point of the random walk is 0, we sometimes omit the superscript and write P_ω^0 and E_ω^0 as P_ω and E_ω , respectively. Note that for random walks (X_n) in an environment ω , we have that

$$\bar{\omega}^i := \theta_{X_i} \omega \in \Omega, \quad i \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

is also a Markov chain, called the *environment viewed from the particle* process. By abuse of notation, we enlarge our probability space so that P_ω still denotes the joint law of the random walks and $(\bar{\omega}^i)_{i \geq 0}$.

For $\omega \in \Omega$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we set $a_i(x) = a_i^\omega(x) := \frac{\omega_i(x)}{\operatorname{tr} \omega(x)} = 2\omega(x, x + e_i)$ and

$$a(x) = a^\omega(x) := \operatorname{diag}[a_1(x), \dots, a_d(x)] = \frac{\omega(x)}{\operatorname{tr} \omega(x)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (7)$$

Finally, for $\omega \in \Omega$, we introduce the difference operator L_ω given by

$$L_\omega u(x) := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega(x, y)[u(y) - u(x)] = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(a(x) \nabla^2 u(x)).$$

That is, L_ω is the generator of the process $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

1.2 Main assumptions and some notations

Throughout the paper, the following assumptions are always in force:

- (A1) $\{\omega(x), x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ are i.i.d. under the probability measure \mathbb{P} .
- (A2) $\frac{\omega}{\text{tr}\omega} \geq 2\kappa I$ for \mathbb{P} -almost every ω and some constant $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2d}]$.
- (A3) $\psi(\omega) := \frac{\zeta(\omega)}{\text{tr}\omega(0)}$ is a $L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ -bounded measurable function of $\omega(0)$.

Throughout this paper, we use c, C to denote positive constants which may change from line to line but only depend on the dimension d and the ellipticity constant κ unless stated otherwise. We write $A \lesssim B$ if $A \leq CB$, and $A \asymp B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $A \gtrsim B$. We also use the notations $A \lesssim_j B$ and $A \asymp_j B$ to indicate that the multiplicative constant depends on the variable j other than (d, κ) . We will use the convention of summation over repeated indices. For example, $a_k b_k$ represents $\sum_{k=1}^d a_k b_k$. This convention is not used in definitions (17) and (18). For simplicity, we use $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\omega)$ to denote a generic *stretched-exponentially integrable* random variable (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\mathcal{H}^c)] < C$) whose value may differ from line to line. We write $\mathcal{H}_x(\omega) := \mathcal{H}(\theta_x \omega)$. We note that \mathcal{H} may depend on other parameters as well, although the constants c, C in the stretched-exponential moment bound only depend on (d, κ) .

1.3 Earlier results in the literature

We first recall the following quenched central limit theorem (QCLT) proved in [26], which is a discrete version of [27].

Theorem A. Assume (A2) and that law \mathbb{P} of the environment is ergodic under spatial shifts $\{\theta_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$. Then, the following assertions hold.

- (i) There exists a probability measure $\mathbb{Q} \approx \mathbb{P}$ such that $(\bar{\omega}^i)_{i \geq 0}$ is an ergodic (with respect to time shifts) sequence under law $\mathbb{Q} \times P_\omega$.
- (ii) For \mathbb{P} -almost every ω , the rescaled path $X_{n^2 t}/n$ converges weakly (under law P_ω) to a Brownian motion with covariance matrix

$$\bar{a} = \text{diag}[\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_d] := E_{\mathbb{Q}}[a] = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[\frac{\omega(0)}{\text{tr}\omega(0)}] > 0. \quad (8)$$

We denote the Radon–Nikodym derivative of \mathbb{Q} with respect to \mathbb{P} by

$$\rho(\omega) = d\mathbb{Q}/d\mathbb{P}. \quad (9)$$

If the environment is i.i.d., it was proved in [19, Theorem 1.5] that

$$E[\exp(\rho^{-c})] + E[\exp(\rho^c)] < \infty \quad (10)$$

for some constant $c = c(\kappa, d) > 0$. For any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write

$$\rho_\omega(x) := \rho(\theta_x \omega).$$

For any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and any function f on a set A , we define

$$\operatorname{osc}_A f := \sup_{x, y \in A} |f(x) - f(y)|, \quad [f]_{\alpha; A} := \sup_{x, y \in A, x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha},$$

and, if A is a finite set, for $p \in (0, \infty)$, we define

$$\|f\|_{p; A} := \left(\frac{1}{\#A} \sum_{x \in A} |f(x)|^p \right)^{1/p}, \quad \|f\|_{\infty; A} := \max_{x \in A} |f(x)|.$$

For any integer $j \geq 0$, let H_j denote the set of j -th order polynomials, with $H_0 = \mathbb{R}$. In fact, in our paper, we will only use the cases $j = 0, 1$.

The following large-scale regularity result can be found in [20], which is a discrete version of the $C^{1,1}$ regularity estimate in [2, Theorem 3.1]. This was first done in the periodic setting in [4, 5].

Theorem B. *Assume (A1), (A2), and that ψ is a **local** function. Let $R \geq 1$. There exists $\alpha = \alpha(d, \kappa) \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$ such that, for any u with $L_\omega u(x) = \psi(\theta_x \omega) + f(x)$ on B_R , $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{H} \leq r < R$, we have that*

$$\frac{1}{r^j} \inf_{p \in H_{j-1}} \operatorname{osc}_{B_r} (u - p) \lesssim \frac{1}{R^j} \inf_{p \in H_{j-1}} \operatorname{osc}_{B_R} (u - p) + A_j, \quad (11)$$

where the terms $A_1 = A_1(R)$ and $A_2 = A_2(R, r)$ obey the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq R^{1-\alpha} \|\psi\|_\infty + R \|f\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad A_1 \leq R^{1-\alpha} \|\psi + f(0)\|_\infty + R^{1+\sigma} [f]_{\sigma; B_R}, \\ A_2 &\leq r^{-\alpha} \|\psi\|_\infty + \log\left(\frac{R}{r}\right) \|f\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 \leq r^{-\alpha} \|\psi + f(0)\|_\infty + R^\sigma [f]_{\sigma; B_R} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. In particular, for any $R > 1$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, there holds

$$|\nabla^j u(0)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}}{R} \right)^j \left(\|u - u(0)\|_{1; B_R} + R^2 \|\psi + f(0)\|_\infty + R^{2+\sigma} [f]_{\sigma; B_R} \right). \quad (12)$$

Introducing the quantities

$$\mu(R) := \begin{cases} R & d = 2, \\ R^{1/2} & d = 3, \\ (1 \vee \log R)^{1/2} & d = 4, \\ 1 & d \geq 5, \end{cases} \quad \delta(R) := \begin{cases} (\log(R \vee 2))^{3/2} & d = 2, \\ 1 & d \geq 3, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

the following theorems on properties of the (global) correctors and quantitative homogenization of the Dirichlet problem were established in [20].

