Killed rough super-Brownian motion[*]

Tommaso Cornelis Rosati[†]

Abstract

This article concerns the construction of a continuous branching process in a random, time-independent environment, on finite volume. The backbone of this study is the convergence of discrete approximations of the parabolic Anderson model (PAM) on a box with Dirichlet boundary conditions. This is a companion paper to [9].

1 Introduction

The aim of the present work is the construction of a continuous branching process in a random, time-independent environment, on a box of size $L \in \mathbb{N}$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions. This processes is built as a scaling limit of a system of independent particles that branch according to the value of a random potential, and die as soon as they leave the given box of size L. The article [9] constructs an analogous process on infinite volume (named rough super-Brownian motion, rSBM), and proves its longtime survival. Such proof relies on the spectral properties of the Anderson Hamiltonian with Dirichlet boundary conditions on a large box, and in particular relies on the process constructed in the present paper for large L.

Morally, in the present setting the scaling limit is simpler to treat than in the infinite volume case, since explosions are less likely to occur. Indeed, the convergence of the particle system can be proven by an application of the results in [9, Section 3].

On the other hand, the average behavior of the particle system, conditional on the environment, is described by the Parabolic Anderson Model (PAM), a stochastic PDE, with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t w(t,x) &= \Delta w(t,x) + \xi(\omega,x)w(t,x) + f(t,x), & (t,x) \in (0,T] \times (0,L)^d, \\
w(0,x) &= w_0(x), \qquad w(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T] \times \partial[0,L]^d,
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.1}
$$

where ξ is space white noise. In $d = 2$ PAM is a *singular* SPDE, and its solution theory with Dirichlet boundary conditions require a particularly sophisticated treatment [7, 3]. In the next section we review the approach in [3] for paracontrolled analysis with Dirichlet boundary conditions, with the aim of proving the convergence of discrete approximations to (1.1). In particular, we show that the required renormalization is given by a diverging sequence of constants *independent of the size L of the box*. In the last section we introduce the particle system and study its scaling limit.

2 PAM with Dirichlet boundary conditions

Define $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Fix $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N = 2L$. Consider $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ($n = \infty$ refers to the continuous case, studied in [3]). Write $\mathbb{Z}_n^d$ for the lattice $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}^d$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}^d$ if $n = \infty$), Λ_n for the lattice $\frac{1}{n}(\mathbb{Z}^d \cap [0, Ln]^d)$ (resp. $[0, L]^d$), Θ_n for the lattice $\frac{1}{n}(\mathbb{Z}^d \cap [-\frac{Nn}{2}, \frac{Nn}{2}]^d)/\sim$ with opposite boundaries identified (resp. $\mathbb{T}_N^d := [-\frac{N}{2}, \frac{N}{2}]^d/\sim$) and define the "dual lattice" $\Xi_n = \frac{1}{N}(\mathbb{Z}^d \cap [-\frac{Nn}{2}, \frac{Nn}{2}]^d)/\sim$, (resp. $\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{Z}^d$) as well as $\Xi_n^+ = \frac{1}{N}(\mathbb{Z}^d \cap [0, Ln]^d)$, (resp. $\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{N}_0^d$). Moreover define $\partial\Lambda_n = \{k \in \Lambda_n : k_i = 0 \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}$ and similarly $\partial\Xi_n^+$. Write $A_{\mathfrak{d}}^n = \Xi_n^+ \setminus \partial\Xi_n^+, A_{\mathfrak{n}}^n = \Xi_n^+$. Finally, for $p \geq 1$ and any function $f \colon \Theta^n \to \mathbb{R}$, write $\|f\|_{L^p(\Theta^n)} = (n^{-d}\sum_{x \in \Theta^n} |f(x)|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ (resp. the classical $L^p([-\frac{N}{2}, \frac{N}{2}]^d)$ norm if $n = \infty$).

2.1 The analytic setting

The idea of [3] in the case $n = \infty$ is to consider suitable even and odd extensions of functions on Λ_n to periodic functions on Θ_n, and then to work with the usual tools from periodic paracontrolled distributions on Θ_n. So for $u, v \colon \Lambda_n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $u|_{\partial\Lambda_n} \equiv 0$ we define:

$$\Pi_o u \colon \Theta_n \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \Pi_o u(\mathfrak{q} \circ x) = \prod \mathfrak{q} \cdot u(x), \qquad \Pi_e v \colon \Theta_n \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \Pi_e v(\mathfrak{q} \circ x) = v(x),$$

where $x \in \Lambda_n, \mathfrak{q} \in \{-1, 1\}^d$ and we define the product $\mathfrak{q} \circ x = (\mathfrak{q}_i x_i)_{i=1,\dots,d}$ as well as $\prod \mathfrak{q} = \prod_{i=1}^d \mathfrak{q}_i$. We shall work with the discrete periodic Fourier transform, defined for $\varphi \colon \Theta_n \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Theta_n}\varphi(k) = \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{x \in \Theta_n} \varphi(x) e^{-2\pi\iota\langle x, k\rangle}, \quad k \in \Xi_n.$$

As in [3] we have a periodic, a Dirichlet and a Neumann basis, which we indicate with $\{\mathfrak{e}_k\}_{k \in \Xi_n}, \{\mathfrak{d}_k\}_{k \in \Xi_n^+ \setminus \partial\Xi_n^+}, \{\mathfrak{n}_k\}_{k \in \Xi_n^+}$ respectively. Here $\mathfrak{e}_k$ is the classical Fourier basis:

$$\mathfrak{e}_k(x) = \frac{e^{2\pi\iota\langle x, k\rangle}}{N^{\frac{d}{2}}}, \quad \text{so that} \quad \mathcal{F}_{\Theta_n}\varphi(k) = N^{\frac{d}{2}}\langle\varphi, \mathfrak{e}_k\rangle, \quad k \in \Xi_n,$$

while the Dirichlet and Neumann bases consist of sine and cosine functions respectively:

$$\mathfrak{d}_k(x) = \frac{1}{N^{\frac{d}{2}}} \prod_{i=1}^d 2\sin(2\pi k_i x_i), \ k \in A_{\mathfrak{d}}^n \quad \mathfrak{n}_k(x) = \frac{1}{N^{\frac{d}{2}}} \prod_{i=1}^d 2^{1-1_{\{k_i=0\}}/2} \cos(2\pi k_i x_i), \ k \in A_{\mathfrak{n}}^n.$$

To the previous explicit expressions we will prefer the following alternative characterization, with $\nu_k = 2^{-\#\{i : k_i=0\}/2}$:

$$\Pi_o\mathfrak{d}_k = \iota^d \sum_{\mathfrak{q}\in\{-1,1\}^d} \prod \mathfrak{q} \cdot \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{q}\circ k}, \quad \forall k \in A_{\mathfrak{d}}^n, \qquad \Pi_e\mathfrak{n}_k = \nu_k \sum_{\mathfrak{q}\in\{-1,1\}^d} \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{q}\circ k}, \quad \forall k \in A_{\mathfrak{n}}^n.$$

For $\mathfrak{l} \in \{\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{n}\}$ and $n < \infty$ write $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}}'(\Lambda_n) = \text{span}\{\mathfrak{l}_k\}_{k \in A_{\mathfrak{l}}^n}$ for the space of discrete distributions. For $n = \infty$ we define distributions via formal Fourier series:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}}'([0, L]^d) = \Big\{ \sum_{k \in A_{\mathfrak{l}}^\infty} \alpha_k \mathfrak{l}_k : |\alpha_k| \leq C(1 + |\kappa|^\gamma), \text{ for some } C, \gamma \geq 0 \Big\}.$$

