

Quenched invariance principles for random walks on percolation clusters.

P. Mathieu *

A. Piatnitski †

March 27, 2022

Abstract

We prove the almost sure ('quenched') invariance principle for a random walker on an infinite percolation cluster in \mathbb{Z}^d , $d \geq 2$.

1 Introduction

Consider super critical Bernoulli bond percolation in \mathbb{Z}^d , $d \geq 2$: for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write: $x \sim y$ if x and y are neighbors in the grid \mathbb{Z}^d , and let \mathbb{E}_d be the set of non-oriented nearest pairs (x, y) . We identify a sub-graph of \mathbb{Z}^d with an application $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$, writing $\omega(x, y) = 1$ if the edge (x, y) is present in ω and $\omega(x, y) = 0$ otherwise. Thus $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$ is the set of sub-graphs of \mathbb{Z}^d . Edges pertaining to ω are then called *open*. Connected components of such a sub-graph will be called *clusters* and the cluster of ω containing a point $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is denoted with $\mathcal{C}_x(\omega)$.

Define now Q to be the probability measure on $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$ under which the random variables $(\omega(e), e \in \mathbb{E}_d)$ are Bernouilli(p) independent variables and let

$$p_c = \sup\{p; Q[\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty] = 0\}$$

be the critical probability. It is known that $p_c \in]0, 1[$, see [5]. Throughout the paper, we choose a parameter p such that

$$p > p_c. \quad (1.1)$$

Then, Q almost surely, the graph ω has a unique infinite cluster there after denoted with $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$.

We are interested in the behaviour of the simple symmetric random walk on $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$: let $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ be the space of càd-làg \mathbb{Z}^d -valued functions on \mathbb{R}_+ and $X(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, be the coordinate maps from $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ to \mathbb{Z}^d . $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is endowed with the Skorohod topology. For a given sub-graph $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$, and for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let P_x^ω be the probability measure on $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ under which the coordinate process is the Markov chain starting at $X(0) = x$ and with generator

$$\mathcal{L}^\omega f(x) = \frac{1}{n^\omega(x)} \sum_{y \sim x} \omega(x, y) (f(y) - f(x)),$$

where $n^\omega(x)$ is the number of neighbors of x in the cluster $\mathcal{C}_x(\omega)$.

The behaviour of $X(t)$ under P_x^ω can be described as follows: starting from point x , the random walker waits for an exponential time of parameter 1 and then chooses, uniformly at random, one of its neighbors in $\mathcal{C}_x(\omega)$, say y and moves to y . This procedure is then iterated with independent hoping times. The walker clearly never leaves the cluster of ω it started from. Since edges are not oriented, the measures with weights $n^\omega(x)$ on the possibly different clusters of ω are reversible.

*Université de Provence, CMI, 39 rue Joliot-Curie, 13013 Marseille, FRANCE. pierre.mathieu@cmi.univ-mrs.fr

†Lebedev Physical Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences and Narvik Institute of Technology, P. O. Box 385, N-8505 Narvik, NORWAY. andrey@sci.lebedev.ru

Let Q_0 be the conditional measure $Q_0(\cdot) = Q(\cdot | \#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty)$ and let $Q_0.P_x^\omega$ be the so-called *annealed* semi-direct product measure law defined by

$$Q_0.P_x^\omega[F(\omega, X(\cdot))] = \int P_x^\omega[F(\omega, X(\cdot))] dQ_0(\omega).$$

Note that $X(t)$ is not Markovian anymore under $Q_0.P_x^\omega$. From [3], it is known that, under $Q_0.P_0^\omega$, the process $(X^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfies an invariance principle as ε tends to 0 i.e. it converges in law to the law of a non-degenerate Brownian motion. The proof is based on the *point of view of the particule*. It relies on the fact that the law of the environment ω , viewed from the current position of the Markov chain is reversible, when considered under the annealed measure. It does not give any information on the behaviour of the walk for a typical choice of ω . On the other hand, only partial results in dimension higher than 4 have been obtained for almost sure, also called *quenched*, invariance principles in the joint work of V. Sidoravicius and A-S. Sznitman, [13]. Our result holds for any dimension:

Theorem 1.1 *Q almost surely on the event $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$, under P_0^ω , the process $(X^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon X(t/\varepsilon^2), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$ converges in law as ε tends to 0 to a Brownian motion with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 Id$ where σ^2 is positive and does not depend on ω .*

