A simple construction of the continuum parabolic Anderson model on $\mathbf{R}^2$

Martin Hairer[*]   Cyril Labbé[†]

Abstract

We propose a simple construction of the solution to the continuum parabolic Anderson model on $\mathbf{R}^2$ which does not rely on any elaborate arguments and makes extensive use of the linearity of the equation. A logarithmic renormalisation is required to counterbalance the divergent product appearing in the equation. Furthermore, we use time-dependent weights in our spaces of distributions in order to construct the solution on the unbounded space $\mathbf{R}^2$.

Keywords: parabolic Anderson model ; PDEs ; weights ; renormalisation.
AMS MSC 2010: 60H15.
Submitted to ECP on January 4, 2015, final version accepted on June 4, 2015.
Supersedes arXiv:1501.00692.

1 Introduction

The goal of this note is to construct solutions to the continuous parabolic Anderson model:

$$\partial_t u = \Delta u + u \cdot \xi , \qquad u(0,x) = u_0(x) . \tag{PAM}$$

Here, u is a function of $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$, while ξ is a white noise on $\mathbf{R}^2$. Notice that ξ is constant in time, so this is quite different from the model studied for example in [2, 3]. The difficulty of this problem is twofold. First, the product $u \cdot \xi$ is not classically well-defined since the sum of the Hölder regularities of u and ξ is slightly below 0. Second, our space variable x lies in the unbounded space $\mathbf{R}^2$ so that one needs to incorporate weights in the Hölder spaces at stake; this causes some difficulty in obtaining the fixed point argument, since one would a priori require a larger weight for $u \cdot \xi$ than for u itself.

The first issue is handled thanks to a renormalisation procedure which, informally, consists in subtracting an infinite linear term from the original equation. The main trick that spares us from using elaborate renormalisation theories is to introduce the "stationary" solution Y of the (additive) stochastic heat equation and to solve the PDE associated to $v = ue^Y$ instead of u. This is analogous to what was done for example in [4, 10]. The second issue is dealt with by choosing an appropriate time-increasing weight for the solution u. Roughly speaking, if ξ is weighted by the polynomial function $\mathrm{p}_a(x) = (1 + |x|)^a$ with a small, and u_s is weighted by the exponential function $\mathrm{e}_s(x) = e^{s(1+|x|)}$, then $\int_0^t P_{t-s} * (u_s \cdot \xi)(x)\, ds$ requires a weight of order $\int_0^t \mathrm{p}_a(x)\mathrm{e}_s(x)\, ds$, which is smaller than $\mathrm{e}_t(x)$. This argument already appears in [10], and probably also elsewhere in the PDE literature.

---
[*]University of Warwick, United Kingdom. E-mail: M.Hairer@Warwick.ac.uk
[†]University of Warwick, United Kingdom. E-mail: C.Labbe@Warwick.ac.uk

The solution to the (generalised) parabolic Anderson model has already been constructed independently by Gubinelli, Imkeller and Perkowski [6] and by Hairer [8] in dimension 2 and, to some extent, by Hairer and Pardoux [7] in dimension 3. (The latter actually considers the case of dimension 1 with space-time white noise, but the case of dimension 3 with spatial noise has exactly the same scaling behaviour, so the proof given there carries through *mutatis mutandis*. The main difference is that some of the renormalisation constants that converge to finite limits in [7] may diverge logarithmically.) However, in all of these results the space variable is restricted to a torus, which is the constraint that we lift in this note. The construction that we propose here is very specific to (PAM) in dimension 2: in particular, as it stands, it unfortunately applies neither to the generalised parabolic Anderson model considered in [6, 8], nor to the case of dimension 3. We refer to [9] for the construction of (PAM) on $\mathbf{R}^3$ using the theory of regularity structures. Let us finally mention the work of Hu [11] who considers a different equation: the usual product $u \cdot \xi$ in (PAM) is replaced by the Wick product.

Let us now present the main steps of our construction. First, we introduce a mollified noise $\xi_\varepsilon := \varrho_\varepsilon * \xi$, where ϱ is a compactly supported, even, smooth function on $\mathbf{R}^2$ that integrates to 1, and $\varrho_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-2}\varrho(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$. In order to quantify the Hölder regularity of ξ, ξ_ε, we introduce weighted Hölder spaces of distributions, see Section 2 below for the general definitions. Informally speaking, given a weight w and an exponent α, $\mathcal{C}_w^\alpha$ consists of those elements of $\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ that grow at most as fast as w at infinity. We have the following very simple convergence result, the proof of which is given on Page 4 below.

Lemma 1.1. *For any given $a > 0$, let $\mathrm{p}_a(x) = (1+|x|)^a$ on $\mathbf{R}^2$ as above. For every $\varepsilon, \kappa > 0$, ξ_ε belongs almost surely to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-1-\kappa}(\mathbf{R}^2)$. As $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, ξ_ε converges in probability to ξ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-1-\kappa}$.*

From now on, a is taken arbitrarily small. Since, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the mollified noise ξ_ε is actually a smooth function belonging to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^\alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$, the SPDE

$$\partial_t u_\varepsilon = \Delta u_\varepsilon + u_\varepsilon(\xi_\varepsilon - C_\varepsilon), \qquad u_\varepsilon(0, x) = u_0(x), \qquad (\mathrm{PAM}_\varepsilon)$$

is well-posed, as can be seen for example by using its Feynman-Kac representation. The constant C_ε appearing in this equation is required in order to control the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ and will be determined later on.

