

M285K - course #10

Some further comment on Malliavin — Bjørn's question.

Q1 key relation $D^L = (\alpha+1)D$, intuition? creation/annihilation?

$$[D, L] = D$$

Q2 intuition on Mehler's formula.

Consider finite-dim setting (1D setting):

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} G_0 \stackrel{\text{standard}}{\text{Gaussian random variable}} \quad (\text{vs } G \text{ Gaussian field}) \\ (\mathcal{F}, P) \text{ generated by } G_0 \\ L^2(\mathcal{F}) = \{f(G_0) : f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})\} \cong L^2(\mathbb{R}). \\ \mathbb{E}[|f(G_0)|^2] = \int |f(x)|^2 \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} dx \\ \mathcal{P}_L(\mathcal{F}) = \{f(G_0) : f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\}. \end{array} \right.$$

$$h = \mathbb{R}$$

Finite-dim Malliavin derivative $\partial f(G_0) := \underline{f'(G_0)}$, $f(G_0) \in R(\mathcal{S})$.

Divergence operator $\partial^* f(G_0) = (-f' + xf)(G_0)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} f(G_0) \partial h(G_0) &= \mathbb{E} f(G_0) h'(G_0) \\ &= \int f(x) h'(x) \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} dx \\ &\stackrel{\text{IBP}}{=} \int \underbrace{(-f'(x) + xf(x))}_{\partial^* f(x)} h(x) \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator: $L = \partial^*$

$$L f(G_0) = \underline{(-f'' + xf')}(G_0)$$

Q1 Notice $[\partial, \partial^*] = 1$

$$\cdots, t_1, \dots, T, / -1, 0, t_1, \dots, t_m, \quad \| L H_\rho(G) \| \leq H_\rho(G_0)$$

→ related creation/annihilation operators:

$$\begin{cases} \partial H_p(G) = (p-1) H_{p-1}(G) \\ \partial^* H_p(G) = H_{p+1}(G) \end{cases}$$

Link to harmonic oscillator:

$$e^{x^2/2} (-\Delta + x^2) e^{-x^2/2} = L + 1.$$

Infinite-dim setting: $[D, D^*] = DD^* - D^*D \neq Id$

But: define $\partial_S = \langle S, D \rangle$, ∂_S^*
($S \in h$)
↳ $[\partial_S, \partial_S^*] = \|S\|_h^2 Id$.

What remains: key relation $\begin{cases} [D, R] = D \\ [\partial_S^*, d] = -D^* \end{cases}$

Ran: $\forall \zeta \in h$, $\mathcal{D}^*(\mathcal{D}^*)^P[\zeta^{*\rho}] = (\mathcal{D}^*)^P(L + p)[\zeta^{*\rho}]$
 $= P(\mathcal{D}^*)^P[\zeta^{*\rho}]$.

Easy to check: $\left\{ \text{span } \{(\mathcal{D}^*)^P(\zeta^{*\rho}) : \rho \geq 1, \zeta \in h\} \right\}$ is
 dense in $L^2(\Omega)$.

$\rightarrow \sigma(L) = N_\infty$

$$L^2(\Omega) = \bigoplus_{p=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_p, \quad \mathcal{H}_p = \underbrace{\text{span}}_{H_p(G(\Omega))} \{(\mathcal{D}^*)^P(\zeta^{*\rho}) : \zeta \in h\}.$$

Q2/ Mehler's formula.

In \mathcal{D} setting: $e^{-tL} f(G_0) = (\mathcal{P}_t f)(G_0)$.

$$\mathcal{D} = \overline{\mathcal{P} \mathcal{D} \mathcal{P}} = \overline{\mathcal{P} \mathcal{D} \mathcal{P}}^{\prime \prime}$$

$$\begin{cases} U_t f = \underbrace{\langle t \rangle - \langle U_t f \rangle}_{\text{operator}} \\ P_t f|_{t=0} = f \end{cases}$$

→ want explicit Green's fn for O-U operator.

SDE method: $P_t f(x) = E[f(X_x^t)]$

where $\begin{cases} dX_x^t = \sqrt{2} dB_x^t - \underline{X_x^t dt} \\ X_x^t|_{t=0} = x \end{cases}$

"Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process".

Explicit solution: $d(e^t X_x^t) = \sqrt{2} e^t dB_x^t$

$$X_x^t = e_x^{-t} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2} \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)} dB_x^s}_{\text{centered Gaussian r.v.}}$$

Var = $1 - e^{-2t}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(X_t)] &= \mathbb{E}[f(e^{-t}x + \sqrt{1-e^{-2t}}y)] e^{-y^2/2} dy \\ &= \int f(e^{-t}x + \sqrt{1-e^{-2t}}y) e^{-y^2/2} dy. \end{aligned}$$

"Mehler's formula."

$$= \mathbb{E}[f(e^{-t}x + \sqrt{1-e^{-2t}}G_0')] \quad \begin{cases} \text{id of } G_0 \\ \text{copy} \end{cases}$$



III.2 Long-time regularity.

a) Classical regularity for $-\nabla \cdot a \nabla w = \nabla \cdot f$.