Our strategy of proof follows the classical pattern introduced by S.M. Kozlov for averaging random walks with random conductances in [10]. The method of Kozlov was successfully used under ellipticity assumptions that are clearly not satisfied here. We refer in particular to first part of [13] where random walks in elliptic environments are considered. The main idea is to modify the process $X(t)$ by the addition of a *corrector* in such a way that the sum is a martingale under P_0^ω and use a martingale invariance principle. Then one has to prove that, in the rescaled limit, the corrector can be neglected or equivalently that the corrector has sub-linear growth. For this second step, in a classical elliptic set-up, one would invoke the Poincaré inequality and the compact embedding of H^1 into L^2 . For percolation models, a weaker, but still suitable form of the Poincaré inequality was proved in the paper of P. Mathieu and E. Remy [12], see also [1]. However another difficulty arises: our reference measure is the counting measure on the cluster at the origin. When rescaled, it does converge to Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d but, for a fixed ε it is of course singular. Thus rather than using classical functional analysis tools, one has to turn to L^2 techniques in varying spaces or 2 scale convergence arguments as they have been recently developped for the theory of homogenization of singular random structures in the work of A. Piatnitski and V. Jikov, see [9]. An elementary self-contained construction of the corrector is given in section 2.2. We also provide an approach to 2 scale convergence avoiding explicit reference to the results of [9]. For background material on homogenization theory in both periodic and random environments we refer to the book [8] where percolation models are considered in chapter 9.

Note on the constants: throughout the paper β and c will denote positive constants depending only on d and p whose values might change from place to place.

Note: N. Berger and M. Biskup recently obtained a proof of Theorem (1.1), see [2]. Although they also rely on the construction of a corrector, their method to prove the sub-linear growth of the corrector is quite different from ours.

2 Proof of the theorem

Let $|x| = \max |x_i|$. We use the notation $x \cdot y$ for the scalar product of the two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We also use the notation $Q_0(\cdot) = Q(\cdot | \#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty)$.

2.1 Tightness

We start recalling the Gaussian upper bound obtained by M. Barlow for walks on percolation clusters, see [1]. The corresponding lower bound also holds, but we won't need it here. Note that, Barlow's bound is only used in the proof of the tightness. Remember that $p > p_c$ so that, Q .a.s. the percolation sub-graph ω contains a unique infinite cluster denoted with $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$.

Statement from [1]: Q .a.s., for any $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ there exists a random variable S_x such that whenever x and y belong to $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ and $t \geq S_x$ then

$$P_x^\omega[X(t) = y] \leq ct^{-d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|y-x|^2}{ct}\right). \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover,

$$Q[x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), S_x \geq t] \leq c \exp(-ct^{\varepsilon(d)}) \quad \text{with } \varepsilon(d) > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

((2.1) is only stated with the further restriction that $t \geq |x-y|$ in [1]. If $t \leq |x-y|$, then (2.1) follows from the Carne-Varopoulos bound, see [12], appendix C.)

Lemma 2.1 *Q almost surely on the event $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$, under P_0^ω , the sequence of processes $(X^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$ is tight in the Skorohod topology.*

Proof: it is sufficient to check that Q .a.s. on the event $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$, for any $T > 0$ one has

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\tau} E_0^\omega[|X^\varepsilon(\tau + \delta) - X^\varepsilon(\tau)|^2] = 0,$$

where τ is any stopping time in the filtration generated by X^ε that is bounded by T . See [4], page 138.

But, using the Markov property, we get that for large enough K ,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_0^\omega[|X^\varepsilon(\tau + \delta) - X^\varepsilon(\tau)|^2] \\ &= \varepsilon^2 E_0^\omega[|X(\frac{\tau + \delta}{\varepsilon^2}) - X(\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon^2})|^2] \\ &\leq \varepsilon^2 \sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} E_y^\omega[|X(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2})|^2] + e^{-K/2}, \end{aligned}$$

In the 'sup', the restriction $|y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2$ is justified since the walker makes more than k steps in time t with probability lower than $e^{-k/t}$. Since we are conditioning on the event $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \mathcal{C}(\omega)$, one may replace the condition $y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ by the condition $y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ in the last term of this inequality.

