

Abstract: We introduce some basic examples which lead to the study of stochastic homogenization. Then we introduce the minimal energy ν of the dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{a}\nabla u) &= 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u &= \ell_p & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases}$$

for suitable U and \mathbf{a} . We show basic properties of ν and the minimizer v and show convergence in some appropriate senses. As we will see, both quantities give us important information about our problem.

1 Notation

Throughout every talk, we fix the constants $d \geq 2$ and $\Lambda > 1$. We define the *state space*

$$\Omega := \left\{ \mathbf{a}: \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d}: \mathbf{a} \text{ is measurable, and } |\xi|^2 \leq \xi \cdot \mathbf{a} \xi \leq \Lambda |\xi|^2 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}. \quad (1.1)$$

The entries of a matrix $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$ are denoted by $\mathbf{a} = \{a_{i,j}\}_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, d\}}$. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Borel set, then we define \mathcal{F}_U to be the smallest σ -Algebra on Ω , such that the mappings

$$\mathbf{a} \longmapsto \int_U a_{i,j}(x) \varphi(x) dx \quad \text{are measurable for all } i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \text{ and } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(U). \quad (1.2)$$

For simplicity, we write $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}$. By definition, (Ω, \mathcal{F}) is a measurable space.

Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then we define the *translation operator* T_y by

$$\mathbf{a} \circ T_y(x) = \mathbf{a}(x + y) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.3)$$

We denote by \mathbb{P} a probability measure on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , which satisfies the following two conditions:

- *\mathbb{Z}^d -stationarity:* For every $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \circ T_z = \mathbb{P}. \quad (1.4)$$

- *Unit range of dependence:* For every pair of Borel sets $U, V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\operatorname{dist}(U, V) \geq 1$, the σ -Algebras \mathcal{F}_U and \mathcal{F}_V are \mathbb{P} -independent.

For any random variable $X: \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote the *expectation with respect to* \mathbb{P} by \mathbb{E} , that is

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \int_\Omega X(\mathbf{a}) d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{a}) = \int_\Omega X d\mathbb{P}. \quad (1.5)$$

For simplicity, we do not always state the dependence on \mathbf{a} . Let $Y: \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be another random variable. We also define the *variance* resp. *covariance* by

$$\operatorname{var}(X) = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])^2] = \mathbb{E}[X^2] - \mathbb{E}[X]^2, \quad \text{resp.} \quad \operatorname{cov}(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}[XY] - \mathbb{E}[X]\mathbb{E}[Y]. \quad (1.6)$$

For a measure space (E, Σ, μ) , we denote by $L^p(E, \mu)$ the *Lebesgue spaces* for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ (with real valued functions), equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{L^p(E, \mu)} := \left(\int_E |f|^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{for all } f \in L^p(E, \mu) \text{ and } 1 \leq p < \infty. \quad (1.7)$$

For $p = \infty$, we define

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(E, \mu)} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{z \in E} |f(z)| \quad \text{for all } f \in L^\infty(E, \mu). \quad (1.8)$$

For simplicity, if $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a Borel set and μ is the Lebesgue measure with respect to E , then we write $L^p(E) := L^p(E, \mu)$. If $1 \leq p < \infty$, for a Borel set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $0 < |U| < \infty$, we also define the normalized norms

$$\|f\|_{\underline{L}^p(U)} = \left(\int_U |f(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = |U|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p(U)} \quad \text{for all } f \in L^p(U). \quad (1.9)$$

For $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we also introduce the *triadic cubes* $\square_m = \frac{1}{2}(-3^m, 3^m)^d$. If $n < m$, we define $\mathcal{Z}_n := 3^n \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \square_m$.