Now let us introduce Littlewood-Paley theory on the lattice, in order to control products between distributions on Λ_n uniformly in n. Consider an *even* function $\sigma \colon \Xi_n \to \mathbb{R}$. Then for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}}'(\Lambda_n)$ we define the *Fourier multiplier*:

$$\sigma(D)\varphi = \sum_{k \in A_{\mathfrak{l}}^n} \sigma(k)\langle\varphi, \mathfrak{l}_k\rangle\mathfrak{l}_k.$$

Upon extending φ in an even or odd fashion we recover the classical notion of Fourier multiplier (namely on a torus: $\sigma(D)\varphi = \mathcal{F}_{\Theta_n}^{-1}(\sigma \mathcal{F}_{\Theta_n}\varphi)$), since $\Pi_o\big(\sigma(D)\varphi\big) = \sigma(D)\Pi_o\varphi$ and verbatim for Π_e. Fix then a dyadic partition of the unity $\{\varrho_j\}_{j\geq -1}$ as in [8, Definition 2.4] and let $j_n = \min\{j \geq -1 \colon \operatorname{supp}(\varrho_j) \not\subseteq (-\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n}{2})^d\}$ ($j_n = \infty$ if $n = \infty$), so as to define for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'_{\mathfrak{l}}(\Lambda_n)$:

$$\Delta_j^n \varphi = \varrho_j(D)\varphi \text{ for } j < j_n, \qquad \Delta_{j_n}^n \varphi = \Big(1 - \sum_{-1 \leq j < j_n} \varrho_j(D)\Big)\varphi.$$

This allows one to define the *paraproduct* and the *resonant product* of two distributions respectively (for $n = \infty$ the latter is a-piori ill-posed):

$$\varphi \varolessthan \psi = \sum_{-1 \leq j \leq j_n} \sum_{-1 \leq i \leq j-1} \Delta_i^n \varphi \Delta_j^n \psi, \qquad \varphi \odot \psi = \sum_{\substack{|i-j| \leq 1 \\ -1 \leq i,j \leq j_n}} \Delta_i^n \varphi \Delta_j^n \psi.$$

In view of the previous calculations this is coherent with the definition on the lattice in [8], in the sense that:

$$\Pi_o\big(\Delta_j^n \varphi\big) = \Delta_j^n \Pi_o \varphi, \qquad \Pi_e\big(\Delta_j^n \varphi\big) = \Delta_j^n \Pi_e \varphi, \quad -1 \leq j \leq j_n.$$

We then define Dirichlet and Neumann Besov spaces via the following norms:

$$\|u\|_{B_{p,q}^{\mathfrak{d},\alpha}(\Lambda_n)} = \|\Pi_o u\|_{B_{p,q}^{\alpha}(\Theta_n)} = \|(2^{\alpha j}\|\Delta_j \Pi_o u\|_{L^p(\Theta_n)})_j\|_{\ell^q(\leq j_n)} \qquad u \in \mathcal{S}'_{\mathfrak{d}}(\Lambda_n)$$

and similarly for $\mathfrak{n}$ upon replacing Π_o with Π_e. For brevity we write $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{l},p}^{\alpha}(\Lambda_n) = B_{p,\infty}^{\mathfrak{l},\alpha}(\Lambda_n)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\alpha}(\Lambda_n) = B_{\infty,\infty}^{\mathfrak{l},\alpha}(\Lambda_n)$ for $\mathfrak{l} \in \{\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{d}\}$. We also write $\|u\|_{L_{\mathfrak{d}}^p(\Lambda_n)} = \|\Pi_o u\|_{L^p(\Theta_n)}$ and $\|u\|_{L_{\mathfrak{n}}^p(\Lambda_n)} = \|\Pi_e u\|_{L^p(\Theta_n)}$. Having introduced Besov spaces we can define the spaces of time-dependent functions $\mathcal{M}^\gamma \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{l},p}^{\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{l},\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}$ for $\mathfrak{l} \in \{\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{n}\}$ as in [8, Definition 3.8] without the necessity of taking into account weights. The above spaces allow for a detailed analysis of products of distributions. The last ingredient in this sense are the following identities:

$$\Pi_e(\varphi\psi) = \Pi_e\varphi\Pi_e\psi, \qquad \Pi_o(\varphi\psi) = \Pi_o\varphi\Pi_e\psi. \tag{2.1}$$

To solve equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions, introduce the following Laplace operators for $n < \infty$ (let $\varphi\colon \Lambda_n \to \mathbb{R}$, $\psi\colon \Theta_n \to \mathbb{R}$):

$$\Delta^n \psi(x) = n^2 \sum_{|x-y|=n^{-1}} \psi(y) - \psi(x), \qquad \Delta_{\mathfrak{d}}^n \varphi = (\Delta^n \Pi_o \varphi)|_{\Lambda_n}, \qquad \Delta_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \varphi = (\Delta^n \Pi_e \varphi)|_{\Lambda_n}.$$

The latter two operators are defined only on the domain $\operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_{\mathfrak{l}}^n) = \mathcal{S}'_{\mathfrak{l}}(\Lambda_n)$. A direct computation (cf. [8, Section 3]) then shows that one can represent both Laplacians as Fourier multipliers:

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{l}}^n \mathfrak{l}_k = l^n(k)\mathfrak{l}_k, \qquad l^n(k) = \sum_{j=1}^d 2n^2\big(\cos(2\pi k_j/n) - 1\big), \text{ for } \mathfrak{l} \in \{\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{n}\}.$$

Note that l^n is an even function in k, so all the remarks from the previous discussion apply. For $n = \infty$ we use the classical Laplacian: the boundary condition is encoded in the domain. We write $\Delta_{\mathfrak{l}}$ for the Laplacian on $\mathcal{S}'_{\mathfrak{l}}([0,L]^d)$. We introduce Dirichlet and Neumann extension operators as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{d}}^n u = \mathcal{E}^n(\Pi_o u)\big|_{[0,L]^d}, \qquad \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n u = \mathcal{E}^n(\Pi_e u)\big|_{[0,L]^d}, \qquad \text{for } n < \infty,$$

where the periodic extension operator $\mathcal{E}^n$ is defined as in [8, Lemma 2.24]. These functions are well-defined since for fixed n the extension $\mathcal{E}^n(\cdot)$ is a smooth function. Moreover a simple calculation shows that

$$\Pi_o(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{d}}^n u) = \mathcal{E}^n(\Pi_o u), \qquad \Pi_e(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n u) = \mathcal{E}^n(\Pi_e u). \tag{2.2}$$

2.2 Solving the equation

We now study Equation (1.1) in dimension $d = 1, 2$ on a box, starting with the probabilistic assumptions on the noise (cf. [9, Asumption 2.1]).