From (2.1), it follows that the first term is bounded by $c\delta$ provided that $\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2} \geq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} S_y$. From (2.2), we get that

$$Q\left[\sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} S_y > \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right] \leq c \frac{K}{\varepsilon^2} \exp(-c(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2})^{\varepsilon(d)}).$$

Using the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we deduce that Q .a.s. on the event $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \mathcal{C}(\omega)$

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^2 \sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} S_y = 0,$$

and the proof is completed by letting K tend to ∞ . ■

2.2 Construction of the corrector

Random fields: we recall that $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}^d}$ is the set of sub-graphs of \mathbb{Z}^d . We shall denote with \mathcal{B} the set of neighbors of the origin in \mathbb{Z}^d . With some abuse of notation, we write $\omega(b)$ instead of $\omega(0, b)$ when $b \in \mathcal{B}$. We use the notation $x.\omega$ to denote the natural action of \mathbb{Z}^d on Ω by translations. Ω is equipped with the product sigma field.

We endow $\Omega \times \mathcal{B}$ with the measure M defined by

$$\int u dM = Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) u(\omega, b) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right].$$

Note that if two random fields u and v coincide in $L^2(\Omega \times \mathcal{B}, M)$, then, Q .a.s. on the event $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$, $u(\omega, b) = v(\omega, b)$ for any $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\omega(b) = 1$.

Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. u is said to be *local* if it only depends on a finite number of coordinates. We associate to u its *gradient*: $\nabla^{(\omega)} u : \Omega \times \mathcal{B}$ defined by

$$\nabla^{(\omega)} u(\omega, b) = u(b.\omega) - u(\omega).$$

Let L_{pot}^2 be the closure in $L^2(\Omega \times \mathcal{B}, M)$ of the set of gradients of local fields, and L_{sol}^2 be its orthogonal complement in $L^2(\Omega \times \mathcal{B}, M)$.

Fields in L_{pot}^2 satisfy a *co-cycle* relation: on the event $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$, for any $u \in L_{pot}^2$ and any closed path in $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ of the form $\gamma = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$ with $x_i \sim x_{i+1}$, $\omega(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ and $x_0 = x_k = 0$ then $\sum_{i=1}^k u(x_{i-1}, \omega, x_i - x_{i-1}) = 0$.

Let us write down explicitly what it means for a square integrable field v to be in L_{sol}^2 : let u be a local function on Ω . Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q\left[\left(\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) v(\omega, b) \nabla^{(\omega)} u(\omega, b) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right)\right] &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) \nabla^{(\omega)} u(\omega, b) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] \\ &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) (u(b.\omega) - u(\omega)) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the translation invariance of Q , we then get that

$$\begin{aligned} Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) u(b.\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v((-b).b.\omega, b) u(b.\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(b.\omega), -b \in \mathcal{C}(b.\omega)}\right] \\ &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v((-b).\omega, b) u(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), -b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] = Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(b.\omega, -b) u(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] \\ &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) v(b.\omega, -b) u(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

So that

$$Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) (u(b.\omega) - u(\omega)) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] = Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) u(\omega) (v(b.\omega, -b) - v(\omega, b)) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right].$$

Thus we have proved the following integration by parts formula:

$$\int v \nabla^{(\omega)} u dM = -Q[n^\omega(0) u \nabla^{(\omega)*} v \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}], \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\nabla^{(\omega)*} v(\omega) = \frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) (v(\omega, b) - v(b.\omega, -b)).$$

(2.3) holds for a square integrable random field v and any local function u .

As a consequence, taking v to be constant, note that $\int \nabla^{(\omega)} u dM = 0$ for any local u . By extension, we will also have $\int u dM = 0$ for any $u \in L_{pot}^2$.

A square integrable random field v is in L_{sol}^2 if it satisfies $\nabla^{(\omega)*} v = 0$ Q .a.s. on the set $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$.

Definition of the corrector: let $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Define the random field $\hat{b}(\omega, e) = \mathbf{1}_{e=b} - \mathbf{1}_{e=-b}$. Let G_b be the unique solution in L_{pot}^2 satisfying the equation

$$\hat{b} + G_b(\omega, e) \in L_{sol}^2. \quad (2.4)$$

(G_b is simply the projection of $-\hat{b}$ on L_{pot}^2 .)