2 Examples

The simplest way to construct an example is a *random checkerboard structure*. We decompose the two dimensional space into unit cubes with corners in \mathbb{Z}^2 . We color each cube either **white** or **black** independently at random, that is we have independent random variables $\{b_z\}_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ such that for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[b(z) = 1] = \mathbb{P}[b(z) = 0] = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (2.1)$$

and fix two matrices $\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{a}_1 \in \left\{ A \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{2 \times 2} : |\xi|^2 \leq \xi \cdot A \xi \leq \Lambda |\xi|^2 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \right\}$. Then we could define a random field $x \mapsto \mathbf{a}(x)$ by

$$\mathbf{a}(x) = \mathbf{a}_{b(z)} \quad \text{for all } x \in z = \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right)^2, \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \quad (2.2)$$

This field is in Ω and the measure \mathbb{P} would be admissible.

More generally, we could consider examples using the homogeneous Poisson point process. Recall, that a homogeneous Poisson point process on the euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d is an at most countable random subset $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with the following two properties:

- For all Borel sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the number of points $N(A) := \#\{\Pi \cap A\}$ follows a Poisson law of mean $|A|$.
- For every finite collection of pairwise disjoint Borel sets $A_1, \dots, A_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the random variables $\{N(A_i)\}_i$ are independent.

In other words, we have a Poisson point process, if for disjoint and bounded Borel sets $A_1, \dots, A_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P}[\#\{\Pi \cap A_i\} = j_i] = \prod_{i=1}^k e^{-|A_i|} \frac{|A_i|^{j_i}}{j_i!}. \quad (2.3)$$

So, if we have a Poisson point process Π on \mathbb{R}^d , we can fix two matrices \mathbf{a}_0 and \mathbf{a}_1 as before and define a random field $x \mapsto \mathbf{a}(x)$ by

$$\mathbf{a}(x) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}_0 & \text{if } \text{dist}(x, \Pi) \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \mathbf{a}_1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

As above, this field is an element of Ω and with \mathbb{P} as above, this measure is clearly admissible by definition of the Poisson point process. For more information, see [King].

3 The energy and sub-additive quantity ν

For the rest of this talk, we fix an open and bounded subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with Lipschitz boundary and an element $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We focus on the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div}(\mathbf{a}\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u = \ell_p & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$. We define the minimal normalized energy of this equation by $\nu = \nu(U, p)$, i.e.

$$\nu(U, p) := \inf_{v \in \ell_p + H_0^1(U)} \frac{1}{2} \int_U \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla v. \quad (3.2)$$

Since the integrand is a convex function, from the direct method of the calculus of variations, we get the existence of a minimizer $v = v(\cdot, U, p) \in \ell_p + H_0^1(U)$ of this integral, that is

$$\nu(U, p) = \frac{1}{2} \int_U \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla v. \quad (3.3)$$

We encounter some basic properties of this minimizer and the quantity ν .

Lemma 3.1 (Basic properties)

Let ν and v be defined as above. Then we have

a) **Uniform convexity:** For every $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\frac{1}{8}|p_1 - p_2| \leq \frac{1}{2}\nu(U, p_1) + \frac{1}{2}\nu(U, p_2) - \nu\left(U, \frac{1}{2}p_1 + \frac{1}{2}p_2\right) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{8}|p_1 - p_2|. \quad (3.4)$$

b) **Normalized sub-additivity:** Let U_1, \dots, U_N be a finite covering of U , such that every U_i is a bounded Lipschitz domain, $U_i \subset U$ and

$$\left|U \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N U_i\right| = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

then we have

$$\nu(U, p) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|U_i|}{|U|} \nu(U_i, p). \quad (3.6)$$

c) **First variation:** v is the unique solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{a}\nabla u) &= 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u &= \ell_p & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

In other words, v is the unique minimizer of the energy ν if and only if

$$v \in \ell_p + H_0^1(U) \quad \text{and} \quad \int \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{a}\nabla v = 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in H_0^1(U). \quad (3.8)$$

d) **Quadratic response:** For every $w \in H_0^1(U)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_U |\nabla w - \nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_U \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{a}\nabla w - \nu(U, p) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{2} \int_U |\nabla w - \nabla v|^2. \quad (3.9)$$

The proof can be found in [ArKuMo, Lemma 1.1; p.6]. From the proof of this Lemma and from quadratic response, we get (with $v(U_i) = v(\cdot, U_i, p)$ for simplicity)

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|U_i|}{|U|} \int_U |\nabla v(U_i) - \nabla v(U)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|U_i|}{|U|} \nu(U_i, p) - \nu(U, p) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|U_i|}{|U|} \int_U |\nabla v(U_i) - \nabla v(U)|^2. \quad (3.10)$$

In other words, the strictness of the subadditivity inequality is proportional to the weighted average of the L^2 -differences of $v(U)$ and $v(U_i)$.