Theorem C. Let ψ be an $L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ -bounded function of $\omega(0)$ with $\|\psi\|_\infty = 1$. For each $d \geq 2$ and \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω , there exists a function $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \boldsymbol{\phi}_\omega : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that solves

$$L_\omega \boldsymbol{\phi}(x) = \psi(\theta_x \omega) - \bar{\psi} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

with the following properties:

- (i) When $d \geq 5$, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(c|\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)/\mu(|x|)|^p)] < C_p$ for any $p \in (0, \frac{2d}{3d+2})$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$;
 When $d = 3, 4$, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(c|\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)/\mu(|x|)|^p)] < C_p$ for any $p \in (0, \frac{2d}{3d+4})$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$;
 When $d = 2$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(c \left| \frac{\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)}{|x|\delta(|x|)} \right|^p \right) \right] \leq C_p$ for any $p \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$;
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}[\exp(c|\nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)/\delta(|x|)|^q)] \leq C_q$ for any $q \in (0, \frac{d}{2d+2})$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$;
- (iii) $\mathbb{E}[\exp(c|\nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)|^r)] \leq C_r$ for any $r \in (0, \frac{d}{2})$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$;
- (iv) (Stationarity properties)
 - When $d \geq 5$, the field $\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_\omega(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ is stationary (under \mathbb{P});
 - When $d \geq 3$, we have $\nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}_\omega(x) = \nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}_{\theta_x \omega}(0)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and the field $\{\nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}_\omega(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ is stationary;
 - When $d = 2$, we have $\nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\phi}_\omega(x) = \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\phi}_{\theta_x \omega}(0)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and the field $\{\nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\phi}_\omega(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ is stationary.

Moreover, such a corrector $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is unique up to an additive constant when $d \geq 3$, and is unique up to an affine transformation when $d = 2$.

Theorem D. Assume (A1), (A2), and (A3). Let $\bar{a} := E_{\mathbb{Q}}[\frac{\omega(0)}{\text{tr}\omega(0)}] > 0$ and $\bar{\psi} := E_{\mathbb{Q}}[\frac{\xi}{\text{tr}\omega(0)}]$. Suppose f, g are both in $C^4(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $R \geq 2$, there exists a random variable $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}(R, \varepsilon, \omega) > 1$ with $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\mathcal{Y}^{d/(2d+2)-\varepsilon})] < C$ such that the solution u of (2) satisfies

$$\max_{x \in B_R} |u(x) - \bar{u}(\frac{x}{R})| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\log R)^{2+\varepsilon} R^{-1} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^4(\bar{B}_1)} \mathcal{Y} & \text{when } d = 2, \\ R^{-1} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^4(\bar{B}_1)} \mathcal{Y} & \text{when } d \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

where \bar{u} is the solution of the Dirichlet problem (3).

We point out that Theorem D also remains valid for certain finite range dependent environments that are not i.i.d. (for example, the “checkerboard” environment considered in [2]), provided that an Efron–Stein-type concentration inequality holds. Indeed, to obtain the heat-kernel bounds with exponential integrability [19] and the optimal convergence rates [20], the only requirements are an Efron–Stein-type concentration inequality and a finite range of dependence. We refer the reader to [10, 3, 2, 6, 17, 19, 1, 23, 20] for recent developments of quantitative stochastic homogenization of non-divergence form elliptic PDE in both discrete and continuous settings.

1.4 Main results

Theorem 3. Assume (A1), (A2), (A3), and $d \geq 3$. Let $\bar{a}, \bar{\psi}$ be as in Theorem D. Suppose that $f \in C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)$ and $g \in C^{6,\alpha}(\partial\mathbb{B}_1)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then, there exists a $C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)$ -extension of g such that the solutions u, \bar{u} of (2), (3) satisfy

$$\max_{x \in B_R} |u(x) - \bar{u}(\frac{x}{R})| \lesssim \begin{cases} R^{-3/2} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \mathcal{H} & \text{when } d = 3, \\ R^{-2} (\log R) \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \mathcal{H} & \text{when } d \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

An example of such an extension is $g = \bar{u}$.

In the i.i.d. setting with well-prepared boundary conditions, Theorem 3 yields improved convergence rates compared to the rate $O(R^{-1})$ in Theorem D when $d \geq 3$. Our approaches and contributions are as follows. We employ the two-scale asymptotic expansion to obtain the estimate (21) in Proposition 5. Due to the i.i.d. structure, the environment enjoys a reflection symmetry; that is, the random fields $\omega(\cdot)$ and $\omega(-\cdot)$ are identically distributed. (Of course, this symmetry fails for environments with only a finite range of dependence.) This reflection symmetry implies that the third-order homogenized tensor vanishes, which in turn suggests that a homogenization error bound sharper than $O(R^{-1})$ may be attainable.

We remark that such improved rates should not be expected in environments with correlations even slightly weaker than in the point-wise i.i.d. case, since the distribution's reflective symmetry is no longer present.

In our i.i.d. setting, without the presence of the third-order tensor, the homogenization rate is completely determined by the $C^{0,1}$ -bounds of higher-order correctors. Roughly speaking, the (first-order) correctors “correct” local coefficients, while the higher-order correctors account for the derivatives of the lower-order correctors. Hence, unlike the correctors themselves, the source terms in the equations for higher-order correctors are highly nonlocal, and thus the large-scale regularity estimates in Theorem B, which apply only to equations with *local* source terms, no longer hold.

Our improved convergence rates in Theorem 3 are inspired by earlier results in the periodic setting [18], where it was proved that if the environment has “one degree of freedom” $a(x)$, i.e., the coefficient matrix is of the form $\omega(x) = C + a(x)M$ for some constant symmetric matrices C and M , then the third-order homogenized tensor vanishes, leading to an improved rate of $O(R^{-2})$. The periodic setting, however, is quite rigid. We provided examples in [18] that show that if the environment has two degrees of freedom, then the third-order homogenized tensor does not vanish in general, and the optimal convergence rate in such cases is only $O(R^{-1})$.

In contrast, in our random setting, $\omega(x) = \text{diag}[\omega_1(x), \dots, \omega_d(x)]$ has d degrees of freedom, which is fundamentally different from the periodic case considered in [18]. Moreover, in the periodic setting, the $C^{0,1}$ -boundedness of higher-order correctors is automatically guaranteed by periodicity.

One of the main contributions of our work is to establish $C^{0,1}$ bounds for higher-order correctors in the random setting. Our approach is based on comparing the true

higher-order correctors with certain *localized* higher-order correctors that possess good regularity properties and *approximate* higher-order correctors that are stationary.

Remark 4. When $d = 2$, the corrector v^k grows super-linearly (Theorem C). Consequently, via the expansion (21), it produces an error term of order $R^{-2}|v^k|$ that dominates the desired $O(R^{-1})$ scale. Therefore, in two dimensions, we should not expect an improvement beyond the $O(R^{-1})$ rate in i.i.d. environments.

All in all, this demonstrates that, in the absence of additional structural assumptions on the random environment, the boundary conditions, or the dimension, the best convergence rate that one can expect is $O(R^{-1})$, as established in [20]. We refer to Remark 6 for a discussion of the optimality of the $O(R^{-1})$ rate.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The two-scale asymptotic expansion

In this section, we will investigate the rate of convergence of the solution of the Dirichlet problem (2). With a as defined in (7), problem (2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} L_\omega u(x) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(a(x) \nabla^2 u(x)) = \frac{1}{R^2} f\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \psi(\theta_x \omega) & x \in B_R^\circ, \\ u(x) = g\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) & x \in \partial B_R^\circ, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where $\psi(\omega) := \frac{\xi(\omega)}{\operatorname{tr} \omega(0)}$. With abuse of notation, we also write

$$\psi(x) := \psi(\theta_x \omega) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad \bar{\psi} := E_{\mathbb{Q}} \psi.$$

Recall a and \bar{a} from (7) and (8). For $\omega \in \Omega$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, let $v^k, \xi : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be solutions of

$$L_\omega v^k(x) = \frac{1}{2}(a_k(x) - \bar{a}_k) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (15)$$

$$L_\omega \xi(x) = \psi(x) - \bar{\psi} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (16)$$

respectively. That is, v^k and ξ are global correctors (whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem C) associated to $\frac{1}{2}a_k(x) = \omega(x, x + e_k)$ and $\psi(\omega)$, respectively. We introduce

$$\lambda_j^k(x) = \lambda_j^k(x; \omega) := a_j(x) [v^k(x + e_j) - v^k(x - e_j)], \quad \bar{\lambda}_j^k(x) := E_{\mathbb{P}} [\rho(x) \lambda_j^k(x)], \quad (17)$$

$$\eta_j(x) = \eta_j(x; \omega) := a_j(x) [\xi(x + e_j) - \xi(x - e_j)], \quad \bar{\eta}_j(x) := E_{\mathbb{P}} [\rho(x) \eta_j(x)], \quad (18)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Note that when $d \geq 3$, by Theorem C, both ∇v^k and $\nabla \xi$ are stationary fields (under \mathbb{P}) and so $\bar{\lambda}_j^k$ and $\bar{\eta}_j$ are constants that do not depend on x .