We define the corrector $\chi : \Omega \times \mathcal{C}_0(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by the equation

$$\chi(\omega, x + e) \cdot b - \chi(\omega, x) \cdot b = G_b(x, \omega, e), \quad (2.5)$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $b, e \in \mathcal{B}$. (In this equation $\chi(\cdot) \cdot b$ stands for the usual scalar product of the two \mathbb{R}^d vectors $\chi(\cdot)$ and b . Note that there is no ambiguity because $G_b = -G_{-b}$ as can be directly seen from equation (2.4).) Observe that, unlike G_b , the corrector χ is not an homogeneous field.

The solution to (2.4) being unique in L_{pot}^2 , the value of $G_b(\omega, e)$ is uniquely determined whenever $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ and $e \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies $\omega(e) = 1$. Therefore $G_b(x, \omega, e)$ is well defined Q .a.s. on the set $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ for any x and e s.t. x and $x + e$ belong to $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$. Thus, if x belongs to $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$, then the value of $\chi(\omega, x) - \chi(\omega, 0)$ can be computed integrating (2.5) along a path in $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ from the origin to x . That this value does not depend on the choice of the path is an immediate consequence of the co-cycle relation satisfied by G_b . We conclude that $\chi(\omega, x)$ is uniquely determined by equation (2.5) up to an additive constant (that might depend on ω).

The martingale property: we claim that the random process $X(t) + \chi(\omega, X(t))$ is a martingale under P_0^ω for Q almost all ω s.t. $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$. Note that since the process $X(t)$, starting from the origin, never leaves $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$, $\chi(\omega, X(t))$ is indeed well defined.

We choose ω s.t. $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$.

Since $G_b \in L_{pot}^2$, the co-cycle relation implies that $G_b(\omega, e) + G_b(e, \omega, -e) = 0$ for any $e \in \mathcal{B}$ s.t. $\omega(e) = 1$. Comparing the expression of \mathcal{L}^ω with the definition of $\nabla^{(\omega)*}$, we then see that $\mathcal{L}^\omega \chi(\omega, x) \cdot b = \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{(\omega)*} G_b(x, \omega)$ for any $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$.

Let $\phi(x) = x + \chi(\omega, x)$. Noting that $\hat{b}(\omega, e) = e \cdot b$ and that $\hat{b}(e, \omega, -e) = -b \cdot e$, we see that $\nabla^{(\omega)*} \hat{b}(\omega) = \frac{2}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) b \cdot e$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\omega \phi(\omega, x) \cdot b &= \frac{1}{n^\omega(x)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x, x + e) e \cdot b + \mathcal{L}^\omega \chi(\omega, x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{(\omega)*} \hat{b}(x, \omega) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{(\omega)*} G_b(x, \omega) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This last equality holds for any $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$. We have proved the martingale property.

The invariance principle: to each pair of neighbouring points $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ such that $\omega(x, y) = 1$ attach a Poisson process of rate $1/n^\omega(x)$, say $N_t^{x, y}$, all of them independent. Let Y be the solution of the equation $Y(0) = 0$,

$$dY(t) = \sum_{y \sim Y(t-)} \omega(Y(t-), y) (y - Y(t-)) dN_t^{Y(t-), y}.$$

Then the law of the random process $(Y(t), t \geq 0)$ is P_0^ω .

Let ω be such that $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$. Let $N(t) = Y(t) + \chi(\omega, Y(t))$. From the previous paragraph, we already know that N is a martingale. Its bracket can be computed using Itô's formula. We fix a direction $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} d \langle N \cdot b \rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n^\omega(Y(t-))} \sum_{y \sim Y(t-)} \omega(Y(t-), Y(t-) + e) (y \cdot b + \chi(\omega, y) \cdot b - Y(t-) \cdot b - \chi(\omega, Y(t-)) \cdot b)^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^{Y(t-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} Y(t-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(Y(t-).\omega, e))^2 dt.$$

Back to the process X and denoting $M(t) = X(t) + \chi(\omega, X(t))$, we can equivalently write that

$$d \langle M \cdot b \rangle (t) = \frac{1}{n^{X(t-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(t-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(X(t-).\omega, e))^2 dt.$$

Let \tilde{Q}_0 be the probability measure

$$\tilde{Q}_0(A) = \frac{\int_A n^\omega(0) dQ_0(\omega)}{\int n^\omega(0) dQ_0(\omega)}.$$