4 Convergence of ν

We want to study the convergence of the energy $\nu(U, p)$ when U gets bigger. For this purpose, it is convenient to work with triadic cubes. Since triadic cubes can be partitioned in smaller triadic cubes, and because of the stationarity of \mathbb{P} , we can see, that

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu(\square_{m+1}, p)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\nu(\square_m, p)] \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.1)$$

In the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have seen, that

$$\frac{1}{2}|p|^2 \leq \nu(U, p) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{2}|p|^2. \quad (4.2)$$

Thus, the sequence $m \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\nu(\square_m, p)]$ is bounded from below and we can find a limit

$$\bar{\nu}(p) := \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[\nu(\square_m, p)]. \quad (4.3)$$

It is clear, that $p \mapsto \bar{\nu}(p)$ is a quadratic form and that (4.2) also holds for $\bar{\nu}$. This allows us to determine homogenized coefficients.

Definition 4.1 (Homogenized coefficients)

Let $\bar{\nu}$ be defined as above. Then we defined the *homogenized coefficients* $\bar{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d}$ by the unique matrix, that satisfies

$$\bar{\nu}(p) = \frac{1}{2} p \cdot \bar{\mathbf{a}} p \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.4)$$

It is clear, that $\mathbb{1}_{d \times d} \leq \bar{\mathbf{a}} \leq \Lambda \mathbb{1}_{d \times d}$. Thus, $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ is a positive definite matrix.

Next, we want to show that we have $L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ -convergence for the quantity ν , that is

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nu(\square_m, p) - \bar{\nu}(p)|] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.5)$$

We want to extract as much quantitative information as we can, so we introduce another quantity which the convergence rate will depend on. We define

$$\omega(m) := \sup_{p \in B_1} \mathbb{E}[\nu(\square_m, p)] - \bar{\nu}(p) \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.6)$$

This quantity converges to zero as $m \rightarrow \infty$. This can be seen from the fact, that $p \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\nu(\square_m, p)] - \bar{\nu}(p)$ is a quadratic form with a positive definite matrix, so

$$\omega(m) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\nu(\square_m, \mathbf{e}_i)] - \bar{\nu}(\mathbf{e}_i) \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.7)$$

with the standard basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_i$ of \mathbb{R}^d .

Proposition 4.2 (Convergence in expectation)

With the above definitions, there exists a constant $C = C(d, \Lambda) > 0$, such that for every $p \in B_1$ and every $\min \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}[|\nu(\square_m, p) - \bar{\nu}(p)|] \leq C 3^{-\frac{d}{4}m} + C \omega\left(\left\lceil \frac{m}{2} \right\rceil\right). \quad (4.8)$$

The proof can be found in [ArKuMo, Proposition 1.4; p.12]. At least, we show that the minimizers $v = v(\cdot, \square_m, p)$ converge in an appropriate sense to ℓ_p .

Theorem 4.3 (Normalized L^2 convergence)

With the above definitions, there exists a constant $C = C(\Lambda, d)$, such that for every $p \in B_1$ and every $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[3^{-2m} \left\|v(\cdot, \square_m, p) - \ell_p\right\|_{L^2(\square_m)}^2\right] \leq C 3^{-\frac{m}{4}} + C \omega\left(\left\lceil \frac{m}{4} \right\rceil\right). \quad (4.9)$$

The proof can be found in [ArKuMo, Theorem 1.5; p.14].

References

- [ArKuMo] S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, J.-C. Mourrat; *Quantitative stochastic homogenization and large-scale regularity* (2017).
- [King] J. F. Kingman; *Poisson processes* (2002).