Assumption 2.1. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\xi^n(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d}$ is a set of i.i.d random variables with:*

$$n^{-d/2} \xi^n(x) \sim \Phi, \tag{2.3}$$

for a probability distribution Φ on $\mathbb{R}$ with finite moments of every order and which satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\Phi^2] = 1.$$

These probabilistic assumptions guarantee certain analytical properties which are highlighted in the next lemma. For convenience, in the remainder of this work we shift Λ_n to be centered around the origin and identify it with a subset of $[-L/2, L/2]^d$, naturally extending the results of the previous section to this set. To be precise, for $L \in 2\mathbb{N}$ we redefine $\Lambda_n = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d : x \in [-L/2, L/2]^d\}$. Moreover, in the following let χ be the same cut-off function as in [8, Section 5.1] and in dimension $d = 2$ define the renormalisation constant (note that this constant does not depend on L):

$$\kappa_n = \int_{\mathbb{T}_n^2} \mathrm{d}k \, \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} \sim \log(n). \tag{2.4}$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\{\overline{\xi}^n(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy Assumption 2.1. There exists a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ supporting for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ random variables c_n, ν and $\{\xi^n(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d}, \xi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that ξ is space white noise on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\xi^n = \overline{\xi}^n$ in distribution.*

Such random variables satisfy the following requirements. Let $X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n$ be the (random) solution to the equation $-\Delta_{\mathfrak{n}}^n X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n = \chi(D) \xi^n$. For every $\omega \in \Omega$ and α satisfying

$$\alpha \in (1, \tfrac{3}{2}) \text{ in } d = 1, \qquad \alpha \in (\tfrac{2}{3}, 1) \text{ in } d = 2, \tag{2.5}$$

the following holds for all $L \in 2\mathbb{N}$:

(i) *$\xi(\omega) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha-2}([-L/2, L/2]^d)$ as well as $\sup_n \|\xi^n(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha-2}(\Lambda_n)} < +\infty$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \xi^n(\omega) \to \xi(\omega)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha-2}([-L/2, L/2]^d)$.*

(ii) *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ (with $(\cdot)_+ = \max\{0, \cdot\}$):*

$$\sup_n \|n^{-d/2} \xi_+^n(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-\varepsilon}(\Lambda_n)} + \sup_n \|n^{-d/2} |\xi^n(\omega)|\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-\varepsilon}(\Lambda_n)} + \sup_n \|n^{-d/2} \xi_+^n(\omega)\|_{L_{\mathfrak{n}}^2(\Lambda_n)} < \infty.$$

Moreover, $\nu(\omega) \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n n^{-d/2} \xi_+^n(\omega) \to \nu(\omega)$, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n n^{-d/2} |\xi^n(\omega)| \to 2\nu(\omega)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-\varepsilon}(\Lambda_n)$.

(iii) *If $d = 2$, in addition, $n^{-d/2} c_n(\omega) \to 0$ and there exist distributions $X_{\mathfrak{n}}(\omega), X_{\mathfrak{n}} \diamond \xi(\omega)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha}([-L/2, L/2]^d)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{2\alpha-2}([-L/2, L/2]^d)$ respectively, such that:*

$$\sup_n \|X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha}(\Lambda_n)} + \sup_n \|(X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \odot \xi^n)(\omega) - c_n(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{2\alpha-2}(\Lambda_n)} < \infty$$

and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n(\omega) \to X_{\mathfrak{n}}(\omega)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha}([-L/2, L/2]^d)$, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n ((X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \odot \xi^n)(\omega) - c_n(\omega)) \to X_{\mathfrak{n}} \diamond \xi(\omega)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{2\alpha-2}([-L/2, L/2]^d)$.

Finally, $\mathbb{P}(c_n(\omega) = \kappa_n, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu(\omega) = \mathbb{E}\Phi_+) = 1$ and for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\xi^n(\omega)$ satisfies [9, Assumption 2.3], with the same renormalisation constant $c_n(\omega)$ as above if $d = 2$.

The proof of this lemma is postponed to the next subsection. For clarity, observe that the first point is a CLT, the second point a LLN, while the third one, essential in $d = 2$ in the proof of the theorem below is a convergence in the second Wiener-Itô chaos. The statement regarding [9, Assumption 2.3] repeats these three points on the entire space.

Theorem 2.3. *Consider ξ^n as in Lemma 2.2 and α as in (2.5), any $T > 0$, $p \in [1, +\infty]$, $\gamma_0 \in [0, 1)$ and $\vartheta, \zeta, \alpha_0$ satisfying:*

$$\vartheta \in \begin{cases} (2-\alpha, \alpha), & d = 1, \\ (2-2\alpha, \alpha), & d = 2, \end{cases} \qquad \zeta > (\vartheta-2) \vee (-\alpha), \qquad \alpha_0 > (\vartheta-2) \vee (-\alpha), \qquad (2.6)$$

and let $w_0^n \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^\zeta(\Lambda_n)$ and $f^n \in \mathcal{M}^{\gamma_0}\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^{\alpha_0}(\Lambda_n)$ be such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{d}}^n w_0^n \to w_0 \text{ in } \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^\zeta([-L/2, L/2]^d), \qquad \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{d}}^n f^n \to f \text{ in } \mathcal{M}^{\gamma_0}\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^{\alpha_0}([-L/2, L/2]^d).$$

For every $\omega \in \Omega$ let $w^n \colon [0, T] \times \Lambda_n \to \mathbb{R}$ be the unique solution to the finite-dimensional linear ODE:

$$\partial_t w^n = (\Delta_{\mathfrak{d}}^n + \xi^n(\omega) - c_n(\omega) 1_{\{d=2\}}) w^n + f^n, \quad w^n(0) = w_0^n, \quad w(t, x) = 0 \ \forall (t, x) \in (0, T] \times \partial\Lambda_n. \tag{2.7}$$

There exist a unique (paracontrolled in the sense of [3] or [8] in $d = 2$) solution w to the equation

$$\partial_t w = (\Delta_{\mathfrak{d}} + \xi) w + f, \quad w(0) = w_0, \quad w(t, x) = 0 \ \forall (t, x) \in (0, T] \times \partial[-L/2, L/2]^d, \tag{2.8}$$

and for all $\gamma > (\vartheta-\zeta)_+/2 \vee \gamma_0$ the sequence w^n is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^{\gamma,\vartheta}(\Lambda_n)$:

$$\sup_n \|w^n\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^{\gamma,\vartheta}(\Lambda_n)} \lesssim \sup_n \|w_0^n\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^\zeta(\Lambda_n)} + \sup_n \|f^n\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\gamma_0}\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^{\alpha_0}(\Lambda_n)},$$

where the proportionality constant depends on the time horizon T and the magnitude of the norms in Lemma 2.2. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{d}}^n w^n \to w \text{ in } \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{d},p}^{\gamma,\vartheta}([-L/2, L/2]^d).$$

Proof. Note that in view of (2.1) solving Equation (2.7) (resp. (2.8)) is equivalent to solving on the discrete (resp. continuous) torus Θ_n the equation:

$$\partial_t \tilde{w}^n = \Delta^n \tilde{w}^n + \Pi_e(\xi^n(\omega) - c_n(\omega) 1_{\{d=2\}}) \tilde{w}^n + \Pi_o f^n, \qquad \tilde{w}^n(0) = \Pi_o w_0, \tag{2.9}$$

and then restricting the solution to the cube Λ_n, i.e. $w^n = \tilde{w}^n|_{\Lambda_n}$, and $\tilde{w}^n = \Pi_o w^n$. Via the bounds in Lemma 2.2 this equation can be solved for all $\omega \in \Omega$ via Schauder estimates and (in dimension $d = 2$) paracontrolled theory following the arguments of [8] (without considering weights). From the arguments of the same article and Equation (2.2) we can also deduce the convergence of the extensions. Note that the solution theories in [3] and [8] coincide, although the former concentrates on the construction of the Hamiltonian rather than the solutions to the parabolic equation (cf. [9, Proposition 3.1]). $\qquad \square$