Proposition 5. Suppose that $d \geq 3$, $f \in C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)$, and $g \in C^{6,\alpha}(\partial\mathbb{B}_1)$. Let u, \bar{u} be the solutions of (2), (3), respectively. Recall a, \bar{a} from (7), (8), and let $v^k, \xi, \lambda_j^k, \bar{\lambda}_j^k, \eta_j, \bar{\eta}_j$ be as above. We extend g so that $g = \bar{u}$ on $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1$. Let $\bar{z} : \bar{\mathbb{B}}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\bar{a} D^2 \bar{z}(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\lambda}_i^k \partial_{kki} \bar{u}(x) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\eta}_j \partial_j f(x) & x \in \mathbb{B}_1, \\ \bar{z}(x) = 0 & x \in \partial\mathbb{B}_1. \end{cases}$$

For $\omega \in \Omega$, $R > 1$, and $j, k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, let $p_j^k, s_j : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be solutions of

$$L_\omega p_j^k(x) = \lambda_j^k(x) - \bar{\lambda}_j^k \quad \text{for } x \in B_R, \quad (19)$$

$$L_\omega s_j(x) = \eta_j(x) - \bar{\eta}_j \quad \text{for } x \in B_R, \quad (20)$$

respectively. Then, for $\omega \in \Omega$, $R > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{x \in B_R} \left| u(x) - \bar{u}\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) - \frac{1}{R} \bar{z}\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \right| \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \max_{i,j,k=1}^d \left[1 + \left\| |\nabla p_j^k| + |\nabla s_j| + (|\bar{\lambda}_j^i| + |\bar{\eta}_j|) |\nabla v^k| \right\|_{d; B_R} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \max_{\bar{B}_R} \left(|\xi| + |v^k| + \frac{1}{R} (|p_i^k| + |s_i|) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Remark 6. This proposition identifies $O(R^{-1})$ as the optimal homogenization rate unless $\bar{z} \equiv 0$, and so no improvement beyond $O(R^{-1})$ should be expected in general. We further expect that Proposition 5 remains valid for environments with finite range of dependence, for the same reasons discussed in the comments following Theorem D.

Proof. Let $z : \bar{B}_R^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} L_\omega z(x) = \frac{1}{R^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \bar{\lambda}_i^k \partial_{kki} \bar{u}\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\eta}_i \partial_i f\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \right] & x \in B_R^\circ, \\ z(x) = 0 & x \in \partial B_R^\circ. \end{cases}$$

Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= u(x) - \bar{u}\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) - \frac{1}{R} z(x) \\ &+ \frac{1}{R^2} \left[v^k(x) \partial_{kk} \bar{u}\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) - f\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \xi(x) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R^3} \left[\partial_{kki} \bar{u}\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) p_i^k(x) - \partial_i f\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) s_i(x) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

for $x \in \bar{B}_R^\circ \subset \bar{\mathbb{B}}_R \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then, applying the formula

$$\begin{aligned} L_\omega(uv)(x) &= u(x) L_\omega v(x) + v(x) L_\omega u(x) + \sum_{y: y \sim x} \omega(x, y) [u(y) - u(x)] [v(y) - v(x)] \\ &= u(x) L_\omega v(x) + v(x) L_\omega u(x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} a_i(x) \left(\nabla_{e_i} u(x) [v(x + e_i) - v(x - e_i)] + \nabla_i^2 u(x) \nabla_{-e_i} v(x) \right) \end{aligned}$$

to the products within (22), we obtain in B_R° that

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_\omega[v^k \partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})] \\
&= L_\omega v^k \partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + v^k L_\omega[\partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})] + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_i^k \nabla_{e_i}[\partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})] + \frac{1}{2} a_i \nabla_i^2[\partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})] \nabla_{-e_i} v^k \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (a_k - \bar{a}_k) \partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \lambda_i^k \partial_{kki} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + O(\frac{1}{R^2}) \|\bar{u}\|_{C^5(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \sum_{k=1}^d |v^k|, \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $|\lambda_i^k| \lesssim |\nabla v^k| \lesssim \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} |v^k|$ in B_R° . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
L_\omega[f(\frac{\cdot}{R})\xi] &= (\psi - \bar{\psi})f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \eta_i \partial_i f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + O(\frac{1}{R^2}) \|\bar{u}\|_{C^5(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} |\xi|, \tag{24} \\
L_\omega[\partial_{kki} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) p_i^k] &= (\lambda_i^k - \bar{\lambda}_i^k) \partial_{kki} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \partial_{kij} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) a_j [p_i^k(\cdot + e_j) - p_i^k(\cdot - e_j)] \\
&\quad + O(\frac{1}{R^2}) \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \sum_{i,k=1}^d |p_i^k|, \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L_\omega[\partial_i f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) s_i] &= (\eta_i - \bar{\eta}_i) \partial_i f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \partial_{ij} f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) a_j [s_i(\cdot + e_j) - s_i(\cdot - e_j)] \\
&\quad + O(\frac{1}{R^2}) \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \sum_{i=1}^d |s_i|. \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|L_\omega[\bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})] - \frac{1}{2R^2} \text{tr}[aD^2 \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})]| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^4} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^4(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)}$, and

$$L_\omega u = \frac{1}{R^2} f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) (\psi - \bar{\psi}) + \frac{1}{R^2} f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) \bar{\psi} = \frac{1}{R^2} [f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) L_\omega \xi + \frac{1}{2} \bar{a}_k \partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})].$$

Then, recalling the definition of w in (22) and writing

$$A := \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \sum_{i,k=1}^d \left[|\xi| + |v^k| + \frac{1}{R} (|p_i^k| + |s_i|) \right],$$

by (23), (24), (25), (26), we have in B_R° that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |L_\omega w| \\
&= \frac{1}{R^2} \left| f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) L_\omega \xi + \frac{1}{2} \bar{a}_k \partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) - R^2 L_\omega[\bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})] - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \bar{\lambda}_i^k \partial_{kki} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \bar{\eta}_i \partial_i f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} (a_k - \bar{a}_k) \partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \lambda_i^k \partial_{kki} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) \\
&\quad - (\psi - \bar{\psi}) f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \eta_i \partial_i f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + O(\frac{1}{R^2}) \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} A \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} (\lambda_i^k - \bar{\lambda}_i^k) \partial_{kki} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) - \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{R^2} \partial_{kij} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) a_j [p_i^k(\cdot + e_j) - p_i^k(\cdot - e_j)] \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} (\eta_i - \bar{\eta}_i) \partial_i f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) + \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{R^2} \partial_{ij} f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) a_j [s_i(\cdot + e_j) - s_i(\cdot - e_j)] \right| \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{R^4} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \sum_{i,k=1}^d \left[1 + |\nabla p_i^k| + |\nabla s_i| + \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \left(|\xi| + |v^k| + \frac{1}{R} (|p_i^k| + |s_i|) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the above inequality, the definition of w from (22), and the ABP maximum principle, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} |u - \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) - \frac{1}{R}z| \\
& \leq \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} |w| + \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \left| \frac{1}{R^2} [v^k \partial_{kk} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) - f(\frac{\cdot}{R})\xi] - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R^3} [\partial_{kki} \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R}) p_i^k - \partial_i f(\frac{\cdot}{R}) s_i] \right| \\
& \lesssim R^2 \|L_\omega w\|_{d; B_R^\circ} + \frac{1}{R^2} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^3} \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \left(|\xi| + |v^k| + \frac{1}{R} (|p_i^k| + |s_i|) \right) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^6} \sum_{i,k=1}^d \left[1 + \left\| |\nabla p_i^k| + |\nabla s_i| \right\|_{d; B_R} + \max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} \left(|\xi| + |v^k| + \frac{1}{R} (|p_i^k| + |s_i|) \right) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Furthermore, by [20, Lemma 30],