U 110 | 7/11 DG-N-M (côpia amarillo)

energy, layers (L , $\|p-L\| \leq C_0$), $\gamma = 1$ $L \rightarrow 0$

→ there are only deterministic regularity estimates.

With positive proba, $\forall R > 0$, we can assemble a counterexample on $\underline{B_R}$.

b) Large - hole regularity

Homog,

$$(-P \cdot \alpha \nabla) \simeq (-P \cdot \bar{\alpha} \nabla)$$

inherent better regularity.

or large holes

maximal reg
Schauder theory
etc

(Armstrong-Smart '14).

Chapter V: [] random field g_L ("minimal medium")

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{E} \|Dg_L\|^p < \infty \\ \forall p < \infty \end{array}}$$

(st. get some Δ on nodes $\geq n$).

e.g. we'll prove:

Theorem (quenched large-scale L^p regularity).

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall 1 < p < \infty : \quad -D \circ D_w = D \cdot f \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\underbrace{\int_{B_{r_0}(x)} |Dw|^2}_{L^2 \text{ estimate or scale } \in \mathcal{O}(1)} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq_p \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\underbrace{\int_{B_{r_0}(x)} |f|^2}_{L^p \text{ estimate or scale } \geq \mathcal{O}(1)} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \end{array} \right.$$

c) flawed estimates

Useful variant: up to averaging wrt stationary ensemble,
should get some regularity on $\nabla \Delta$.

Theorem (connected L^p regularity).

$$[h \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; L^p(\mathcal{N}))]$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \forall 1 < p, q < \infty, \forall \delta > 0, \quad -\nabla \cdot \nabla w = \nabla \cdot h \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\underset{B(x)}{\int} |\nabla w|^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} \leq_{p, q, \delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\underset{B(x)}{\int} |h|^2 \right)^{\frac{q+\delta}{2}} \right]^{\frac{p}{q+\delta}}. \end{array} \right]$$

Notation: $[h]^{(k)} = \left(\underset{B(x)}{\int} |h|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ quasimodular averages.

$$\rightarrow \left[\|[\nabla w]\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; L^q(\mathcal{N}))} \leq_{p, q, \delta} \|h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; L^{q+\delta}(\mathcal{N}))} \right]$$

see: Chapter V.

loose some
stoch integrability
 $\Rightarrow g_{\tau_8}$ is not uniformly
bounded.

d) Perturbative version : only this needed in this chapter.

Theorem (perturbative annealed L^p regularity).

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \exists C_0 = C_0(d, \alpha, \beta) > 0 \text{ large.} \\ \text{st. } \forall |p-2|, |q-2| \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 : \end{array} \right. \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} h \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, L^\infty(\Omega)), \\ -\nabla \cdot a \nabla w = \nabla \cdot h \end{array} \right.$$
$$\|[\nabla w]\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; L^q(\Omega))} \lesssim \|h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; \bigcap_{q=1}^q L^q(\Omega))}$$

no loss in
this perturbative
setting.

View this as upgrading Meyers' estimate:

$$\left(\cdot \|[\mathcal{D}_w]\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \cdot \|[\mathcal{h}]\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right) \text{ a.s.}$$

for $|p-2| \leq \frac{1}{C_0}$.

Key ingredient for the proof:

Lemma

(~ dual version of Calderón-Zygmund).

(Caffarelli-Rosado '98, Shen '07).

Given $1 \leq p_0 < p_1 \leq \infty$, $F, G \in L^{p_0} \cap L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $F, G \geq 0$.

Assume that $\forall \text{ ball } D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \exists \text{ measurable } F_D^0, F_D^1 \geq 0$.

$$\begin{cases} F \leq F_D^0 + F_D^1 \\ F_D^1 \leq F + F_D^0 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} D &= B(x_1, r) \\ C_D &= B(x_1, c_r) \end{aligned}$$

s.t.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left(\int_D |F_D^0|^{P_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{P_0}} \leq C_0 \left(\int_{C_D} |G|^{P_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{P_0}} \quad (\text{local dependence}) \\ \left(\int_{\frac{1}{C_0}D} |F_D^1|^{P_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{P_1}} \leq C_0 \left(\int_D |F_D^1|^{P_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{P_2}} \quad (\text{reverse Jensen}) \end{array} \right.$$

Then, $\forall p_0 \geq p < p_1 :$

$$\int_{R^d} |F|^p \leq_{C_0, P_0, P_1, P} \int_{R^d} |G|^{P_0}$$

Idea for application : - $D \cdot \alpha P_w = D \cdot h$

$\forall h \in D : P_w = P_{w_D^0} + P_{w_D^1}$

$$\left\} - D \cdot \alpha P_{w_D^0} = \underbrace{P_c(h \mathbb{I}_D)} \right\}$$

$$(-\nabla \cdot \varrho \nabla \varphi^{-1}) = \nabla \cdot (\varrho \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus D}) \underset{\text{= 0 in } D}{=} 0$$

3/2

Wednesday: proof of dual CZ lemma.

Friday: proof of perturbative theory.