For every $\omega \in \Omega$ it is also possible to define the Anderson Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{d},L}^\omega$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The domain and spectral decomposition for this operator are rigorously constructed in [3] with the help of the resolvent equation for $d = 2$ and [6] via Dirichlet forms in $d = 1$. We write $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{d},L}^{n,\omega}, \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{d},L}^\omega$ for the operators $\Delta_{\mathfrak{d}}^n + \xi^n(\omega) - c_n(\omega) 1_{\{d=2\}}$ and (formally) $\Delta_{\mathfrak{d}} + \xi(\omega) - \infty 1_{\{d=2\}}$ respectively. These operators generate semigroups $T_t^{n,\mathfrak{d},L,\omega} = e^{t\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{d},L}^{n,\omega}}$ and $T_t^{\mathfrak{d},L,\omega} = e^{t\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{d},L}^\omega}$. In particular, the following result is a simple consequence of the just quoted works.

Lemma 2.4. *For a given null set $N_0 \subseteq \Omega$ and all $\omega \in N_0^c$, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ the operator $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{d},L}^\omega$ has a discrete, bounded from above, spectrum and admits an eigenfunction $e_{\lambda(\omega,L)}$ associated to its largest eigenvalue $\lambda(\omega, L)$, such that $e_{\lambda(\omega,L)}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2})^d$.*

Proof. That the spectrum is discrete and bounded from above can be found in the works quoted above. For $\varphi, \psi \in L^2((-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2})^d)$ we write $\psi \geq \varphi$ if $\psi(x) - \varphi(x) \geq 0$ for Lebesgue-almost all x and we write $\psi \gg \varphi$ if $\psi(x) - \varphi(x) > 0$ for Lebesgue-almost all x. By the strong maximum principle of [1, Theorem 5.1] (which easily extends to our setting, see Remark 5.2 of the same paper) we know that for the semigroup $T_t^{\mathfrak{d}, L, \omega} = e^{t\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{d}, L}^\omega}$ of the PAM we have $T_t^{\mathfrak{d}, L, \omega}\varphi \gg 0$ whenever $\varphi \geq 0$ and $\varphi \neq 0$; we even get $T_t^{\mathfrak{d}, L, \omega}\varphi(x) > 0$ for all x in the interior $(-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2})^d$. So by a consequence of the Krein-Rutman theorem, see [5, Theorem 19.3], there exists an eigenfunction $e_{\lambda(\omega, L)} \gg 0$. And since $e_{\lambda(\omega, L)} = e^{-t\lambda(\omega, L)}T_t^{\mathfrak{d}, L, \omega}e_{\lambda(\omega, L)}$, we have $e_{\lambda(\omega, L)}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2})^d$. $\square$

2.3 Stochastic estimates

Here we prove Lemma 2.2. The following bounds are essentially an adaptation of [2, Section 4.2] to the Dirichlet boundary condition setting (see also [3] for the spatially continuous setting). The key issue is to bound the resonant product $X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \odot \overline{\xi}^n$, that can be decomposed in (a discrete version of) its zeroth and second Wiener-Itô chaos. The main difference with respect to the periodic case, and the central point of the following proof, is that the zeroth chaos is not a constant, yet our calculations will show that up to a *constant* blow up κ_n this term is well-defined.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. *Step 0.* We shall prove the lemma for fixed L, α, ε. The convergence happens simultaneously over all parameter choices in view of similar arguments as in the proof of Corollary 3.9. Instead of proving the path-wise convergences of the lemma, it is sufficient to show the convergences in distribution. The results then follows by Skorohod's representation theorem, setting $\nu(\omega) = c_n(\omega) = \xi^n(\omega) = 0$ on a nullset. Let us write ξ^n instead of $\overline{\xi}^n$. We will show that there exists a space white noise ξ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and (if $d = 2$) a random distribution $X_{\mathfrak{n}} \diamond \xi$ such that (all convergences being in distribution):

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\|\xi^n\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha-2}(\Lambda_n)}^q] < +\infty, \qquad \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n\xi^n \to \xi \text{ in } \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\alpha-2}([0, L]^d), \tag{2.10}$$

as well as:

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\|n^{-d/2}(\xi^n)_+\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-\varepsilon}(\Lambda_n)} + \|n^{-d/2}(\xi^n)_+\|_{L^2(\Lambda_n)}] < +\infty, \tag{2.11}$$

with $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n n^{-d/2}(\xi^n)_+ \to \mathbb{E}\Phi_+$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-\varepsilon}([0, L]^d)$. Moreover, in dimension $d = 2$, we have (recall κ_n from (2.4)):

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\|X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^\alpha(\Lambda_n)} + \|(X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \odot \xi^n) - \kappa_n\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{2\alpha-2}(\Lambda_n)}] < +\infty \tag{2.12}$$

as well as $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \to X_{\mathfrak{n}}$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^\alpha([0, L]^d)$, and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{n}}^n(X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \odot \xi^n - \kappa_n) \to X_{\mathfrak{n}} \diamond \xi$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{2\alpha-2}([0, L]^d)$. Once these bounds and convergences are established, the proof is concluded. Note that ξ^n satisfies [9, Assumption 2.3] in view of [9, Lemma 2.4].

Step 1. We now observe that the bound and convergence from (2.10) as well as the bound and convergence for $X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n$ from (2.12) are similar to and simpler than the bound for $X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \odot \xi^n$. Also, Equation (2.11) and the following convergences are analogous to [9, Appendix B]. We hence restrict to proving the bound and convergence of $X_{\mathfrak{n}}^n \odot \xi^n$ from (2.12).

Step 2. We establish the uniform bounds. We will derive only bounds in spaces of the kind $B_{p,p}^{\mathfrak{n}, 2\alpha-2}(\Lambda_n)$ for any $p \geq 1$ and α such that $2\alpha - 2 < 0$. The results on the Hölder scale then follow by Besov embedding. In order to avoid confusion, we will omit the subindex $\mathfrak{n}$ in the noise terms and we write sums as discrete integrals against scaled measures with the following definitions:

$$\int_{\Theta_n} dx\, f(x) = \sum_{x \in \Theta_n} \frac{f(x)}{n^d}, \quad \int_{\Xi_n} dk\, f(k) = \sum_{k \in \Xi_n} \frac{f(k)}{N^d}, \quad \int_{\{-1,1\}^d} d\mathfrak{q}\, f(\mathfrak{q}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \{-1,1\}^d} f(\mathfrak{q}).$$

Then, observing that $\nu_k^{-2} = \#\{\mathfrak{q} \in \{-1,1\}^d \ : \ \mathfrak{q} \circ k = k\}$, one has for $f \colon \Xi_n \to \mathbb{C}$:

$$\int_{\Xi_n} \mathrm{d}k \, f(k) = \int_{\{-1,1\}^d \times \Xi_n^+} \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q} \, \mathrm{d}k \, \nu_k^2 \, f(\mathfrak{q} \circ k). \tag{2.13}$$