$$\max_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} |z - \bar{z}(\frac{\cdot}{R})| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \max_{j, \ell=1}^d (|\bar{\lambda}_j^\ell| + |\bar{\eta}_j|) \|\bar{u}\|_{C^5(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_1)} \sum_{k=1}^d (1 + R \|\nabla v^k\|_{d; B_R^\circ} + \text{osc}_{\bar{B}_R^\circ} v^k).$$

This inequality, together with (27), yields the claimed bound (21). \square

2.2 Homogenization in i.i.d. environments

In order for the homogenization error $|u(\cdot) - \bar{u}(\frac{\cdot}{R})|$ to be smaller than $O(R^{-1})$, it is essential (by (21) of Proposition 5) that $\bar{z} \equiv 0$. We recall that in the *periodic environment* studied in [18], the tensor $\bar{\lambda}_j^k$ (corresponding to c_j^{kk} in [18, (1.6)], where c_j^{kl} is the third-order homogenized tensor) vanishes when the coefficient matrix is of the form $\omega(x) = C + a(x)M$ for some $a \in C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and constant symmetric matrices C, M .

In the stochastic setting considered here, we will show that the tensors $\bar{\lambda}_j^k, \bar{\eta}_j$ are identically zero when the environment is i.i.d., implying that $\bar{z} \equiv 0$ and suggesting that a homogenization error bound sharper than $O(R^{-1})$ may be achievable.

The proof relies crucially on the reflection symmetry of the i.i.d. environment, namely that the environments $\omega(\cdot)$ and $\omega(-\cdot)$ are identically distributed. Of course, such symmetry does not hold for environments with only a finite range of dependence.

Proposition 7. *Recall $\bar{\lambda}_j^k$ and $\bar{\eta}_j$ from (17) and (18), respectively. When $d \geq 3$, we have*

$$\bar{\lambda}_j^k = \bar{\eta}_j = 0 \quad \forall j, k \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

Proof. We will only prove that $\bar{\eta}_j = 0$. The proof of $\bar{\lambda}_j^k = 0$ follows the same lines.

For $\omega \in \Omega$, let its “reflection” $\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\omega}_\omega \in \Omega$ be defined by

$$\tilde{\omega}(x) = \omega(-x) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Then $\tilde{\omega}$ and ω have the same distribution under \mathbb{P} . Note that

$$\rho_{\tilde{\omega}}(0) = \rho_{\omega}(0).$$

Let $\xi = \xi_{\omega}$ (whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem C) be as defined in (16). Since ψ is a function of $\omega(0)$, we have $\psi_{\tilde{\omega}}(x) = \psi_{\omega}(-x)$. Hence, for \mathbb{P} -almost all ω , we have

$$\xi_{\tilde{\omega}}(x) = \xi_{\omega}(-x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

up to an additive constant (which may depend on ω).

By the above discussions and the fact that $\nabla \xi$ is a stationary field under \mathbb{P} , we have for any $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\eta}_j &= E_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\rho_{\omega}(0) a_j^{\omega}(0) [\xi_{\omega}(e_j) - \xi_{\omega}(-e_j)] \right] \\ &= E_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\rho_{\tilde{\omega}}(0) a_j^{\tilde{\omega}}(0) [\xi_{\tilde{\omega}}(-e_j) - \xi_{\tilde{\omega}}(e_j)] \right] \\ &= -\bar{\eta}_j, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\bar{\eta}_j = 0$. □

3 Bounding p_j^k

In this section, we will compute the bound of a solution p_j^k of (19). To this end, we construct p_j^k using the “local Green function” in [20].

We fix a smooth function $\eta_0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that satisfies

$$\eta_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset [0, 1], \quad \eta_0|_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{8/3}} = 1, \quad \eta_0|_{\mathbb{B}_{7/3}} = 0.$$

For $R > 0$, we introduce $\eta = \eta_R : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\eta(x) = \eta_R(x) := \eta_0\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (28)$$

and we note that

$$\eta|_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{3R}} = 1, \quad \eta|_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} = 0, \quad |D\eta| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}, \quad |D^2\eta| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2}.$$

For any fixed $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $G_R(\cdot, z) = G_R(\cdot, z; \omega) : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the solution to

$$L_{\omega} G_R(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{R^2} G_R(\cdot, z) \eta - \mathbb{1}_z \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

where $\mathbb{1}_z(x) := 1$ if $x = z$, and $\mathbb{1}_z(x) := 0$ if $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{z\}$. Note that $G_R(\cdot, z)$ is L_{ω} -harmonic on $B_{2R} \setminus \{z\}$, that is, $w(x) = G_R(x, z)$ satisfies

$$L_{\omega} w(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in B_{2R} \setminus \{z\}. \quad (29)$$

Lemma 8. *Let $R > 1$ and $d \geq 3$. For $x \in B_R$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have*

$$|\nabla^2 G_R(x, z)| \lesssim \mathcal{H}_{x,z}^{d+1} (|x - z| \wedge R + 1)^{-2} e^{-c|x-z|/R} (|x - z| + 1)^{2-d}.$$

Here $\mathcal{H}_{x,y} = \mathcal{H}_x + \mathcal{H}_y$, and $\mathcal{H}_x(\omega) = \mathcal{H}(\theta_x \omega)$ is an exponentially integrable random variable.

Proof. By [20, Proposition 36(b)], we have

$$|\nabla G_R(x, z)| \lesssim \mathcal{H}_{x,z}^d (|x - z| \wedge R + 1)^{-1} e^{-c|x-z|/R} (|x - z| + 1)^{2-d}. \quad (30)$$

Since $|\nabla^2 G_R(x, z)| \lesssim |\nabla G_R(x, z)|$, the statement is true when $|x - z| \wedge R \leq \mathcal{H}_{x,z}$. It remains to prove the lemma for the case $|x - z| \wedge R > \mathcal{H}_{x,z}$.

By (29), for any $x \in B_R$, $G_R(\cdot, z)$ is L_ω -harmonic on $B_{|x-z| \wedge R}(x)$. Hence, when $|x - z| \wedge R > \mathcal{H}_{x,z}$, we have by the $C^{1,1}$ -estimates in (12) of Theorem B that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^2 G_R(x, z)| &\lesssim \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_x}{|x - z| \wedge R} \right)^2 \|G_R(\cdot, z)\|_{1; B_{2R}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_x}{|x - z| \wedge R} \right)^2 \mathcal{H}_z^{d-1} e^{-c|x-z|/R} (|x - z| + 1)^{2-d}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used [20, Proposition 36(a)] in the last inequality. The lemma follows. \square

Let ω' denote an independent copy of ω , and let $\omega'_y \in \Omega$ be the environment defined by

$$\omega'_y(x) := \begin{cases} \omega(x) & \text{if } x \neq y \\ \omega'(y) & \text{if } x = y. \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

For any function $\zeta(\omega)$, let

$$\partial'_y \zeta(\omega) := \zeta(\omega'_y) - \zeta.$$

Lemma 9. *If $u(x) = u_\omega(x)$ solves $L_\omega u(x) = \xi(x, \omega)$ for some $\xi : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then $\partial'_y u$ solves*

$$L_\omega(\partial'_y u)(x) = \partial'_y \xi(x, \omega) - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\partial'_y a(y) \nabla^2 u'_y(y)) \mathbb{1}_y(x),$$

where $u'_y(x) := u_{\omega'_y}(x)$, and $\omega'_y \in \Omega$ is as in (31).