$X(t-).\omega$ is the process of the environment viewed from the particule. The measure \tilde{Q}_0 is reversible, invariant and ergodic with respect to $X(t-).\omega$, see Lemma 4.9 in [3]. As a consequence, we get that, Q .a.s. on the set $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$,

$$\frac{\langle M \cdot b \rangle (t)}{t} \rightarrow \tilde{Q}_0\left(\frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e))^2\right).$$

Let now $M^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon M(t/\varepsilon^2)$. We have proved that, for any $t > 0$, as ε tends to 0

$$\langle M^\varepsilon \cdot b \rangle (t) \rightarrow t \tilde{Q}_0\left(\frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e))^2\right).$$

For any function f that vanishes on the diagonal, the process

$$\sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} f(X(s), X(s-)) - \int_0^t ds \frac{1}{n^{X(s-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(s-).\omega(e) f(X(s-) + e, X(s-))$$

is a martingale. Applying this to $f(x, y) = (b \cdot (x + \chi(\omega, x)) - b \cdot (y + \chi(\omega, y)))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|b \cdot (x + \chi(\omega, x)) - b \cdot (y + \chi(\omega, y))| \geq \eta}$ for some direction b and some $\eta > 0$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} (M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta} \\ & - \int_0^t ds \frac{1}{n^{X(s-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(s-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e)| \geq \eta} \end{aligned}$$

is a martingale. Taking expectations and using the ergodic theorem for the process $X(s-).\omega$ we get that, on the set $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_0^\omega \left[\frac{1}{t} \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} (M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta} \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t ds E_0^\omega \left[\frac{1}{n^{X(s-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(s-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e)| \geq \eta} \right] \\ & \rightarrow \tilde{Q}_0\left(\frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e)| \geq \eta}\right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & E_0^\omega \left[\sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} (M^\varepsilon(s) \cdot b - M^\varepsilon(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M^\varepsilon(s) \cdot b - M^\varepsilon(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta} \right] \\ & = \varepsilon^2 E_0^\omega \left[\sum_{0 \leq s \leq t/\varepsilon^2} (M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta/\varepsilon} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$\rightarrow 0$.

From the martingale convergence theorem, Theorem 5.1 part a in [7], we then deduce that, Q .a.s. on the set $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$, the law of the process $\varepsilon X(\cdot/\varepsilon^2) + \varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\cdot/\varepsilon^2))$ under P_0^ω converges to the law of a Brownian motion with a deterministic covariance matrix A .

That A is diagonal is proved in [3], Theorem 4.7, 3. One can argue that A is positive as a consequence of the Gaussian lower bounds obtained in [1], but the original proof is given in [6].

We therefore conclude that Theorem 1.1 will follow if we can prove that, Q .a.s. on the set $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$, for all $t > 0$, $\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(t/\varepsilon^2))$ converges to 0 in P_0^ω probability.

2.3 Convergence of the corrector

We now check that the contribution of the corrector is negligible in the limit i.e. we prove that, for all t , $\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(t/\varepsilon^2))$ converges to 0 in P_0^ω probability, Q .a.s. on the set $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$. In view of (2.1), it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\varepsilon\chi(\omega, y)|^2 = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}$$

Below, we use the Poincaré inequality to prove that there exist some constants $a_\varepsilon(\omega)$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\varepsilon\chi(\omega, y) - a_\varepsilon|^2 = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.6)$$

As a consequence of (2.1), (2.6) implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2})) - a_\varepsilon| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0.$$

But the invariance principle for the process $\varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}) + \varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}))$ implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}) + \varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}))| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0,$$

and (2.1) implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2})| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}))| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0.$$

Thus we see that a_ε tends to 0 and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\varepsilon\chi(\omega, y)|^2 = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}$$

It remains to justify (2.6).

Poincaré inequalities: since G_b is square integrable, the spatial ergodic theorem, see [11] page 205, implies that $\varepsilon^d \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \omega(e) (G_b(x\omega, e))^2$ has a Q .a.s. finite limit. Therefore

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^d \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |x| \leq 1/(1-a)\varepsilon} x\omega(e) (G_b(x\omega, e))^2 < \infty, \quad (2.7)$$

Q_0 .a.s. and for any constant $0 < a < 1$.