Second, let G be a compactly supported, even, smooth function on $\mathbf{R}^2 \backslash \{0\}$, such that $G(x) = \frac{\log|x|}{2\pi}$ whenever $|x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then, there exists a compactly supported smooth function F on $\mathbf{R}^2$ that vanishes on the ball of radius $\frac{1}{2}$ and such that, in the distributional sense, we have:

$$\Delta G(x) = \delta_0(x) + F(x). \qquad (1.1)$$

With these notations at hand, we introduce the process $Y_\varepsilon(x) := G * \xi_\varepsilon(x)$. By construction, Y_ε is a smooth stationary process on $\mathbf{R}^2$ that coincides with the solution of the Poisson equation driven by ξ_ε, up to some smooth term:

$$\Delta Y_\varepsilon(x) = \xi_\varepsilon(x) + F * \xi_\varepsilon(x).$$

From now on, D_{x_i} denotes the differentiation operator with respect to the variable x_i, with $i \in \{1, 2\}$. More generally, for every $\ell \in \mathbf{N}^2$, we define $D_x^\ell f$ as the map obtained from f by differentiating ℓ_1 times in direction x_1 and ℓ_2 times in direction x_2. We also use the notation $\nabla f = (D_{x_1} f, D_{x_2} f)$. The following result is a consequence of Lemma 1.1 together with the smoothing effect of the convolution with G and $D_{x_i} G$.

Corollary 1.2. *For any given $\kappa \in (0, 1/2)$, the sequence of processes Y_ε (resp. $D_{x_i} Y_\varepsilon$) converges in probability as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the space $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{1-\kappa}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-\kappa}(\mathbf{R}^2)$) towards the*

process Y (resp. $D_{x_i}Y$) defined by

$$Y := G * \xi \ , \qquad D_{x_i}Y := D_{x_i}G * \xi \ .$$

We introduce $v_\varepsilon(t,x) := u_\varepsilon(t,x)e^{Y_\varepsilon(x)}$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$ and $t \geq 0$, and we observe that

$$\partial_t v_\varepsilon = \Delta v_\varepsilon + v_\varepsilon(Z_\varepsilon - F * \xi_\varepsilon) - 2\nabla v_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla Y_\varepsilon \ , \qquad v_\varepsilon(0,x) = u_0(x)e^{Y_\varepsilon(x)} \ ,$$

where we have introduced the renormalised process

$$Z_\varepsilon(x) := |\nabla Y_\varepsilon(x)|^2 - C_\varepsilon \ .$$

At this stage we fix the renormalisation constant C_ε to be given by

$$C_\varepsilon := \mathbb{E}\big[|\nabla Y_\varepsilon|^2\big] = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\log \varepsilon + \mathcal{O}(1) \ , \tag{1.2}$$

where the part denoted by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ converges to a constant (depending on the choice of G and ϱ) as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we refer to the end of Section 3 for the calculation. The following result, which is proven on Page 7, shows that this sequence of renormalised processes also converges in an appropriate space. We refer to Nualart [13] for details on Wiener chaoses.

Proposition 1.3. *For any given $\kappa \in (0,1/2)$, the collection of processes Z_ε converges in probability as $\varepsilon \to 0$, in the space $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-\kappa}(\mathbf{R}^2)$, towards the generalised process Z defined as follows: for every test function η, $\langle Z, \eta \rangle$ is the random variable in the second homogeneous Wiener chaos associated to ξ represented by the $L^2(dz\,d\tilde{z})$ function*

$$(z,\tilde{z}) \mapsto \int \sum_{i=1,2} D_{x_i}G(z-x)D_{x_i}G(\tilde{z}-x)\eta(x)dx \ .$$

We are now able to set up a fixed point argument for the process v_ε with controls that are uniform in ε. The precise statement of the main result of this article requires some notation: in this introduction, we provide a weaker but more readable version of the statement and we refer to Section 4 for the details.

Theorem 1.4. *Let u_0 be a Hölder distribution with regularity better than -1, and that grows at most exponentially fast at infinity. The sequence of processes v_ε converges uniformly on all compact sets of $(0,\infty) \times \mathbf{R}^2$, in probability as $\varepsilon \to 0$, to a limit v which is the unique solution of*

$$\partial_t v = \Delta v + v(Z - F * \xi) - 2\nabla v \cdot \nabla Y \ , \qquad v(0,x) = u_0(x)e^{Y(x)} \ .$$

As a consequence, u_ε converges in probability towards the process $u = ve^{-Y}$.

2 Weighted Hölder spaces

In this section, we introduce the appropriate weighted spaces that will allow us to set up a fixed point argument associated to (PAM). We work in $\mathbf{R}^d$ for a general dimension $d \in \mathbf{N}$, even though we will apply these results to $d = 2$ in the next sections.

Definition 2.1. *A function $w : \mathbf{R}^d \to (0,\infty)$ is a weight if there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$C^{-1} \leq \sup_{|x-y| \leq 1} \frac{w(x)}{w(y)} \leq C \ .$$

In this article, we will consider two families of weights indexed by $a, \ell \in \mathbf{R}$:

$$\mathrm{p}_a(x) := (1+|x|)^a \ , \qquad \mathrm{e}_\ell(x) := \exp\big(\ell(1+|x|)\big) \ .$$

Observe that the constant C can be taken uniformly for all p_a and e_ℓ, as long as a and ℓ lie in a compact domain of $\mathbf{R}^2$. We can now consider weighted versions of the usual spaces of Hölder functions $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

Definition 2.2. *For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\mathcal{C}_w^\alpha(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is the space of functions $f : \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{R}$ such that*

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,w} := \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} \frac{|f(x)|}{w(x)} + \sup_{|x-y|\leq 1} \frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{w(x)|x-y|^\alpha} < \infty \, .$$

More generally, for every $\alpha > 1$, we define $\mathcal{C}_w^\alpha(\mathbf{R}^d)$ recursively as the space of functions f which admit first order derivatives and such that

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,w} := \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} \frac{|f(x)|}{w(x)} + \sum_{i=1}^d \|D_{x_i} f\|_{\alpha-1,w} < \infty \, .$$

We then extend this definition to negative α. To this end, we define for every $r \in \mathbf{N}$, the space $\mathcal{B}_1^r$ of all smooth functions η on $\mathbf{R}^d$, which are compactly supported in the unit ball of $\mathbf{R}^d$ and whose $\mathcal{C}^r$ norm is smaller than 1. We will use the notation η_x^λ to denote the function $y \mapsto \lambda^{-d}\eta\left(\frac{y-x}{\lambda}\right)$.