Let

$$p_j^k(x) = - \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G_R(x, z) \left(\lambda_j^k(z) - \bar{\lambda}_j^k \right). \quad (32)$$

We may omit the indices k, j and write $p_j^k, \lambda_j^k, \bar{\lambda}_j^k$ as $p, \lambda, \bar{\lambda}$, since our arguments work for all k, j . Note that p solves the equation

$$L_\omega p = \frac{1}{R^2} p \eta + (\lambda - \bar{\lambda}) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Proposition 10. *For any $x \in B_R$, we have*

$$|p(x)| \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}_x} \Gamma(R) := \begin{cases} R^{3/2} & \text{if } d = 3, \\ R(\log R)^{1/2} & \text{if } d = 4, \\ R & \text{if } d \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

To estimate the size of p , we introduce a stationary version of p . Let

$$p^{\text{AP}}(x) = p_{\omega}^{\text{AP}}(x) = - \int_0^{\infty} e^{-s/R^2} E_{\omega}^x[\lambda(Y_s) - \bar{\lambda}] ds \quad (33)$$

where $(Y_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is the continuous-time RWRE from Definition 2. Then p^{AP} solves

$$L_{\omega} p^{\text{AP}} = \frac{1}{R^2} p^{\text{AP}} + (\lambda - \bar{\lambda}) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (34)$$

Note that, denoting the Green's function $G^{\text{AP}} = G_{\omega, R}^{\text{AP}}$ associated to the operator (34) by

$$G^{\text{AP}}(x, y) := \int_0^{\infty} e^{-s/R^2} p_s^{\omega}(x, y) ds, \quad (35)$$

we have a similar formula to (32) for p^{AP} :

$$p^{\text{AP}}(x) = - \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^{\text{AP}}(x, y) (\lambda(y) - \bar{\lambda}). \quad (36)$$

Moreover, for $d \geq 3$, we have (for some stretched-exponentially integrable \mathcal{H})

$$G^{\text{AP}}(x, y) \lesssim \mathcal{H}_y e^{-c|x-y|/R} (|x-y| + 1)^{2-d} \quad \text{for any } x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \quad (37)$$

and the same bound holds for $G_R(x, y)$ as well, see [20, (68) and Proposition 36(a)].

The function p^{AP} is stationary (i.e., $p^{\text{AP}}(x)$ has the same distribution as $p^{\text{AP}}(0)$). We claim that there exists a random variable \mathcal{H} (which may depend on R) with $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\mathcal{H}^c)] < C$ such that

$$|p^{\text{AP}}| \leq R^2 \mathcal{H}, \quad |p| \leq R^2 \mathcal{H}. \quad (38)$$

To this end, observe that by (36), the definition of λ in (17), and Theorem C(ii),

$$|p^{\text{AP}}| \lesssim \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{H}_y e^{-c|y|/R} (|y| + 1)^{2-d}. \quad (39)$$

Recall that the meaning of \mathcal{H} may differ from line to line. In fact, (39) implies that

$$|p^{\text{AP}}| \lesssim R^2 \mathcal{H}. \quad (40)$$

Indeed, since $\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-c|y|/R} (|y| + 1)^{2-d} \lesssim R^2$, by Jensen's inequality and (39),

$$\left(\frac{C}{R^2} |p^{\text{AP}}| \right)^n \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-c|y|/R} (|y| + 1)^{2-d} \mathcal{H}_y^n \quad \text{for any } n \geq 1.$$

Using the stationarity of the measure \mathbb{P} under spatial-shifts, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{C}{R^2} |p^{\text{AP}}| \right)^n \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-c|y|/R} (|y| + 1)^{2-d} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}_y^n] \asymp \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}^n] \quad \text{for any } n \geq 1.$$

Therefore $\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\left(\frac{C}{R^2} |p^{\text{AP}}| \right)^c \right) \right] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\exp(\mathcal{H}^c)] < C'$ and (40) follows. The second bound in (38) is proved exactly the same way. Claim (38) is proved.

However, p^{AP} does not have the desired regularity. We overcome this challenge by using the fact that p has better regularity than p^{AP} (although p is only “almost stationary”), and then comparing p to p^{AP} .

Remark 11. Some comments are in order.

- Our control of the term $p = p_j^k$ follows a different strategy as the bound of the local corrector ϕ in [20]. Recall that, in [20], we first estimate the approximate corrector ϕ^{AP} using a sensitivity argument, and then compare ϕ to ϕ^{AP} . Such a strategy does not work for reasons explained below.
- In [20, Theorem 17], ϕ^{AP} has the desired $C^{1,1}$ -bound because ψ is a *local function*. This $C^{1,1}$ bound is crucial in the application of the sensitivity argument (the Efron–Stein inequality). However, for p^{AP} , the “source” term $\lambda - \bar{\lambda}$ is highly non-local, and so the argument above fails. Thus, we are forced to estimate p directly. The control of p consists of two parts:
 - the “random error”, i.e., the size of $|p - \mathbb{E}[p]|$, which we will achieve using the Efron–Stein inequality;
 - the “deterministic error”, i.e., the size of $\mathbb{E}[p]$, which will be achieved by the triangle inequality $|\mathbb{E}[p(x)]| \leq \mathbb{E}[|p^{\text{AP}}|] + \mathbb{E}[|p^{\text{AP}} - p|]$.

For the first estimate, we note the crucial role of the *local* Green function G_R in the construction of p as we need its $C^{0,1}$ and $C^{1,1}$ bounds. For the second estimate, to control $\mathbb{E}[|p^{\text{AP}}|]$, we compare it with $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[|p^{\text{AP}}|]$. And for the term $\mathbb{E}[|p^{\text{AP}} - p|]$, we again use G_R to get the desired bound.

Proof of Proposition 10. As explained in Remark 11, we will compare the $C^{1,1}$ regularity of p^{AP} to that of p . The $C^{1,1}$ bounds will later be used in the sensitivity estimates of p and p^{AP} . The idea is to exploit both the stationarity of p^{AP} and the good regularity of p . We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. By the discrete Krylov–Safonov Hölder estimate ([25, Corollary 4.6]) and (38), we have for $1 \leq r < R$ that

$$\text{osc}_{B_r} p^{\text{AP}} \lesssim \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma \left[\|p^{\text{AP}}\|_{1, B_R} + R^2 \left\| \frac{1}{R^2} p^{\text{AP}} + (\lambda - \bar{\lambda}) \right\|_{d, B_R} \right] \stackrel{(38)}{\lesssim} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma R^2 \mathcal{H},$$

where $\gamma > 0$ depends only on d and the ellipticity constant. Hence,

$$[p^{\text{AP}}]_{\gamma; B_{R/2}} \lesssim R^{2-\gamma} \mathcal{H}.$$

Similarly, we find that $[p]_{\gamma; B_{R/2}} \lesssim R^{2-\gamma} \mathcal{H}$.