In this setting, our aim to estimate uniformly over n the following quantity:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\|(X^n \odot \xi^n) - c_n\|_{B_{p,p}^{\mathfrak{n},2\alpha-2}(\Lambda_n)}^p \Big] = \sum_{j=-1}^{j_n} 2^{(2\alpha-2)jp} \int_{\Theta_n} \mathrm{d}x \ \mathbb{E}\Big[|\Pi_e \Delta_j (X^n \odot \xi^n - \kappa_n)|^p(x) \Big].$$

For $k_1, k_2 \in \Xi_n$ and $\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2 \in \{-1,1\}^d$ we adopt the notation: $k_{[12]} = k_1 + k_2, \mathfrak{q}_{[12]} = \mathfrak{q}_1 + \mathfrak{q}_2$, $(\mathfrak{q} \circ k)_{[12]} = \mathfrak{q}_1 \circ k_1 + \mathfrak{q}_2 \circ k_2$ and $\psi_0^n(k_1, k_2) = \sum_{\substack{|i-j| \le 1 \\ -1 \le i,j \le j_n}} \varrho_i(k_1) \varrho_j(k_2)$. Hence via (2.13):

$$\Delta_j \Pi_e (X^n \odot \xi^n)(x) = \int_{(\{-1,1\}^d \times \Xi_n^+)^2} \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}_{12} \, \mathrm{d}k_{12} \, N^d \nu_{k_1} \nu_{k_2} e^{2\pi\iota \langle x, (\mathfrak{q} \circ k)_{[12]} \rangle} .$$

$$\cdot \varrho_j((\mathfrak{q} \circ k)_{[12]}) \psi_0^n(k_1, k_2) \frac{\chi(k_2)}{l^n(k_2)} \langle \xi^n, \mathfrak{n}_{k_1} \rangle \langle \xi^n, \mathfrak{n}_{k_2} \rangle$$

$$= \int_{(\{-1,1\}^d \times \Xi_n^+)^2} \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}_{12} \, \mathrm{d}k_{12} \, 1_{\{k_1 \ne k_2\}} N^d \nu_{k_1} \nu_{k_2} e^{2\pi\iota \langle x, (\mathfrak{q} \circ k)_{[12]} \rangle} .$$

$$\cdot \varrho_j((\mathfrak{q} \circ k)_{[12]}) \psi_0^n(k_1, k_2) \frac{\chi(k_2)}{l^n(k_2)} \langle \xi^n, \mathfrak{n}_{k_1} \rangle \langle \xi^n, \mathfrak{n}_{k_2} \rangle + \mathrm{Diag}$$

where Diag indicates the integral over the set $\{k_1 = k_2\}$. First, since Φ has all moments finite, we apply a generalized discrete BDG inequality [2, Proposition 4.3] and the same calculations as in [2, Corollary 4.7] to find:

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_j (\Pi_e (X^n \odot \xi^n)(x) - \kappa_n)|^p]$$
$$\lesssim \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_j (\Pi_e (X^n \odot \xi^n)(x) - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Diag}]|^p] + |\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Diag}] - 1_{\{j=-1\}} \kappa_n|^p$$
$$\lesssim \left[\int \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}_{12} \, \mathrm{d}k_{12} \, \left| \varrho_j((\mathfrak{q} \circ k)_{[12]}) \psi_0^n(k_1, k_2) \frac{\chi(k_2)}{l^n(k_2)} \right|^2 \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} + |\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Diag}] - 1_{\{j=-1\}} \kappa_n|^p .$$

For the first term on the right hand side we have:

$$\int_{(\{-1,1\}^d \times \Xi_n^+)^2} \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}_{12} \, \mathrm{d}k_{12} \, \left| \varrho_j((\mathfrak{q} \circ k)_{[12]}) \psi_0^n(k_1, k_2) \frac{\chi(k_2)}{l^n(k_2)} \right|^2 = \int_{\Xi_n^2} \mathrm{d}k_{12} \, \left| \varrho_j(k_{[12]}) \psi_0^n(k_1, k_2) \frac{\chi(k_2)}{l^n(k_2)} \right|^2$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{i \ge j-\ell} \int_{\Xi_n^2} \mathrm{d}k_{12} \, 1_{\{|k_1+k_2| \sim 2^j\}} 1_{\{|k_2| \sim 2^i\}} 2^{-4i} \lesssim \sum_{i \ge j-\ell} 2^{jd} 2^{i(d-4)} \lesssim 2^{2j(d-2)},$$

which is of the required order (and we used that $d < 4$). Let us pass to the diagonal, term. Using that $\{\langle \xi^n, \mathfrak{n}_k \rangle\}_{k \in A_\mathfrak{n}^n}$ are uncorrelated we rewrite the term as:

$$\int_{\Xi_n^+ \times (\{-1,1\}^d)^2} \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}_{12} \, \mathrm{d}k \, \nu_k^2 e^{2\pi\iota \langle x, \mathfrak{q}_{[12]} \circ k \rangle} \varrho_j(\mathfrak{q}_{[12]} \circ k) \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} \quad - \quad 1_{\{j=-1\}} \kappa_n .$$

We split up this sum in different terms according to the relative values of $\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2$. If $\mathfrak{q}_1 = -\mathfrak{q}_2$ (there are 2^d such terms) the sum does not depend on x and it disappears for $j \ge 0$. Let us assume $j = -1$. Via (2.13) and parity we are then left with the constant:

$$2^d \int_{\Xi_n^+} \mathrm{d}k \, \nu_k^2 \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} - \kappa_n = \int_{\Xi_n} \mathrm{d}k \, \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} - \kappa_n .$$

The sum on the left-hand side diverges logarithmically in n and we now show how to renormalize with κ_n. To clarify our computation let us also introduce an auxiliary constant $\bar{\kappa}_n = \int_{\Xi_n} \mathrm{d}k \ \bar{\nu}_k^2 \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)}$, where $\bar{\nu}_k = 2^{-\#\{i:\ k_i=\pm n\}/2}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, r \geq 0$, let us indicate with $Q_r^n(x) \subseteq \mathbb{T}_n^d$ the box $Q_r^n(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{T}_n^d : |y-x|_\infty \leq r/2\}$ ($|\cdot|_\infty$ being the maximum of the component-wise distances in $\mathbb{T}_n^d$). Then one can bound uniformly over n and N:

$$|\kappa_n - \bar{\kappa}_n| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}_n^d} \mathrm{d}k \ \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} - \int_{\Xi_n} \mathrm{d}k \ \bar{\nu}_k^2 \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} \right| = \left| \sum_{k \in \Xi_n} \int_{Q_{\frac{1}{N}}^n(k)} \mathrm{d}k' \ \frac{\chi(k+k')}{l^n(k+k')} - \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} \right|$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{N} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{k \in \Xi_n} \sup_{\vartheta \in Q_{\frac{1}{N}}(k)} \frac{\chi(k)}{(l^n(\vartheta))^2} |\nabla l^n(\vartheta)| \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{N} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{k \in \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\chi(k)}{|k|^3} \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{N},$$

where we have used that $d = 2$, $|l^n(\vartheta)| \gtrsim |\vartheta|^2$ on $[-n/2, n/2]^d$ as well as $|\nabla l^n(\vartheta)| \lesssim |\theta|$ on $[-n/2, n/2]^d$. Similar calculations show that the difference converges: $\lim_{n \to \infty} \kappa_n - \bar{\kappa}_n \in \mathbb{R}$. We are now able to estimate:

$$\left| \int_{\Xi_n} \mathrm{d}k \ \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} - \kappa_n \right| \lesssim 1 + |\bar{\kappa}_n - \kappa_n| \lesssim 1$$

where we used that the sum on the boundary $\partial\Xi_n$ converges to zero and is thus uniformly bounded in n. For the same reason, the above difference converges to the limit $\lim_{n \to \infty} \overline{\kappa}_n - \kappa_n \in \mathbb{R}$.