Definition 2.3. *For every $\alpha < 0$, we set $r := -\lfloor\alpha\rfloor$ and we define $\mathcal{C}_w^\alpha(\mathbf{R}^d)$ as the space of distributions f on $\mathbf{R}^d$ such that*

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,w} := \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{B}_1^r} \sup_{\lambda \in (0,1]} \frac{|f(\eta_x^\lambda)|}{w(x)\lambda^\alpha} < \infty \, .$$

In order to deal with the regularity of random processes, it is convenient to have a characterisation of $\mathcal{C}_w^\alpha$ that only relies on a countable number of test functions. To state such a characterisation, we need some notation. For any $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^r$, we set

$$\psi_x^n(y) := 2^{\frac{nd}{2}}\psi((y_1-x_1)2^n, \ldots, (y_d-x_d)2^n) \, , \quad x,y \in \mathbf{R}^d \, , \quad n \geq 0 \, .$$

We also define $\Lambda_n := \{(2^{-n}k_i)_{i=1\ldots d} : k_i \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\alpha < 0$ and $r > |\alpha|$. There exists a finite set Ψ of compactly supported functions in $\mathcal{C}^r$, as well as a compactly supported function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^r$ such that $\{\varphi_x^0, x \in \Lambda_0\} \cup \{\psi_x^n, n \geq 0, x \in \Lambda_n, \psi \in \Psi\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $\mathbf{R}^d$, and such that for any distribution ξ on $\mathbf{R}^d$, the following equivalence holds: $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_w^\alpha$ if and only if ξ belongs to the dual of $\mathcal{C}^r$ and*

$$\sup_{n\geq 0}\sup_{\psi\in\Psi}\sup_{x\in\Lambda_n} \frac{|\langle\xi,\psi_x^n\rangle|}{w(x)2^{-\frac{nd}{2}-n\alpha}} + \sup_{x\in\Lambda_0}\frac{|\langle\xi,\varphi_x^0\rangle|}{w(x)} < \infty \, . \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. This result is rather standard and is obtained by a wavelet analysis, see [12, 5] or [8, Prop. 3.20]. In these references, the spaces are not weighted, but since all the arguments needed for the proof are local, it suffices to use the fact that $\frac{w(y)}{w(x)}$ is bounded from above and below uniformly over all x,y such that $|x-y| \leq 1$ to obtain our statement. $\square$

Remark 2.5. If ξ is a linear transformation acting on the linear span of the functions φ_x^0, ψ_x^n such that (2.1) is finite, then ξ can be extended uniquely to an element of $\mathcal{C}_w^\alpha$.

We are now in position to characterise the regularity of the noise.

Proof of Lemma 1.1. We work in dimension $d = 2$. Set $\alpha = -1 - \kappa$ with $\kappa > 0$. By Proposition 2.4, it suffices to show that almost surely

$$\sup_{n\geq 0}\sup_{\psi\in\Psi}\sup_{x\in\Lambda_n} \frac{|\langle\xi,\psi_x^n\rangle|}{2^{-n(1+\alpha)}p_a(x)} \lesssim 1 \, , \qquad \sup_{x\in\Lambda_0}\frac{|\langle\xi,\varphi_x^0\rangle|}{p_a(x)} \lesssim 1 \, .$$

We restrict to the first bound, since the second is simpler. For any integer $p \geq 1$, we write

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{n \geq 0} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi} \sup_{x \in \Lambda_n} \left(\frac{|\langle \xi, \psi_x^n \rangle|}{2^{-n(\alpha+1)} \mathrm{p}_a(x)}\right)^{2p}\right] \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \frac{2^{2np(\alpha+1)}}{\mathrm{p}_a(x)^{2p}} \left(\mathbb{E}\langle \xi, \psi_x^n \rangle^2\right)^p
$$
$$
\lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Z}^2} \frac{2^{2np(\alpha+1)}}{\mathrm{p}_a(x)^{2p}} 2^{2n} .
$$

At the first line, we used the equivalence of moments of Gaussian random variables. At the second line, we used the following facts: the restriction of Λ_n to the unit ball of $\mathbf{R}^2$ has at most of the order of 2^{2n} elements, the L^2 norm of ψ_x^n is 1 and p_a is a weight. Recall that $\alpha < -1$, Ψ is a finite set and $\mathrm{p}_a(x) = (1 + |x|)^a$. Taking p large enough, we deduce that the triple sum converges, so that ξ admits a modification that almost surely belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^\alpha$. We now turn to $\|\xi_\varepsilon - \xi\|_{\alpha, \mathrm{p}_a}$: the computation is very similar, the only difference rests on the term

$$
\mathbb{E}\langle \xi - \xi_\varepsilon, \psi_x^n \rangle^2 = \|\psi_0^n - \varrho_\varepsilon * \psi_0^n\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim 1 \wedge (\varepsilon^2 2^{2n}) . \tag{2.2}
$$

Let n_0 be the smallest integer such that $2^{-n_0} \leq \varepsilon$. For p large enough, we obtain

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{n \geq 0} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi} \sup_{x \in \Lambda_n} \left(\frac{|\langle \xi - \xi_\varepsilon, \psi_x^n \rangle|}{2^{-n(\alpha+1)} \mathrm{p}_a(x)}\right)^{2p}\right] \lesssim \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Z}^2} \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{2^{2n + 2np(\alpha+1)}}{\mathrm{p}_a(x)^{2p}} (1 \wedge \varepsilon^{2p} 2^{2np})
$$
$$
\lesssim \sum_{n < n_0} \varepsilon^{2p} 2^{2n(p(\alpha+2)+1)} + \sum_{n \geq n_0} 2^{2n(p(\alpha+1)+1)} .
$$

Since $\alpha = -1 - \kappa < -1$, taking p large enough, we get that the second sum on the r.h.s. is bounded by a term of order $\varepsilon^{-2(1+p(\alpha+1))}$. Then, according as $p(\alpha + 2) + 1$ is negative, null or positive, the first sum on the r.h.s. is bounded by a term of order ε^{2p}, $\varepsilon^{2p}|\log_2 \varepsilon|$ or $\varepsilon^{-2(1+p(\alpha+1))}$. Consequently, for p large enough $\mathbb{E}\|\xi_\varepsilon - \xi\|_{\alpha, \mathrm{p}_a}^{2p} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. $\qquad \square$

Let w_f and w_g be two weights on $\mathbf{R}^d$. We have the following elementary extension of the classical theorem [1, Thm 2.52].