Step 2. Note that $p - p^{\text{AP}}$ solves

$$L_\omega(p - p^{\text{AP}}) = \frac{1}{R^2}(p\eta - p^{\text{AP}}).$$

Here, we consider the difference $p - p^{\text{AP}}$ to remove the nonlocal source term $\lambda - \bar{\lambda}$. By the $C^{1,1}$ estimate (12) with $u = p - p^{\text{AP}}$, $\psi \equiv 0$, $\sigma = \gamma$, and $f = \frac{1}{R^2}(p\eta - p^{\text{AP}})$, we obtain

$$|\nabla^2(p - p^{\text{AP}})| \lesssim \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}}{R}\right)^2 \left(R^2 + R^{2+\gamma} \left[\frac{1}{R^2}(p\eta - p^{\text{AP}})\right]_{\gamma; B_R}\right) \lesssim \mathcal{H}^2. \quad (41)$$

Furthermore, in view of (32), we have for $x \in B_R$ that

$$\nabla^2 p(x) = - \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla^2 G_R(x, z) (\lambda(z) - \bar{\lambda}),$$

and hence, by Lemma 8 (and the argument that leads (39) to (40)),

$$|\nabla^2 p(x)| \lesssim \mathcal{H}_x \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|z| \wedge R + 1)^{-2} e^{-c|z|/R} (|z| + 1)^{2-d} \lesssim (\log R) \mathcal{H}_x. \quad (42)$$

We note that this argument for $\nabla^2 p$ does not work for $\nabla^2 p^{\text{AP}}$ because the Green function G^{AP} does not have as good regularity as G_R .

Combining (41) and (42), we obtain $|\nabla^2 p^{\text{AP}}(x)| \lesssim (\log R) \mathcal{H}_x$ for $x \in B_R$. Since $(\nabla^2 p^{\text{AP}}(x))_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is stationary, we conclude that, for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$|\nabla^2 p^{\text{AP}}(x)| \lesssim (\log R) \mathcal{H}_x. \quad (43)$$

This yields that p_ω^{AP} has a close to optimal $C^{1,1}$ regularity. However, its $C^{0,1}$ bound is not as good as we want.

Step 3. Next, we deduce a formula for $\partial'_y p^{\text{AP}}$. By (34) and Lemma 9,

$$L_\omega(\partial'_y p^{\text{AP}}) = \frac{1}{R^2} \partial'_y p^{\text{AP}} + \partial'_y \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\partial'_y a(y) \nabla^2 p_y^{\text{AP}'}(y)) \mathbb{1}_y, \quad (44)$$

where $p_y^{\text{AP}'} := p_{\omega_y}^{\text{AP}}$ is as in Lemma 9. Let us estimate $\partial'_y \lambda$. Using the product rule for ∂'_y , and writing $\tilde{v}^k := v^k + v^k(\cdot - e_j)$, we have

$$\partial'_y \lambda = \partial'_y (a_j \nabla_{e_j} \tilde{v}^k) = a_j^{\omega_y'} \nabla_{e_j} \partial'_y \tilde{v}^k + \mathbb{1}_y \partial'_y a_j \nabla_{e_j} \tilde{v}^k. \quad (45)$$

Hence, by (44) and (45),

$$L_\omega(\partial'_y p^{\text{AP}}) = \frac{1}{R^2} \partial'_y p^{\text{AP}} + a_j^{\omega_y'} \nabla_{e_j} \partial'_y \tilde{v}^k - \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\partial'_y a \nabla^2 p_y^{\text{AP}'}) - \partial'_y a_j \nabla_{e_j} \tilde{v}^k \right) \mathbb{1}_y. \quad (46)$$

Notice that the function G^{AP} defined in (35) satisfies

$$L_\omega G^{\text{AP}}(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{R^2} G^{\text{AP}}(\cdot, z) - \mathbb{1}_z \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d$$

for any fixed $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then, we see from (46) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial'_y p^{\text{AP}}(x) &= G^{\text{AP}}(x, y) \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\partial'_y a(y) \nabla^2 p_y^{\text{AP}'}(y)) - \partial'_y a_j(y) \nabla_{e_j} \tilde{v}^k(y) \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^{\text{AP}}(x, z) a_j^{\omega'_y}(z) \nabla_{e_j} \partial'_y \tilde{v}^k(z). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Note that, by the inequality below [20, (94)],

$$|\nabla_{e_j} \partial'_y \tilde{v}^k(z)| \lesssim \mathcal{H}_y'^2 \mathcal{H}_{y,z}^d e^{-c|z-y|/R} (|z-y|+1)^{2-d} (|z-y| \wedge R+1)^{-1}.$$

This inequality, together with (47), (43), and [20, (68)], yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial'_y p^{\text{AP}}(x)| &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}_{x,y}} e^{-c|x-y|/R} (|x-y|+1)^{2-d} (\log R) \\ &\quad + \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-c(|x-z|+|z-y|)/R} (|x-z|+1)^{2-d} (|z-y|+1)^{2-d} (|z-y| \wedge R+1)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\partial'_y p^{\text{AP}}(0)|^2 &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} (\log R)^2 \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-2c|y|/R} (|y|+1)^{4-2d} \\ &\quad + \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left| \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-c(|z|+|z-y|)/R} (|z|+1)^{2-d} \frac{(|z-y|+1)^{2-d}}{|z-y| \wedge R+1} \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} \Gamma(R)^2 + T(R)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where $\Gamma(R)$ is defined as in the statement of the theorem, and

$$T(R) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_R(x, y) dx \right|^2 dy \right)^{1/2}$$

with

$$g_R(x, y) := e^{-c(|x+y|+|x|)/R} (|x+y|+1)^{2-d} (|x|+1)^{2-d} (|x| \wedge R+1)^{-1}.$$

Step 4. We claim that

$$T(R) \lesssim \Gamma(R). \quad (50)$$

First, noting that $\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{1-d} dx \lesssim R$ and using Hölder's inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} g_R(x, y) dx \right|^2 dy &\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x+y|+1)^{2-d} (|x|+1)^{1-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\ &\lesssim R \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x+y|+1)^{4-2d} (|x|+1)^{1-d} dx dy \\ &\lesssim R \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{1-d} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{3R}} (|z|+1)^{4-2d} dz dx \\ &\lesssim R^2 \int_0^{3R} (r+1)^{4-2d} r^{d-1} dr \lesssim \Gamma(R)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Second, using that $|x + y| \geq |y| - |x| \geq R$ for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{B}_R \times (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} g_R(x, y) dx \right|^2 dy &\leq R^{4-2d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} e^{-c|x+y|/R} (|x| + 1)^{1-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\ &\leq R^{4-2d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R}} e^{-2c|y|/R} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} e^{c|x|/R} (|x| + 1)^{1-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\ &\lesssim R^{4-2d} \left(\int_{2R}^{\infty} e^{-2cr/R} r^{d-1} dr \right) \left| \int_0^R e^{cr/R} (r + 1)^{1-d} r^{d-1} dr \right|^2 \lesssim R^{6-d} \lesssim \Gamma(R)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Third, using that $|x + y| \geq |x| - |y| \geq R/2$ for $(x, y) \in (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R) \times \mathbb{B}_{R/2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{R/2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} g_R(x, y) dx \right|^2 dy &\lesssim R^{4-2d} R^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{R/2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} e^{-c(|x+y|+|x|)/R} (|x| + 1)^{2-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\ &\lesssim R^{2-2d} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{R/2}} e^{2c|y|/R} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} e^{-2c|x|/R} (|x| + 1)^{2-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\ &\lesssim R^{2-2d} \left(\int_0^{R/2} e^{2cr/R} r^{d-1} dr \right) \left| \int_R^{\infty} e^{-2cr/R} (r + 1)^{2-d} r^{d-1} dr \right|^2 \lesssim R^{6-d} \lesssim \Gamma(R)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, noting that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} e^{-c|x|/R} dx \lesssim R^d$ and using Hölder's inequality, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{R/2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} g_R(x, y) dx \right|^2 dy &\lesssim R^{4-2d} R^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{R/2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} e^{-c(|x+y|+|x|)/R} (|x + y| + 1)^{2-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\ &\lesssim R^{2-2d} R^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{R/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} e^{-c(2|x+y|+|x|)/R} (|x + y| + 1)^{4-2d} dx dy \\ &\lesssim R^{2-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} e^{-c|x|/R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2c|z|/R} (|z| + 1)^{4-2d} dz dx \\ &\lesssim R^2 \int_0^{\infty} e^{-2cr/R} (r + 1)^{4-2d} r^{d-1} dr \lesssim \Gamma(R)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we obtain the claimed bound (50), and hence,