For all other possibilities of $\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2$ we show boundedness in a distributional sense. If $\mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_2$ we have:

$$\left| \int_{\Xi_n^+} \mathrm{d}k \ \nu_k^2 e^{2\pi\iota\langle x, 2\mathfrak{q}_1 k\rangle} \varrho_j(2k) \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} \right| \lesssim 2^{j(d-2)}.$$

Finally, if only one of the two components of $\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2$ differs (let us suppose it is the first one) we find (with $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $k = (k_1, k_2)$):

$$\left| \int_{\Xi_n^+} \mathrm{d}k \ \nu_k^2 e^{2\pi\iota 2x_2 k_2} \varrho_j(2k_2) \frac{\chi(k)}{l^n(k)} \right| \lesssim \left(\sum_{k_1 \geq 1} \frac{1}{|k_1|^{2\theta}} \right) \left(\sum_{k_2 \geq 1} \frac{\varrho_j(2k_2)}{|k_2|^{2(1-\theta)}} \right) \lesssim 2^{j\varepsilon}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, up to choosing $\theta \in (1/2, 1)$ sufficiently close to $1/2$.

Step 3. Now we briefly address the convergence in distribution. Clearly the previous calculations and compact embeddings of Hölder-Besov spaces guarantee tightness of the sequence $X_\mathfrak{n}^n \odot \xi^n - \kappa_n$ in the required Hölder spaces for any $\alpha < 2 - d/2$. We have to uniquely identify the distribution of any limit point. Whereas for $\xi, X_\mathfrak{n}^n$ the limit points are Gaussian and uniquely identified as white noise ξ and $\Delta_\mathfrak{n}^{-1}\chi(D)\xi$ respectively, the resonant product requires more care, but we can use the same arguments as in [8, Section 5.1] for higher order Gaussian chaoses. $\qquad\square$

3 Killed rSBM

In this last section we introduce a killed version of the rSBM described in [9]. Recall that we consider the lattice approximation $\Lambda_n^L = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^d : x \in [-L/2, L/2]^d\}$ (we explicitly write the dependence on L because we will let L vary). Define in addition the space of functions $E^L = \{\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^{\Lambda_n^L} : \eta(x) = 0, \forall x \in \partial\Lambda_n^L\}$. Recall that the final statement of Lemma 2.2 allows us to apply the results of [9]. We work in the following framework.

Assumption 3.1. *Let ξ^n be the sequence of random variables on Ω constructed in Lemma 2.2 and define:*

$$\xi_e^n(\omega, x) = \xi^n(\omega, x) - c_n(\omega)1_{\{d=2\}}, \qquad \varrho = \frac{d}{2}.$$

Let $u^n(\omega, t, x)$ be the process constructed in [9, Definition 2.6] and let $\mu^n(\omega, t)$ be the measure associated to it. Such process lives on a probability space:

$$\left(\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P} \ltimes \mathbb{P}^{\omega, n}\right),$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{\omega, n}$ is the quenched law of u^n, conditional on the environment $\xi^n(\omega)$, for $\omega \in \Omega$.

Observe that in [9] any $\varrho \geq \frac{d}{2}$ is allowed. The choice $\varrho = \frac{d}{2}$ is the most interesting one, since at this level fluctuations appear, as opposed to convergence to convergence to the continuous PAM: this is related to the fact that $n^{\frac{d}{2}}$ is the explosion rate of ξ^n, so that $n^{-\varrho}|\xi^n|$ has a nontrivial limit $2\mathbb{E}\Phi_+ > 0$ only for $\varrho = \frac{d}{2}$ (see Lemma 2.2).

The process u^n does not keep track of the individual particles (all particles are identical, only their position matters, cf [9, Appendix A]). Instead we consider here a labelled process that distinguishes individual particles and in which all particles that leave the box $(-L/2, L/2)^d$ are killed. For this purpose, introduce the space $E^n_{\text{lab}} = \bigsqcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} (\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}^d \cup \{\Delta\})^m$, where $\bigsqcup$ denotes the disjoint union, endowed with the discrete topology. Here Δ is a cemetery state. For $\eta \in E^n_{\text{lab}}$ we write $\dim(\eta) = m$ if $\eta \in (\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}^d \cup \{\Delta\})^m$. A rigorous construction of the process below follows as in [9, Appendix A].

Definition 3.2. *Fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and $X_0^n \in E^n_{\text{lab}}$ with $\dim(X_0^n) = \lfloor n^\varrho \rfloor$, $(X_0^n)_i = 0$, $i = 1 \ldots \lfloor n^\varrho \rfloor$. Let $X^n(\omega)$ be the Markov jump process on E^n_{lab} with initial condition $X^n(0) = X_0^n$ and with generator:*

$$\mathcal{L}^\omega_{\text{lab}}(F)(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\eta)} 1_{\{\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}^d\}}(\eta_i)\Big[\sum_{|y - \eta_i| = n^{-1}} \big(F(\eta^{i \mapsto y}) - F(\eta)\big)$$
$$+ (\xi^n)_+(\omega, \eta_i)\big(F(\eta^{i,+}) - F(\eta)\big) + (\xi^n)_-(\omega, \eta_i)\big(F(\eta^{i,-}) - F(\eta)\big)\Big],$$

where $\eta_j^{i \mapsto y} = \eta_j(1 - 1_{\{i\}}(j)) + y 1_{\{i\}}(j)$ and $\eta_j^{i,+} = \eta_j 1_{[0, \dim(\eta)]}(j) + \eta_i 1_{\{\dim(\eta)+1\}}(j)$ as well as $\eta_j^{i,-} = \eta_j(1 - 1_{\{i\}}(j)) + \Delta 1_{\{i\}}(j)$, on the domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}^\omega_{\text{lab}})$ of functions $F \in C_b(E^n_{\text{lab}})$ is such that the right hand-side is bounded. We can then redefine the process

$$u^n(\omega, t, x) = \#\{i \in \{1, \ldots, \dim(X^n(\omega, t))\} : X_i^n(\omega, t) = x\}$$

which has the same quenched law $\mathbb{P}^{\omega, n}$ as the process above.

Similarly, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ consider $\tau_i^{n,L}(\omega) = \inf\{t \geq 0: \dim(X^n(\omega, t)) \geq i \text{ and } X_i^n(t) \in \partial\Lambda_n^L\}$. Define $X^{n,L}(\omega, t) \in E^n_{\text{lab}}$ by $\dim(X^{n,L}(\omega, t)) = \dim(X^n(\omega, t))$ and $X_i^{n,L}(\omega, t) = X_i^n(\omega, t) 1_{\{t < \tau_i^{n,L}(\omega)\}} + \Delta 1_{\{\tau_i^{n,L}(\omega) \leq t\}}$, and based on $X^{n,L}$ define $u^{n,L}$ taking values in E^L by

$$u^{n,L}(\omega, t, x) = \#\{i \in \{1, \ldots, \dim(X^{n,L}(\omega, t))\} : X_i^{n,L}(\omega, t) = x\}.$$

Write $\mathcal{M}((-L/2, L/2)^d)$ for the set of all finite positive measures on $(-L/2, L/2)^d$ and for μ, ν in this space we say $\mu \geq \nu$ if also $\mu - \nu$ is a *positive* measure. The following result is now easy to verify (cf [9, Appendix A]).