Theorem 2.6. *Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_{w_f}^\alpha$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}_{w_g}^\beta$ where $\alpha < 0$ and $\beta > 0$ with $\alpha + \beta > 0$. Then there exists a continuous bilinear map $(f, g) \mapsto f \cdot g$ from $\mathcal{C}_{w_f}^\alpha \times \mathcal{C}_{w_g}^\beta$ into $\mathcal{C}_{w_f w_g}^\alpha$ that extends the classical multiplication of smooth functions.*

Remark 2.7. The space $\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ defined in Section 2 coincides with the usual Besov space $\mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^\alpha$. Indeed, they enjoy the same characterisation in a wavelet analysis, see [8, Prop 3.20] and [12, Section 6.10].

Proof. Let χ be a compactly supported, smooth function on $\mathbf{R}^d$ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^d} \chi(x-k) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$. For simplicity, we set $\chi_k(\cdot) := \chi(\cdot - k)$. Writing $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ for the α-Hölder norm without weight (i.e. with weight 1), observe that $h \in \mathcal{C}_w^\alpha$ if and only if $\|h\chi_k\|_\alpha \lesssim w(k)$ hold uniformly over all $k \in \mathbf{Z}^d$, and $\|h\|_{\alpha,w}$ is equivalent to the smallest possible bound. From [1, Thm 2.52], we know that $f\chi_k \cdot g\chi_\ell$ is well-defined for all $k, \ell \in \mathbf{Z}^d$, and that the bound $\|f\chi_k \cdot g\chi_\ell\|_\alpha \lesssim \|f\chi_k\|_\alpha \|g\chi_\ell\|_\beta$ holds. Consequently, we get

$$
\|f\chi_k \cdot g\chi_\ell\|_\alpha \lesssim w_f(k) w_g(\ell) \|f\|_{\alpha, w_f} \|g\|_{\beta, w_g} ,
$$

uniformly over all $k, \ell \in \mathbf{Z}^d$. Since the number of non-zero terms among $\{\langle f\chi_k \cdot g\chi_\ell, \eta_x \rangle, k, \ell \in \mathbf{Z}^d\}$ is uniformly bounded over all $\eta \in \mathcal{B}_1^r$, all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and all f, g as in the statement, we deduce that $f \cdot g := \sum_{k, \ell \in \mathbf{Z}^d} f\chi_k \cdot g\chi_\ell$ is well-defined and that

$\|f \cdot g\|_{\alpha, w_f w_g} \lesssim \|f\|_{\alpha, w_f} \|g\|_{\beta, w_g}$ holds. Finally, the multiplication of [1, Thm 2.52] extends the classical multiplication of smooth functions, therefore, from our construction, it is plain that this property still holds in our case. $\qquad \square$

Let now $P_t(x) := (4\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-|x|^2/4t}$ be the heat kernel in dimension d. We write $P_t * f$ for the spatial convolution of P_t with a function/distribution f on $\mathbf{R}^d$. We have the following regularisation property which is a slight variant of well-known facts.

Lemma 2.8. *For every $\beta \geq \alpha$ and every $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}_{e_\ell}$, we have*

$$\|P_t f\|_{\beta, e_\ell} \lesssim t^{-\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}} \|f\|_{\alpha, e_\ell},$$

uniformly over all ℓ in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}$ and all t in a compact set of $[0, \infty)$.

Proof. We use a decomposition of the heat kernel $P_t(x) = P_+(t, x) + P_-(t, x)$ where P_- is smooth and P_+ is supported in the unit ball centred at 0, we refer the reader to Lemma 5.5 in [8] for instance. Using the decay properties of the heat kernel, the statement regarding P_- is easy to check. Concerning the singular part, one writes $P_+ = \sum_{n \geq 0} P_n$ where each P_n is a smooth function supported in the parabolic annulus $\{(t, x) : 2^{-n-1} \leq |t|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |x| \leq 2^{-n+1}\}$ and such that $P_n(t, x) = 2^{dn} P_0(2^{2n} t, 2^n x)$. Then, we get

$$|\langle f, \eta_x^\lambda(\cdot - y)\rangle| \lesssim \lambda^\alpha e_\ell(x+y), \qquad |\langle f, D_x^k P_n(t, \cdot - y)\rangle| \lesssim 2^{-n(\alpha - |k|)} e_\ell(y),$$

uniformly over all $\eta \in \mathcal{B}_1^r$, all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$, all $t > 0$, all $n \geq 0$ and all $k \in \mathbf{N}^2$. Notice that $P_n(t, \cdot)$ vanishes as soon as $n \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \log_2 t$. Consequently,

$$|\langle P_+(t) * f, \eta_x^\lambda\rangle| \lesssim e_\ell(x)(\lambda^\alpha \wedge t^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}), \quad |\langle f, D_x^k P_+(t, \cdot - x)\rangle| \lesssim e_\ell(x) t^{\frac{\alpha - |k|}{2}},$$

so that the statement follows by interpolation. $\qquad \square$

3 Bounds on Y and Z

Let us collect a few facts on the behaviour of smooth functions with a singularity at the origin; we refer to [8, Sec. 10.3] for proofs. For any smooth function $K : \mathbf{R}^d \backslash \{0\} \to \mathbf{R}$ and any real number ζ, we define

$$\|K\|_{\zeta; m} = \sup_{|k| \leq m} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} \|x\|^{|k| - \zeta} |D_x^k K(x)|,$$

where the first supremum runs over $k \in \mathbf{N}^d$ and $|k| = \sum_i k_i$. We say that K is of order ζ if $\|K\|_{\zeta; m} < \infty$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Recall ϱ_ε from the introduction, and define $K_\varepsilon = K * \varrho_\varepsilon$. If K is of order $\zeta \in (-d, 0)$ then for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|K_\varepsilon\|_{\zeta; m} \leq C\|K\|_{\zeta; m}$, uniformly over $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Furthermore, for all $\bar{\zeta} \in [\zeta - 1, \zeta)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|K - K_\varepsilon\|_{\bar{\zeta}; m} \leq C \varepsilon^{\zeta - \bar{\zeta}} \|K\|_{\zeta; m+1}.$$

If K_1 and K_2 are of order ζ_1 and ζ_2 respectively, then $K_1 K_2$ is of order $\zeta = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2$ and we have the bound

$$\|K_1 K_2\|_{\zeta; m} \leq C\|K_1\|_{\zeta_1; m} \|K_2\|_{\zeta_2; m},$$

where C is a positive constant.