We quote from [12], Theorem 1.3: for some $\varepsilon > 0$ define \mathcal{C}^ε to be the connected component of the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ with the box $[-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]^d$ that contains the origin. There exists a constant β such that Q_0 .a.s. for small enough ε , for any function $u : \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \leq \beta \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{x \sim y \in \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon} \omega(x,y) (u(x) - u(y))^2.$$

Since $\#\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon$ is of order ε^{-d} for small enough ε and since $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) \cap [-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]^d \subset \mathcal{C}^{(1-a)\varepsilon}$ for some constant a , we therefore have a constant β such that, Q_0 .a.s. for small enough ε , for any function $u : \mathcal{C}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x|, |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \leq \beta \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{x \sim y \in \mathcal{C}^{(1-a)\varepsilon}} \omega(x,y) (u(x) - u(y))^2.$$

We use this last inequality for the function $u(x) = \chi(\omega, x)$ to get that,

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x|, |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\chi(\omega, x) - \chi(\omega, y))^2 \leq \beta \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |x| \leq 1/(1-a)\varepsilon} x \cdot \omega(e) (G_b(x, \omega, e))^2.$$

By (2.7) we therefore get that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{2d} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x|, |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x) - \varepsilon \chi(\omega, y))^2 < \infty,$$

Q_0 .a.s., and thus

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 < \infty, \quad (2.8)$$

Q_0 .a.s. where a_ε is the mean value of $\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x)$ on the set $\{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon\}$.

Two scale convergence: we first introduce some notation. Let $G =]-1, 1[^d$. For $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we define the measures

$$\mu_\omega = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} n^\omega(z) \delta_z, \quad \mu_\omega^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^d \sum_{z \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} n^\omega(z) \delta_{\varepsilon z}.$$

Given a direction $e \in \mathcal{B}$, the gradient of a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\nabla_e^\varepsilon \phi(z) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\phi(z + \varepsilon e) - \phi(z)).$$

Let us now choose $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ and let

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z) = (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} z) - a_\varepsilon) \cdot b_0.$$

Thus ψ^ε is well defined for $z \in \varepsilon \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$. From the definition of χ , we have

$$\nabla_e^\varepsilon \psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z) = G_{b_0}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega, e),$$

for $z \in \varepsilon \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$.

Keep in mind that for $z' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the expression $z' \cdot \omega$ denotes the graph obtained by translating ω by z' . In particular, for $z \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^d$, then $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega(e)$ is either 0 or 1, depending on whether the edge $(z, z + e)$ belongs to ω or not. We sometimes prefer the notation $(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \omega(e)$ in order to avoid possible confusion.

In our new notation, (2.7) and (2.8) now read:

$$C_1(\omega) = \sup_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{\varepsilon} \int_G (\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \omega(e) (\nabla_e^\varepsilon \psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z))^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) < \infty, \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$C_2(\omega) = \sup_{\varepsilon} \int_G (\psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z))^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) < \infty, \quad (2.10)$$

for Q_0 almost any ω . For further reference, let us call Ω_1 the set of ω 's such that $0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$, $C_1(\omega) < \infty$ and $C_2(\omega) < \infty$ and observe that $Q_0(\Omega_1) = 1$.

Define the measure

$$\mathcal{P}(A) = Q[\mathbf{1}_A(\omega) n^\omega(0) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}].$$

According to the ergodic theorem, for any smooth function $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$ and any $u \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ we have

$$\int_G \phi(z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega\right) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \left(\int_G \phi(z) dz\right) \left(\int_\Omega u(\omega') d\mathcal{P}(\omega')\right), \quad (2.11)$$

Q_0 -a.s.

We endow Ω with its natural (product) topology to turn it into a compact space. We will use the notation $C(\Omega)$ for continuous real valued functions defined on Ω . Using standart separability arguments, we see that (2.11) holds simultaneously for any $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$ and $u \in C(\Omega)$ on a set of full Q_0 measure. More precisely, let Ω_2 be the set of ω 's such that $0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ and, for any functions $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$ and $u \in C(\Omega)$ one has:

$$\int_G \phi(z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega\right) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \left(\int_G \phi(z) dz\right) \left(\int_\Omega u(\omega') d\mathcal{P}(\omega')\right), \quad (2.12)$$

and, for any $e \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\int_G \phi(z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega\right) G_{b_0}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega, e\right) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \left(\int_G \phi(z) dz\right) \left(\int_\Omega u(\omega') G_{b_0}(\omega', e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega')\right). \quad (2.13)$$

Then $Q_0(\Omega_2) = 1$. Finally let $\Omega_0 = \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$.