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\partial'_y p^{\text{AP}}(0)|^2 \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} \Gamma(R)^2 + T(R)^2 \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} \Gamma(R)^2.$$

Step 5. Using an argument similar to (47), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial'_y p(x) &= G_R(x, y) \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\partial'_y a(y) \nabla^2 p'_y(y)) - \partial'_y a_j(y) \nabla_{e_j} \tilde{v}^k(y) \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G_R(x, z) a_j^{\omega'_y}(z) \nabla_{e_j} \partial'_y \tilde{v}^k(z) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

for $x \in B_R$. Then, using (42), arguments similar to steps 3 and 4, and [20, Proposition 36], we obtain for any $x \in B_R$ that

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\partial'_y p(x)|^2 \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} \Gamma(R)^2. \quad (52)$$

By the L_p version of the Efron–Stein inequality [20, (38)], for any $q \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|p(x) - \mathbb{E}p(x)|^q] \lesssim q^{q/2} \mathbb{E}[V^{q/2}(p(x))] \lesssim q^{q/2} \Gamma(R)^q \quad \forall x \in B_R, \quad (53)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[(p^{\text{AP}} - \mathbb{E}p^{\text{AP}})^q] \lesssim q^{q/2} \Gamma(R)^q, \quad (54)$$

where $V(p(x)) := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\partial'_y p(x)|^2$.

Step 6. Observe that $E_{\mathbb{Q}} p^{\text{AP}} = 0$. Hence, we have for the \mathbb{Q} -variance that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[(p^{\text{AP}})^2] &\leq E_{\mathbb{Q}}[(p^{\text{AP}})^2] + \mathbb{E}[p^{\text{AP}}]^2 = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[(p^{\text{AP}} - \mathbb{E}p^{\text{AP}})^2] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[(p^{\text{AP}} - \mathbb{E}p^{\text{AP}})^3]^{2/3} \\ &\stackrel{(54)}{\lesssim} \Gamma(R)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality, we used Hölder's inequality and the exponential integrability of $\rho = d\mathbb{Q}/d\mathbb{P}$ in (10). By Hölder's inequality and a moment bound of $\rho^{-1} = d\mathbb{P}/d\mathbb{Q}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[|p^{\text{AP}}|] \lesssim (E_{\mathbb{Q}}[(p^{\text{AP}})^2])^{1/2} \lesssim \Gamma(R). \quad (55)$$

Step 7. Let $u = p^{\text{AP}} - p$. Then u solves the equation

$$L_{\omega} u = \frac{1}{R^2} u \eta + \frac{1}{R^2} p^{\text{AP}} (1 - \eta).$$

Hence, we have for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &= \frac{1}{R^2} \left| \sum_{y \in B_{3R}} G_R(x, y) p^{\text{AP}}(y) (1 - \eta(y)) \right| \\ &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{y \in B_{3R}} e^{-c|x-y|/R} (|x-y|+1)^{2-d} |p^{\text{AP}}(y)|. \end{aligned}$$

Using this inequality and (55), we obtain $\mathbb{E}[|u(x)|] \lesssim \Gamma(R)$. Therefore, using (55) again, we obtain for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ that

$$|\mathbb{E}[p(x)]| \lesssim \mathbb{E}[|p^{\text{AP}}|] + \mathbb{E}[|u(x)|] \lesssim \Gamma(R). \quad (56)$$

Step 8. The bound (53), together with (56), implies that, for any $x \in B_R$,

$$|p(x) - \mathbb{E}[p(x)]| \leq \Gamma(R) \mathcal{H}_x$$

for a stretched exponentially integrable variable \mathcal{H} . This inequality, together with (56), yields the desired result. \square

4 Bounding ∇p_j^k

In this section, we will compute the bound of ∇p_j^k where p_j^k is defined in (32). As in the previous section, we omit the indices k, j and write $p_j^k, \lambda_j^k, \bar{\lambda}_j^k$ as $p, \lambda, \bar{\lambda}$, respectively, since our arguments work for all k, j .

Proposition 12. *For any $x \in B_R$, we have*

$$|\nabla p(x)| \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}_x} \tilde{\Gamma}(R) := \begin{cases} R^{1/2} & \text{if } d = 3, \\ \log R & \text{if } d \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Again, we divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. In view of (51), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial'_y \nabla p(x) &= \nabla_x G_R(x, y) \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\partial'_y a(y) \nabla^2 p'_y(y)) - \partial'_y a_j(y) \nabla_{e_j} \tilde{v}^k(y) \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_x G_R(x, z) a_j^{\omega'_y}(z) \nabla_{e_j} \partial'_y \tilde{v}^k(z), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where the subscript of ∇_x indicates that ∇ is applied only to the variable x . For $x \in B_R$, by (30), (57), and the same arguments as in (48), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial'_y \nabla p(x)| &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}_{x,y}} e^{-c|x-y|/R} \frac{(|x-y|+1)^{2-d}}{|x-y| \wedge R+1} (\log R) \\ &\quad + \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-c(|x-z|+|z-y|)/R} \frac{(|x-z|+1)^{2-d}}{|x-z| \wedge R+1} \frac{(|z-y|+1)^{2-d}}{|z-y| \wedge R+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. In particular, in view of (49) and (50), we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\partial'_y \nabla p(0)|^2 &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} (\log R)^2 \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-2c|y|/R} \frac{(|y|+1)^{4-2d}}{(|y| \wedge R+1)^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left| \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-c(|z|+|z-y|)/R} \frac{(|z|+1)^{2-d}}{|z| \wedge R+1} \frac{(|z-y|+1)^{2-d}}{|z-y| \wedge R+1} \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} (\log R)^2 + \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left| \sum_{z \in B_R} e^{-c(|z|+|z-y|)/R} (|z|+1)^{1-d} \frac{(|z-y|+1)^{2-d}}{|z-y| \wedge R+1} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{R^2} \Gamma(R)^2 \\ &\lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} (\log R)^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \tilde{g}_R(y, z) dz \right|^2 dy + \frac{1}{R^2} \Gamma(R)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{g}_R(y, z) := e^{-c(|z|+|z-y|)/R} (|z|+1)^{1-d} (|z-y|+1)^{2-d} (|z-y| \wedge R+1)^{-1}.$$

First, noting that $\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{1-d} dx \lesssim R$ and $\int_{\mathbb{B}_{3R} \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{2-d} dx \lesssim R^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \tilde{g}_R(y, z) dz \right|^2 dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_{3R}} \frac{(|x|+1)^{2-d}}{|x| \wedge R+1} (|x+y|+1)^{1-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{1-d} (|x+y|+1)^{1-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_{3R} \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{2-d} (|x+y|+1)^{1-d} dx \right|^2 dy \\
& \lesssim R \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{1-d} (|x+y|+1)^{2-2d} dx dy \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2R}} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{3R} \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{2-d} (|x+y|+1)^{2-2d} dx dy \\
& \lesssim R \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{1-d} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{3R}} (|z|+1)^{2-2d} dz dx \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{3R} \setminus \mathbb{B}_R} (|x|+1)^{2-d} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{5R}} (|z|+1)^{2-2d} dz dx \\
& \lesssim R^{4-d} \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \Gamma(R)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Second, using that $|z-y| \geq |y|-|z| \geq R$ for $(y, z) \in (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R}) \times \mathbb{B}_R$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \tilde{g}_R(y, z) dz \right|^2 dy \leq R^{2-2d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} e^{-c|z-y|/R} (|z|+1)^{1-d} dz \right|^2 dy \\
& \leq R^{2-2d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}_{2R}} e^{-2c|y|/R} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} e^{c|z|/R} (|z|+1)^{1-d} dz \right|^2 dy \lesssim R^{4-d} \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \Gamma(R)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we find that