Assume that $\zeta_1 \wedge \zeta_2 > -d$. We set $\zeta = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + d$. If $\zeta < 0$, then $K_1 * K_2$ is of order ζ and we have the bound

$$\|K_1 * K_2\|_{\zeta; m} \leq C\|K_1\|_{\zeta_1; m} \|K_2\|_{\zeta_2; m}. \tag{3.1}$$

On the other hand, if $\zeta \in \mathbf{R}_+ \backslash \mathbf{N}$ and K_1, K_2 are compactly supported, then the function

$$K(x) = (K_1 * K_2)(x) - \sum_{|k| < \zeta} \frac{x^k}{k!} D_x^k (K_1 * K_2)(0) \,,$$

is of order ζ and a bound similar to (3.1) holds, but with the constant C depending on the size of the supports in general.

We will apply these bounds to the function G defined in the introduction. Since G is smooth on $\mathbf{R}^2 \backslash \{0\}$, compactly supported and satisfies $G(x) = \frac{\log |x|}{2\pi}$ in a neighbourhood of the origin, it is a function with a singularity of order ζ, for all $\zeta < 0$, according to our definition. From now on, we set $\varrho^{*2} = \varrho * \varrho$ and we assume without loss of generality that ϱ, ϱ^{*2} are supported in the unit ball of $\mathbf{R}^2$.

Lemma 3.1. *Fix $\kappa \in (0, 1)$. We have the bounds*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[|Z(\eta_x^\lambda)|^2\big] \lesssim \lambda^{-\kappa} \,, \quad \mathbb{E}\big[|Z_\varepsilon(\eta_x^\lambda)|^2\big] \lesssim \lambda^{-\kappa} \,, \quad \mathbb{E}\big[|Z_\varepsilon(\eta_x^\lambda) - Z(\eta_x^\lambda)|^2\big] \lesssim \lambda^{-5\kappa} \varepsilon^\kappa \,,$$

uniformly over all $\varepsilon, \lambda \in (0, 1)$, all $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$ and all $\eta \in \mathcal{B}_1^r$.

Proof. By translation invariance, it suffices to consider $x = 0$. The random variables $Z(\eta^\lambda)$, $Z_\varepsilon(\eta^\lambda)$ and $Z_\varepsilon(\eta^\lambda) - Z(\eta^\lambda)$ all belong to the second *homogeneous* Wiener chaos associated with the noise ξ. This is because the constant C_ε has been chosen to cancel the 0-th Wiener chaos component of $|\nabla Y_\varepsilon|^2$. We start with the second bound of the statement:

$$\mathbb{E}\big[|Z_\varepsilon(\eta^\lambda)|^2\big] = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \int_{z,\tilde{z}} \Big(\int \eta^\lambda(x) D_{x_i} G_\varepsilon(z-x) D_{x_i} G_\varepsilon(\tilde{z}-x) dx \Big)^2 dz\, d\tilde{z}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{2} \iint \eta^\lambda(x) \eta^\lambda(x') \Big((D_{x_i} G_\varepsilon) * (D_{x_i} G_\varepsilon)(x-x') \Big)^2 dx\, dx' \,,$$

so that the bounds at the beginning of the section yield the desired result. The first bound of the statement follows by replacing G_ε by G in the expression above. We turn to the proof of the third bound. To that end, we write

$$\mathbb{E}\big[|Z_\varepsilon(\eta^\lambda) - Z(\eta^\lambda)|^2\big] = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \iint \eta^\lambda(x) \eta^\lambda(x') H_{\varepsilon,i}(x-x') dx\, dx' \,,$$

where

$$H_{\varepsilon,i}(y) = \Big((D_{x_i}(G_\varepsilon - G)) * D_{x_i} G_\varepsilon \Big) \cdot \Big((D_{x_i}(G_\varepsilon + G)) * D_{x_i} G_\varepsilon \Big)(y)$$
$$- \Big((D_{x_i}(G_\varepsilon - G)) * D_{x_i} G \Big) \cdot \Big((D_{x_i}(G_\varepsilon + G)) * D_{x_i} G \Big)(y) \,,$$

so that, once again, the bounds on the behaviour of singular functions at the origin yield the asserted bound. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Let L denote an arbitrary element among Z, Z_ε and $Z - Z_\varepsilon$. Using the equivalence of moments of elements in inhomogeneous Wiener chaoses of finite order, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{n \geq 0} \sup_{x \in \Lambda_n} \Big(\frac{L(\psi_x^n)}{\mathrm{p}_a(x) 2^{-n\alpha - n}} \Big)^{2p} \right] \lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^2} \frac{1}{\mathrm{p}_a(k)^{2p}} \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n \cap B(k,1)} \frac{\mathbb{E}[L(\psi_x^n)^2]^p}{2^{-n\alpha 2p - 2np}} \,.$$

When L is equal to Z or Z_ε, Lemma 3.1 ensures that $\mathbb{E}[L(\psi_x^n)^2] \lesssim 2^{-2n+\kappa n}$ uniformly over all x, n, and ε. Moreover, $\#(\Lambda_n \cap B(k,1)) \lesssim 2^{2n}$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{n\geq 0} \sup_{x\in\Lambda_n} \left(\frac{L(\psi_x^n)}{\mathrm{p}_a(x)2^{-n\alpha-n}}\right)^{2p}\right] \lesssim \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}^2} \frac{1}{\mathrm{p}_a(k)^{2p}} \sum_{n\geq 0} 2^{np(2\alpha+\kappa)+2n} .$$