Lemma 3.3. *For any $\omega \in \Omega$ the process $t \mapsto u^{n,L}(\omega, t, \cdot)$ is a Markov process with paths in $\mathbb{D}([0, +\infty); E^L)$, associated to the generator $\mathcal{L}_L^{n,\omega} : C_b(E^L) \to C_b(E^L)$ defined via:*

$$\mathcal{L}_L^{n,\omega}(F)(\eta) = \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n^L \setminus \partial\Lambda_n^L} \eta_x \cdot \Big[\sum_{x \sim y} n^2 (F(\eta^{x \mapsto y}) - F(\eta))$$
$$+ (\xi_e^n)_+(\omega, x)[F(\eta^{x+}) - F(\eta)] + (\xi_e^n)_-(\omega, x)[F(\eta^{x-}) - F(\eta)]\Big],$$

where for $\eta \in E^L$ we define $\eta^{x \mapsto y}(z) = (\eta(z) - 1_{\{z=x\}} + 1_{\{z=y, \, y \notin \partial \Lambda_n^L\}})_+$ and $\eta^{x\pm}(z) = (\eta(z) \pm 1_{\{z=x\}})_+$. We associate to $u^{n,L}(\omega, t)$ a measure:

$$\mu^{n,L}(\omega, t)(\varphi) = \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n^L} \lfloor n^{-\varrho} \rfloor u^{n,L}(\omega, t, x) \varphi(x), \qquad \forall \varphi \in C((-L/2, L/2)^d). \tag{3.1}$$

Finally:

$$\mu^{n,L}(\omega, t) \leq \mu^{n,L+2}(\omega, t) \leq \cdots \leq \mu^n(\omega, t) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, t \geq 0. \tag{3.2}$$

When studying the convergence of the process $\mu^{n,L}$, special care has to be taken with regard to what happens on the boundary of the box. Indeed a function $\varphi \in C^\infty([-L/2, L/2]^d)$ (i.e. smooth in the interior with all derivatives continuous on the entire box) is not smooth in the scale of spaces $B_{p,q}^{l,\alpha}$ for $l \in \{\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{n}\}$, since it does not satisfy the required boundary conditions. For this reason we consider only vague convergence for the processes $\mu^{n,L}$. We write

$$\mathcal{M}_0^L = \big(\mathcal{M}((-L/2, L/2)^d), \tau_v\big)$$

for the set of finite positive measures on $(-L/2, L/2)^d$ endowed with the vague topology τ_v (cf. [4, Section 3]), i.e. $\mu^n \to \mu$ in $\mathcal{M}_0^L$ if $\mu^n(\varphi) \to \mu(\varphi)$, for all $\varphi \in C_0((-L/2, L/2)^d)$, the space of continuous functions that vanish on the boundary of the box (the latter is a Banach space, when endowed with the uniform norm). This topology is convenient because sets of the form $K_R \subset \mathcal{M}_0^L$, with $K_R = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0^L \ : \ \mu(1) \leq R\}$ are compact. The observation below now follows from a short calculation.

Remark 3.4. For $\alpha > 0$ there is a continuous embedding of Banach spaces

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}}^\alpha([-L/2, L/2]^d) \hookrightarrow C_0((-L/2, L/2)^d).$$

Moreover, if $\{\mu^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0^L$ satisfies that for some $R > 0$, $\{\mu^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq R$, then $\mu^n \to \mu$ in $\mathcal{M}_0^L$ is equivalent to:

$$\mu^n(\varphi) \to \mu(\varphi), \qquad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty((-L/2, L/2)^d).$$

Now we study the convergence of the killed process. First observe that one can bound its total mass locally uniformly in time.

Lemma 3.5. *For all $\omega \in \Omega$ it holds that:*

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \sup_n \mathbb{P}^{\omega,n} \Big(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \mu^{n,L}(\omega, t)(1) \geq R \Big) = 0, \qquad \sup_n \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|T_t^{n,\mathfrak{d},L,\omega} 1\|_\infty < +\infty.$$

Proof. The first bound follows from comparison with the process on the whole real line (i.e. Equation (3.2)), see [9, Corollary 4.3]. The second bound follows from Theorem 2.3 because the antisymmetric extension of 1 is bounded: $|\Pi_o 1(\cdot)| \equiv 1$. Hence by comparison and the discussion preceding Equation (2.9): $\|T_t^{n,\mathfrak{d},L,\omega} 1\|_\infty \leq \|\widetilde{w}(t)\|_\infty$, with $\widetilde{w}$ solving:

$$\partial_t \widetilde{w} = \Delta^n \widetilde{w} + \Pi_e(\xi^n(\omega) - c_n(\omega) 1_{\{d=2\}}) \widetilde{w}, \qquad \widetilde{w}(0) \equiv 1. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 3.6. *For every $\omega \in \Omega$ the sequence $\{t \mapsto \mu^{n,L}(\omega, t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathcal{M}_0^L)$. Any limit point $\mu^L(\omega)$ lies in $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathcal{M}_0^L)$.*

Proof. We want to apply Jakubowski's tightness criterion [4, Theorem 3.6.4]. The sequence $\mu^{n,L}$ satisfies the compact containment condition in view of Lemma 3.5. The tightness of the entire process is guaranteed if we prove that the sequence $\{t \mapsto \mu^{n,L}(t)(\varphi)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}([0,T]; \mathbb{R})$ for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((-L/2, L/2)^d)$. Here we can follow the calculation of [9, Lemma 4.2] (only simpler, since we do not need weights), using the results from Theorem 2.3. The continuity of the limit points is shown as in [9, Lemma 4.4]. $\qquad \square$

One can characterize the limit points of $\{\mu^{n,L}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in a similar way as the rough super-Brownian motion, and for that purpose we need to solve the following equation (for any $\omega \in \Omega, L \in 2\mathbb{N}$):

$$\partial_t \varphi = \mathcal{H}^\omega_{\mathfrak{d},L}\varphi - \nu\varphi^2, \quad \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \quad \varphi(t,x) = 0, \ \forall(t,x) \in (0,T] \times \partial[-L/2,L/2]^d, \qquad (3.3)$$

where we define φ a solution to (3.3) if

$$\varphi(t) = T^{\mathfrak{d},L,\omega}_t\varphi_0 - \nu\int_0^t T^{\mathfrak{d},L,\omega}_{t-s}[\varphi^2(s)]\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Lemma 3.7. *Fix $\omega \in \Omega, L \in 2\mathbb{N}$. For $T > 0$ and $\varphi_0 \in C^\infty_c((-L/2,L/2)^d)$ with $\varphi_0 \geq 0$ and ϑ as in Theorem 2.3, there exists a unique (paracontrolled in $d = 2$) solution $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}^\vartheta_{\mathfrak{d}}([-L/2,L/2]^d)$ to (3.3) and the following bounds hold:*

$$0 \leq \varphi(t) \leq T^{\mathfrak{d},L,\omega}_t\varphi_0, \qquad \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{L}^\theta_{\mathfrak{d}}([-L/2,L/2]^d)} \lesssim e^{C\|\{T^{\mathfrak{d},L,\omega}_t\varphi_0\}_{t\in[0,T]}\|_{CL^\infty([-L/2,L/2]^d)}}.$$