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\partial'_y \nabla p(0)|^2 \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} (\log R)^2 + \frac{1}{R^2} \Gamma(R)^2 \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}} \tilde{\Gamma}(R)^2.$$

Step 3. The L_p version of the Efron–Stein inequality then yields

$$|\nabla p(x) - \mathbb{E}[\nabla p(x)]| \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}_x} \tilde{\Gamma}(R) \quad \forall x \in B_R.$$

Further, using [20, Lemma 40] (with $\mu(R)$ replaced by the size $\Gamma(R)$ of p), we obtain

$$|\mathbb{E}[\nabla p(x)]| \lesssim \tilde{\Gamma}(R).$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$|\nabla p(x)| \lesssim_{\mathcal{H}_x} \tilde{\Gamma}(R) \quad \forall x \in B_R.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Propositions 10 and 12 give the bounds for $|p_j^k|$ and $|\nabla p_j^k|$. By repeating the same analysis, we get the corresponding bounds for $|s_j|$ and $|\nabla s_j|$. By combining Proposition 5 with Propositions 7, 10, and 12, we obtain the desired conclusion. \square

References

- [1] S. N. Armstrong, B. Fehrman, J. Lin, *Green function and invariant measure estimates for nondivergence form elliptic homogenization*. arXiv:2211.13279.
- [2] S. N. Armstrong, J. Lin, *Optimal quantitative estimates in stochastic homogenization for elliptic equations in nondivergence form*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 225 (2017), no. 2, pp. 937-991.
- [3] S. N. Armstrong, C. Smart, *Quantitative Stochastic Homogenization of Elliptic Equations in Nondivergence Form*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 214 (2014), no. 3, pp. 867-911.
- [4] M. Avellaneda, F.H. Lin, *Compactness methods in the theory of homogenization*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math., 40(6), pp. 803-847, 1987.
- [5] M. Avellaneda, F.H. Lin, *Compactness methods in the theory of homogenization. II. Equations in nondivergence form*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math., 42(2), pp. 139-172, 1989.
- [6] N. Berger, M. Cohen, J.-D. Deuschel, X. Guo, *An elliptic Harnack inequality for random walk in balanced environments*. Ann. Probab. 50 (2022), no. 3, pp. 835-873.
- [7] N. Berger, J.-D. Deuschel, *A quenched invariance principle for non-elliptic random walk in i.i.d. balanced random environment*. Probab. Theory Related Fields 158 (2014), no. 1-2, pp. 91-126.
- [8] M. Biskup, *Recent progress on the random conductance model*. Probab. Surv. 8 (2011), pp. 294-373.
- [9] E. Bolthausen, A.-S. Sznitman, *Ten lectures on random media*. DMV Seminar, vol 32. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2002.
- [10] L. A. Caffarelli, P. E. Souganidis, *Rates of convergence for the homogenization of fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic pde in random media*. Invent. Math. 180(2), pp. 301-360 (2010).
- [11] Y. Capdeboscq, T. Sprekeler, E. Süli, *Finite element approximation of elliptic homogenization problems in nondivergence-form*. ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 54 (2020), pp. 1221-1257.

- [12] J.-D. Deuschel, X. Guo, *Quenched local central limit theorem for random walks in a time-dependent balanced random.* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 182 (2022), pp. 111-156.
- [13] J.-D. Deuschel, X. Guo, A. Ramirez, *Quenched invariance principle for random walk in time-dependent balanced random environment.* Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. Vol. 54, No. 1(2018), pp. 363-384.
- [14] A. Drewitz, A. Ramirez, *Selected topics random walk in random environment.* Topics in percolative and disordered systems. Springer, New York, NY, 2014. 23-83.
- [15] P. Freese, D. Gallistl, D. Peterseim, T. Sprekeler *Computational multiscale methods for nondivergence-form elliptic partial differential equations.* Comput. Methods Appl. Math., 24 (2024), pp. 649-672.
- [16] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, F. Otto, *Quantification of ergodicity in stochastic homogenization: optimal bounds via spectral gap on Glauber dynamics.* Invent. Math. 199 (2015), no. 2, pp. 455-515.
- [17] X. Guo, J. Peterson, H. V. Tran, *Quantitative homogenization in a balanced random environment.* Electron. J. Probab., 27 (2022), pp. 1-31.
- [18] X. Guo, T. Sprekeler, H. V. Tran *Characterizations of diffusion matrices in homogenization of elliptic equations in nondivergence-form.* Cal. Var. PDE. 64, 1 (2025).
- [19] X. Guo, H. V. Tran, *Stochastic integrability of the heat kernel bounds of random walks in a balanced random environment.* Electron. J. Probab. 29 (2024), no. 194, pp. 1-31.
- [20] X. Guo, H. V. Tran, *Optimal convergence rates in stochastic homogenization in a balanced random environment,* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-025-01409-1>
- [21] X. Guo, H. V. Tran, Y. Yu, *Remarks on optimal rates of convergence in periodic homogenization of linear elliptic equations in non-divergence form.* Partial Differ. Equ. Appl. 1, 15 (2020).
- [22] X. Guo, O. Zeitouni, *Quenched invariance principle for random walks in balanced random environment.* Probab. Theory Related Fields 152 (2012), pp. 207-230.
- [23] W. Jing, Y. Zhang, *On the periodic homogenization of elliptic equations in nondivergence form with large drifts.* Multiscale Model. Simul. 21 (2023), no. 4, pp. 1486–1501.

- [24] T. Kumagai, *Random walks on disordered media and their scaling limits*. Cham: Springer, 2014. Lecture notes from the 40th Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, 2010, École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour.
- [25] H. J. Kuo, N. Trudinger, *Linear elliptic difference inequalities with random coefficients*. Math. Comp. 55, 37–53 (1990)
- [26] G. Lawler, *Weak convergence of a random walk in a random environment*. Comm. Math. Phys. 87:81–87, (1982).
- [27] G. Papanicolaou and S.R.S. Varadhan, *Diffusions with random coefficients*. Statistics and probability: essays in honor of C. R. Rao, pp. 547-552, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1982).
- [28] T. Sprekeler, *Homogenization of nondivergence-form elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients and finite element approximation of the homogenized problem*. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 62 (2024), pp. 646-666.
- [29] T. Sprekeler, E. Süli, Z. Zhang, *Finite element approximation of stationary Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations with application to periodic numerical homogenization*. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 63 (2025), pp. 1315-1343.
- [30] T. Sprekeler, H.V. Tran, *Optimal convergence rates for elliptic homogenization problems in nondivergence-form: analysis and numerical illustrations*. Multiscale Model. Simul., 19 (2021), pp. 1453-1473.
- [31] O. Zeitouni, *Random walks in random environment*. In Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics, volume 1837 of Lecture Notes in Math., pp. 189-312. Springer, Berlin, 2004.

E-mail address, Xiaoqin Guo: guoxq@ucmail.uc.edu

E-mail address, Timo Sprekeler: timo.sprekeler@tamu.edu

E-mail address, Hung Vinh Tran: hung@math.wisc.edu