This quantity is finite for $\alpha = -\kappa$ and p large enough. Therefore, Z and Z_ε belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-\kappa}$. Regarding $Z - Z_\varepsilon$, Lemma 3.1 ensures that $\mathbb{E}[(Z-Z_\varepsilon)(\psi_x^n)^2] \lesssim \varepsilon^\kappa 2^{-2n+5\kappa n}$ uniformly over all x, n and ε. Then, the same arguments as before yield

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{n\geq 0} \sup_{x\in\Lambda_n} \left(\frac{(Z-Z_\varepsilon)(\psi_x^n)}{\mathrm{p}_a(x)2^{-n\alpha-n}}\right)^{2p}\right] \lesssim \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}^2} \frac{1}{\mathrm{p}_a(k)^{2p}} \sum_{n\geq 0} \varepsilon^{\kappa p}2^{np(2\alpha+5\kappa)+2n} ,$$

so that, choosing for instance $\alpha = -3\kappa$ and p large enough, one gets the bound $\mathbb{E}[\|Z - Z_\varepsilon\|_{-3\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}] \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{2}}$ uniformly over all $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, thus concluding the proof. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Since G is compactly supported and coincides with the Green function of the Laplacian in a neighbourhood of the origin, the classical Schauder estimates [14] imply that for any $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, the bounds

$$\|G * f\|_{\alpha+2} \lesssim \|f\|_\alpha , \quad \|D_{x_i}G * f\|_{\alpha+1} \lesssim \|f\|_\alpha ,$$

hold uniformly over all $f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha$. Recall the functions $\chi_k, k \in \mathbf{Z}^d$ from the proof of Theorem 2.6. Since G is compactly supported, we deduce from the bounds above that

$$\|G * (f\chi_k)\|_{\alpha+2} \lesssim w(k)\|f\|_{\alpha,w} , \quad \|D_{x_i}G * (f\chi_k)\|_{\alpha+1} \lesssim w(k)\|f\|_{\alpha,w} ,$$

uniformly over all $k \in \mathbf{Z}^d$ and all $f \in \mathcal{C}_w^\alpha$. For fixed x, only a bounded number of $\{\chi_k(x), k \in \mathbf{Z}^d\}$ are non-zero, uniformly over all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$. Since $f = \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}^d} f\chi_k$, we deduce that

$$\|G * f\|_{\alpha+2,w} \lesssim \|f\|_{\alpha,w} , \quad \|D_{x_i}G * f\|_{\alpha+1,w} \lesssim \|f\|_{\alpha,w} ,$$

uniformly over all $f \in \mathcal{C}_w^\alpha$. This being given, the statement is a direct consequence of Lemma 1.1. $\qquad\square$

We conclude this section with the computation of the renormalisation constant C_ε. Recall that ϱ, ϱ^{*2} and G are compactly supported. We let G_ε be the compactly supported, smooth function $G * \varrho_\varepsilon$. We have

$$C_\varepsilon = \mathbb{E}[|\nabla Y_\varepsilon|^2] = \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{x\in\mathbf{R}^2} D_{x_i}G_\varepsilon(x)D_{x_i}G_\varepsilon(x)dx = -\int_{x\in\mathbf{R}^2} G_\varepsilon(x)\Delta G_\varepsilon(x)dx ,$$

where we used a simple integration by parts to get the last identity. By (1.1), we have $\Delta G_\varepsilon = \varrho_\varepsilon + F_\varepsilon$, where $F_\varepsilon = F * \varrho_\varepsilon$. The latter is a compactly supported, smooth function that vanishes on the centred ball of radius $1/2 - \varepsilon$. Hence, uniformly over all $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, the function $G_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon$ is smooth and compactly supported so that its integral is uniformly bounded. On the other hand, since ϱ is even, ϱ^{*2} integrates to 1 and $G(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\log|x|$ for all $x \in B(0,1/2)$, we get

$$-\int G_\varepsilon(x)\varrho_\varepsilon(x)dx = -\int G(x)\varrho_\varepsilon^{*2}(x)dx = \frac{1}{2\pi}\log\varepsilon^{-1} - \frac{1}{2\pi}\int \log|x|\varrho^{*2}(x)dx .$$

The first term on the right gives the diverging term of the renormalisation constant, while the second term is finite. This concludes the computation.

4 Picard iteration

For any $r > 0$, $\ell \in \mathbf{R}$ and $T > 0$, we consider the Banach space $\mathcal{E}_{\ell,T}^r$ of all continuous functions v on $(0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^2$ such that

$$\|v\|_{\ell,T,r} := \sup_{t \in (0,T]} \frac{\|v(t,\cdot)\|_{r,\mathrm{e}_{\ell+t}}}{t^{-1+\kappa}} < \infty \ .$$

This being given, we have the following precise statement of our main result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\ell \in \mathbf{R}$ and $T > 0$. Consider an initial condition $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{e}_\ell}^{-1+4\kappa}$. For all $\ell' > \ell$, the sequence of processes v_ε converges in probability as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the space $\mathcal{E}_{\ell',T}^{1+2\kappa}$ to a limit v which is the unique solution of*

$$\partial_t v = \Delta v + v(Z - F * \xi) - 2\nabla v \cdot \nabla Y \ , \qquad v(0, x) = u_0(x)e^{Y(x)} \ .$$

As a consequence, u_ε converges in probability in $\mathcal{E}_{\ell',T}^{1-\kappa}$ towards the process $u = ve^{-Y}$.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this result. Fix $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, and let the parameter a appearing in the weight p_a be any value in $(0, \frac{\kappa}{2})$. Let $g, h^{(1)}, h^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-\kappa}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{e}_\ell}^{-1+4\kappa}$ be given. We define the map $v \mapsto \mathcal{M}_{T,f}v$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_{T,f}v(t) = \int_0^t P_{t-s} * \left(v_s \cdot g + D_{x_i} v_s \cdot h^{(i)}\right) ds + P_t * f \ .$$

In this equation, there is an implicit summation over $i \in \{1, 2\}$. This convention will be in force for the rest of the article.