The proof is analogous to the one of [9, Proposition 4.5]. We thus arrive at the following description of the limit points of $\{\mu^{n,L}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Theorem 3.8. *For any $\omega \in \Omega$ and $L \in 2\mathbb{N}$, under Assumption 3.1, there exists $\mu^L(\omega) \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathcal{M}^L_0)$ such that $\mu^{n,L}(\omega) \to \mu^L(\omega)$ in distribution in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathcal{M}^L_0)$. The process $\mu^L(\omega)$ is the unique (in law) process in $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathcal{M}^L_0)$ which satisfies one (and then all) of the following equivalent properties with $\mathcal{F}^\omega = \{\mathcal{F}^\omega_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ being the usual augmentation of the filtration generated by $\mu^L(\omega)$.*

(i) *For any $t \geq 0$ and $\varphi_0 \in C^\infty_c((-L/2,L/2)^d), \varphi_0 \geq 0$ and for $U^{\mathfrak{d},L,\omega}_t\varphi_0$ the solution to Equation (3.3) with initial condition φ_0 the process*

$$N^{\varphi_0}_t(s) = e^{-\langle\mu^L(\omega,s),U^{\mathfrak{d},L,\omega}_{t-s}\varphi_0\rangle}, \qquad s \in [0,t]$$

is a bounded continuous $\mathcal{F}^\omega$-martingale.

(ii) *For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^\omega_{\mathfrak{d},L}}$ the process:*

$$K^\varphi(t) = \langle\mu^L(\omega,t),\varphi\rangle - \langle\delta_0,\varphi\rangle - \int_0^t \mathrm{d}r\,\langle\mu^L(\omega,r),\mathcal{H}^\omega_{\mathfrak{d},L}\varphi\rangle, \qquad t \in [0,T]$$

is a continuous $\mathcal{F}^\omega$-martingale, square-integrable on $[0,T]$ for all $T > 0$, with quadratic variation

$$\langle K^\varphi\rangle_t = 2\nu\int_0^t \mathrm{d}r\,\langle\mu^L(\omega,r),\varphi^2\rangle.$$

Proof. The proof is almost identical to the one of [9, Theorem 2.13]. The main difference is that here we only test against functions with zero boundary conditions and thus use the results from Section 2. $\square$

We call the above process the killed rSBM on $(-\frac{L}{2},\frac{L}{2})^d$. Note that one can interpret the killed rSBM as an element of $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ extending it by zero, i.e. $\mu^L(\omega,t,A) = \mu^L(\omega,t,A\cap(-L/2,L/2)^d)$ for any measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. This allows us to couple infinitely many killed rSBMs with a rSBM on $\mathbb{R}^d$ so that they are ordered in the natural way.

Corollary 3.9. *For any $\omega \in \Omega$, under Assumption 3.1, there exists a process*

$$(\mu(\omega,\cdot),\mu^2(\omega,\cdot),\mu^4(\omega,\cdot),\dots)$$

taking values in $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d))^{\mathbb{N}}$ *(equipped with the product topology) such that μ is an rSBM and μ^L is a killed rSBM for all $L \in 2\mathbb{N}$ (all associated to the environment $\{\xi^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$), and such that:*

$$\mu^2(\omega, t, A) \leq \mu^4(\omega, t, A) \leq \cdots \leq \mu(\omega, t, A) \tag{3.4}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and all Borel sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. The construction (3.1) of μ^n and $\mu^{n,L}$ based on the labelled particle system gives us a coupling $(\mu^n, \mu^{n,2}, \mu^{n,4}, \dots)$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\mu^{n,2}(\omega, t, A) \leq \mu^{n,4}(\omega, t, A) \leq \cdots \leq \mu^n(\omega, t, A)$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and all Borel sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where as above we extend $\mu^{n,L}$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ by setting it to zero outside of $(-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2})^d$ (cf. Equation (3.2)). By [9, Theorem 2.13] and Theorem 3.8 one obtains tightness of the finite-dimensional projections $(\mu^n, \mu^{n,2}, \dots, \mu^{n,L})$ for $L \in 2\mathbb{N}$, and this gives tightness of the whole sequence in the product topology. Moreover, for any subsequential limit $(\mu, \mu^2, \mu^4, \dots)$, μ is an rSBM and μ^L is a killed rSBM on $(-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2})^d$. It is however a little subtle to obtain the ordering (3.4), because we only showed tightness in the vague topology on $\mathcal{M}_0^L$ for the $\mu^{n,L}$ component. So we introduce suitable cut-off functions to show that the ordering is preserved along any (subsequential) limit: Let $\chi^m \in C_c^{\infty}((-L/2, L/2)^d)$, $\chi^m \geq 0$ such that $\chi^m = 1$ on a sequence of compact sets K^m which increase to $(-L/2, L/2)^d$ as $m \to \infty$. Note that on compact sets the sequence $\mu^{n,L}$ converges weakly (and not just vaguely). We then estimate (in view of Equation (3.2)) for $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\varphi \geq 0$:

$$\langle \mu^L(t), \varphi \rangle = \lim_{m \to \infty} \langle \mu^L(t), \varphi \cdot \chi^m \rangle = \lim_{m \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle \mu^{n,L}(t), \varphi \cdot \chi^m \rangle$$
$$\leq \lim_{m \to \infty} \langle \mu(t), \varphi \cdot \chi^m \rangle = \langle \mu(t), \varphi \rangle,$$

and similarly one obtains $\langle \mu^L(t), \varphi \rangle \leq \langle \mu^{L'}(t), \varphi \rangle$ for $L \leq L'$. Since a signed measure that has a positive integral against every positive continuous function must be positive, our claim follows. □

References

[1] G. Cannizzaro, P. Friz, and P. Gassiat. Malliavin calculus for regularity structures: The case of gPAM. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 272(1):363–419, 2017. MR-3567508

[2] K. Chouk, J. Gairing, and N. Perkowski. An invariance principle for the two-dimensional parabolic anderson model with small potential. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 5(4):520–558, Dec 2017. MR-3736653

[3] K. Chouk and W. van Zuijlen. Asympotics of the eigenvalues of the anderson hamiltonian with white noise potential in two dimensions. *In preparation*, 2019+.

[4] D. A. Dawson and E. Perkins. *Superprocesses at Saint-Flour*. Probability at Saint-Flour. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012. MR-3075367

[5] K. Deimling. *Nonlinear functional analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985. MR-0787404

[6] P. Y. Gaudreau Lamarre. Semigroups for One-Dimensional Schrödinger Operators with Multiplicative White Noise. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1902.05047, Feb 2019.

[7] M. Gerencsér and M. Hairer. Singular spdes in domains with boundaries. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173(3):697–758, Apr 2019. MR-3936145

[8] J. Martin and N. Perkowski. Paracontrolled distributions on Bravais lattices and weak universality of the 2d parabolic Anderson model. *ArXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1704.08653, April 2017. MR-4029148

[9] N. Perkowski and T. Rosati. A Rough Super-Brownian Motion. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1905.05825, May 2019.