Proposition 4.2. *Take $\ell_0 \in \mathbf{R}$. For any given $g, h^{(1)}, h^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-\kappa}$ and any $f \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{e}_{\ell_0}}^{-1+4\kappa}$, the map $\mathcal{M}_{T,f}$ admits a unique fixed point $v \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell_0,T}^{1+2\kappa}$. Furthermore, the solution map $(g, h^{(1)}, h^{(2)}, f) \mapsto v$ is continuous.*

Proof. The parameter r in the space $\mathcal{E}_{\ell,T}^r$ is taken to be equal to $1 + 2\kappa$. Since this value is fixed until the end of the proof, we do not write the subscript r in the associated norm. First, Lemma 2.8 ensures that $\|P_t * f\|_{1+2\kappa,\mathrm{e}_{\ell+t}} \lesssim t^{-1+\kappa}\|f\|_{-1+4\kappa,\mathrm{e}_\ell}$ uniformly over all t in any given compact interval of $\mathbf{R}_+$. Second, using Theorem 2.6 and the simple inequality

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^2} \frac{\mathrm{p}_a(x)\mathrm{e}_{\ell+s}(x)}{\mathrm{e}_{\ell+t}(x)} \leq e^{-a}\left(\frac{a}{t-s}\right)^a \ ,$$

we obtain

$$\|v_s \cdot g + D_{x_i} v_s \cdot h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{e}_{\ell+t}} \lesssim (t-s)^{-a}\|v_s\|_{1+2\kappa,\mathrm{e}_{\ell+s}}\left(\|g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}\right)$$
$$\lesssim (t-s)^{-a}s^{-1+\kappa}\|v\|_{\ell,T}\left(\|g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}\right) \ ,$$

uniformly over all s, t in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}_+$ and all ℓ in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}$. Then, by Lemma 2.8 and using $a < \kappa/2$, we obtain

$$\left\| \int_0^t P_{t-s} * \left(v_s \cdot g + D_{x_i} v_s \cdot h^{(i)}\right) ds \right\|_{1+2\kappa,\mathrm{e}_{\ell+t}} \tag{4.1}$$

$$\lesssim \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}s^{-1+\kappa}ds \, \|v\|_{\ell,T}\left(\|g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}\right)$$

$$\lesssim t^{-1+\kappa}T^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}\|v\|_{\ell,T}\left(\|g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}\right) \ ,$$

uniformly over all $t \in (0, T]$. This ensures that $\mathcal{M}_{T,f}(v) \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell,T}^{1+2\kappa}$. Furthermore we have

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{T,f}v - \mathcal{M}_{T,f}\bar{v}\|_{\ell,T} \lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}\|v - \bar{v}\|_{\ell,T}\left(\|g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}\right) \ , \tag{4.2}$$

uniformly over all ℓ in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}$, all T in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}_+$, all $f \in \mathcal{C}_{e_\ell}^{-1+4\kappa}$ and all $v, \bar{v} \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell,T}$. (Here and below we write $\mathcal{E}_{\ell,T}$ instead of $\mathcal{E}_{\ell,T}^{1+2\kappa}$ for conciseness.) Consequently, there exists $T^* > 0$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{T^*,f}$ is a contraction on $\mathcal{E}_{\ell,T^*}$, uniformly over all $\ell \in [\ell_0, \ell_0 + T]$ and all $f \in \mathcal{C}_{e_{\ell_0}}^{-1+4\kappa}$. Fix an initial condition $f \in \mathcal{C}_{e_{\ell_0}}^{-1+4\kappa}$. To obtain a fixed point for the map $\mathcal{M}_{T,f}$, we proceed by iteration. The map $\mathcal{M}_{T^*,f}$ admits a unique fixed point $v^* \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell_0,T^*}$. If $T^* \geq T$, we are done. Otherwise, set $f^* := v_{T^*/2}^* \in \mathcal{C}_{e_{\ell_0^*}}^{1+2\kappa}$, where $\ell_0^* = \ell_0 + T^*/2$. Since $\ell_0^* \leq \ell_0 + T$, the map $\mathcal{M}_{T^*,f^*}$ is again a contraction on $\mathcal{E}_{\ell_0^*,T^*}$, so that it admits a unique fixed point $v^{**} \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell_0^*,T^*}$. We define $v_s := v_s^*$ for all $s \in (0, T^*/2]$ and $v_s := v_{s-T^*/2}^{**}$ for all $s \in (T^*/2, 3T^*/2]$. A simple calculation shows that v is a fixed point of $\mathcal{M}_{\frac{3T^*}{2},f}$ and that $v \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell_0,3T^*/2}$. Suppose that $\bar{v}$ is another fixed point. By the uniqueness of the fixed point on $(0, T^*]$, we deduce that v^* and $\bar{v}$ coincide on this interval. Moreover, a simple calculation shows that $(\bar{v}_{s+\frac{T^*}{2}}, s \in (0, T^*])$ is necessarily a fixed point of $\mathcal{M}_{T^*,f^*}$ so that it coincides with v^{**}. Iterating this argument ensures existence and uniqueness of the fixed point on any interval $[0, T]$.

We turn to the continuity of the solution map with respect to f, g and $h^{(i)}$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ be the map associated with $\bar{g}$ and $\bar{h}^{(i)}$. For any initial conditions f and $\bar{f}$ in $\mathcal{C}_{e_\ell}^{-1+4\kappa}$, both $\mathcal{M}_{T,f}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{T,\bar{f}}$ admit a unique fixed point v and $\bar{v}$. Furthermore, we have

$$v_t - \bar{v}_t = \left(\mathcal{M}_{T,f} v - \mathcal{M}_{T,f} \bar{v} \right)_t + \int_0^t P_{t-s} * \left(\bar{v}_s (g - \bar{g}) + D_{x_i} \bar{v}_s (h^{(i)} - \bar{h}^{(i)}) \right) ds$$
$$+ P_t * (f - \bar{f}) .$$

Using (4.1) and (4.2), we deduce that

$$\|v - \bar{v}\|_{\ell,T} \lesssim T^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} \|v - \bar{v}\|_{\ell,T} \left(\|g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|\bar{g}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|\bar{h}^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} \right)$$
$$+ T^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} \|v\|_{\ell,T} \left(\|\bar{g} - g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|\bar{h}^{(i)} - h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} \right)$$
$$+ \|f - \bar{f}\|_{-1+4\kappa,\ell} ,$$

uniformly over all ℓ in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}$ and all T in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}_+$. Fix $R > 0$. There exists $T > 0$ such that

$$\|v - \bar{v}\|_{\ell,T} \lesssim \|f - \bar{f}\|_{-1+4\kappa,\ell} + T^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} \left(\|\bar{g} - g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} + \|\bar{h}^{(i)} - h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a} \right) ,$$

uniformly over all ℓ in a compact set of $\mathbf{R}$ and all $g, \bar{g}, h, \bar{h}$ such that $\|v\|_{\ell,T}$, $\|g\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}$, $\|\bar{g}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}$, $\|h^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}$ and $\|\bar{h}^{(i)}\|_{-\kappa,\mathrm{p}_a}$ are smaller than R. This yields the continuity of the solution map on $(0, T]$. By iterating the argument as above, we obtain continuity on any bounded interval. $\qquad \square$

We are now in position to prove the main result of this article.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let u_0 be an element in $\mathcal{C}_{e_\ell}^{-1+4\kappa}$ for a given $\ell \in \mathbf{R}$. Let $f_\varepsilon := u_0 e^{Y_\varepsilon}$. By Corollary 1.2 and Theorem 2.6, f_ε converges to $f = u_0 e^Y$ in $\mathcal{C}_{e_{\ell''}}^{-1+4\kappa}$ for any $\ell'' > \ell$. Let v_ε be the unique fixed point of $\mathcal{M}_{T,f_\varepsilon}$ with $g_\varepsilon = Z_\varepsilon - F * \xi_\varepsilon$ and $h_\varepsilon^{(i)} := -2D_{x_i} Y_\varepsilon$. By Corollary 1.2 and Proposition 1.3, we know that g_ε, $h_\varepsilon^{(i)}$ converge in probability to

$$g = Z - F * \xi , \qquad h^{(i)} = -2D_{x_i} Y ,$$

in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}_a}^{-\kappa}$. Notice that the convergence of $F * \xi_\varepsilon$ towards $F * \xi$ is a consequence of Lemma 1.1, since F is a compactly supported, smooth function. Therefore, Proposition 4.2 ensures that v_ε converges in probability in $\mathcal{E}_{\ell'',T}^{1+2\kappa}$ to the unique fixed point v of the map $\mathcal{M}_{T,f}$ associated to $g, h^{(1)}, h^{(2)}$. Moreover, Theorem 2.6 ensures that, for any $\ell' > \ell''$, $u_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon e^{-Y_\varepsilon}$ converges to $u = v e^{-Y}$ in the space $\mathcal{E}_{\ell',T}^{1-\kappa}$. $\qquad \square$

References

[1] Hajer Bahouri, Jean-Yves Chemin, and Raphaël Danchin, *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 343, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. MR-2768550

[2] René A. Carmona and Stanislav A. Molchanov, *Parabolic Anderson problem and intermittency*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **108** (1994), no. 518, viii+125. MR-1185878

[3] Daniel Conus, Mathew Joseph, and Davar Khoshnevisan, *On the chaotic character of the stochastic heat equation, before the onset of intermitttency*, Ann. Probab. **41** (2013), no. 3B, 2225–2260. MR-3098071

[4] Giuseppe Da Prato and Arnaud Debussche, *Two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations driven by a space-time white noise*, J. Funct. Anal. **196** (2002), no. 1, 180–210. MR-1941997

[5] Ingrid Daubechies, *Orthonormal bases of compactly supported wavelets*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **41** (1988), no. 7, 909–996. MR-951745

[6] Massimiliano Gubinelli, Peter Imkeller, and Nicolas Perkowski, *Paracontrolled distributions and singular PDEs*, ArXiv e-prints (2012).

[7] Martin Hairer and Étienne Pardoux, *A Wong-Zakai theorem for stochastic PDEs*, ArXiv e-prints (2014), J. Math. Soc. Japan, to appear.

[8] Martin Hairer, *A theory of regularity structures*, Invent. Math. **198** (2014), no. 2, 269–504.

[9] Martin Hairer and Cyril Labbé, *Multiplicative stochastic heat equations on the whole space*, ArXiv e-prints (2015).

[10] Martin Hairer, Etienne Pardoux, and Andrey Piatnitski, *Random homogenisation of a highly oscillatory singular potential*, Stoch. PDEs: Anal. Comp. **1** (2013), no. 4, 571–605.

[11] Yaozhong Hu, *Chaos expansion of heat equations with white noise potentials*, Potential Anal. **16** (2002), no. 1, 45–66. MR-1880347

[12] Yves Meyer, *Wavelets and operators*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 37, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992, Translated from the 1990 French original by D. H. Salinger. MR-1228209

[13] David Nualart, *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*, second ed., Probability and its Applications (New York), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. MR-2200233

[14] Leon Simon, *Schauder estimates by scaling*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **5** (1997), no. 5, 391–407. MR-1459795

Electronic Journal of Probability
Electronic Communications in Probability

Advantages of publishing in EJP-ECP

- Very high standards

- Free for authors, free for readers

- Quick publication (no backlog)

Economical model of EJP-ECP

- Low cost, based on free software (OJS[1])

- Non profit, sponsored by IMS[2], BS[3], PKP[4]

- Purely electronic and secure (LOCKSS[5])

Help keep the journal free and vigorous

- Donate to the IMS open access fund[6] (click here to donate!)

- Submit your best articles to EJP-ECP

- Choose EJP-ECP over for-profit journals

---

[1]OJS: Open Journal Systems http://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs/
[2]IMS: Institute of Mathematical Statistics http://www.imstat.org/
[3]BS: Bernoulli Society http://www.bernoulli-society.org/
[4]PK: Public Knowledge Project http://pkp.sfu.ca/
[5]LOCKSS: Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe http://www.lockss.org/
[6]IMS Open Access Fund: http://www.imstat.org/publications/open.htm