In the sequel α will denote an element of Ω_0 . Consider the family of linear functionals

$$L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi) = \int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z).$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get that

$$(L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi))^2 \leq \int_G (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z))^2 d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \int_G \phi(z)^2 u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha\right)^2 d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z).$$

From (2.10) and (2.12) we deduce that for $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$ and $u \in C(\Omega)$

$$\limsup_\varepsilon (L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi))^2 \leq C_2(\alpha) \int_G \phi(z)^2 dz \int_\Omega u(\omega)^2 d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

Therefore, up to extracting a sub-sequence, we can assume that for any smooth ϕ and any continuous $u \in C(\Omega)$, $L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi)$ has a limit say $L^\alpha(u, \phi)$ where L^α is a linear functional satisfying

$$(L^\alpha(u, \phi))^2 \leq C_2(\alpha) \int_G \phi(z)^2 dz \int_\Omega u(\omega)^2 d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

Thus L^α can be extended as a continuous linear functional on $L^2(\Omega \times G, d\mathcal{P} \times dx)$ and, by Riesz's theorem, there exists a function $v^\alpha \in L^2(\Omega \times G, d\mathcal{P} \times dx)$ such that

$$L^\alpha(u, \phi) = \int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega u(\omega) v^\alpha(\omega, z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

Let us summarize the preceeding discussion: we have proved that, up to extracting a sub-sequence, for $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$ and $u \in C(\Omega)$,

$$\int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega u(\omega) v^\alpha(\omega, z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega). \quad (2.14)$$

We will prove the following

Lemma 2.2 For any $\alpha \in \Omega_0$, $v^\alpha(\omega, z) = 0$ for Lebesgue almost any $z \in G$ and \mathcal{P} almost any ω .

As a consequence of this Lemma, we have that for Q_0 almost any α , for any function $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$,

$$\int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since we also have uniform bounds on the L^2 norm of ψ^ε , see (2.10), we deduce that, for any rectangle $A \subset G$,

$$\int_A \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow 0.$$

We conclude that, for any rectangle $A \subset [-1, 1]^d$, Q_0 .a.s.

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); \varepsilon x \in A} (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.15)$$

Remark 2.3 The content of this part of the paper, including the proof of the Lemma in the next section, should be compared with the results of [9]. The convergence in (2.14) is known as 'two-scale convergence'. The only difference between our setting and [9] is the discrete nature of the grid whereas continuous diffusions are considered in [9].

It is also possible to directly apply the results of [9] to justify Lemma (2.2). We refer the interested reader to the first version of the present paper on the Arxiv for details. Here, we preferred to give a more self-contained approach but most of the arguments are mere copies of the proofs in [9] with some minor simplifications due to the fact that, for instance, the Palm measure \mathcal{P} is explicit and absolutely continuous w.r.t. Q .

Proof of Lemma (2.2): the proof is in three steps. Throughout the following proof, ϕ is always assumed to be in $C_o^\infty(G)$, the space of smooth functions with compact support in G .

Step 1: we check the integration by parts formula:

$$\int_G \phi(z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = -\varepsilon \int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon \phi(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z), \quad (2.16)$$

where u is any function defined on $\Omega \times \mathcal{B}$ and ε is small enough (depending on the support of ϕ):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G \phi(z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) &= \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \phi(\varepsilon x) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(x, \alpha) n^\alpha(x) \\ &= \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \phi(\varepsilon x) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} x \cdot \alpha(e) (u(x, \alpha, e) - u(x, e, \omega, -e)) n^\alpha(x). \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \phi(\varepsilon x) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} x \cdot \alpha(e) u(x, e, \alpha, -e) n^\alpha(x) = \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \sum_{e' \in \mathcal{B}} x' \cdot \alpha(e') u(x', \alpha, e') \phi(\varepsilon x' + \varepsilon e') n^\alpha(x'),$$

with the change of variables $x' = x + e$ and $e' = -e$. Putting the last two equalities together, one gets (2.16). Observe that boundary terms vanish because ϕ has compact support and ε is small enough.

Step 2: we prove that $v^\alpha(\omega, z)$ does not depend on ω i.e. that Q_0 .a.s.

$$v^\alpha(\omega, z) = \frac{\int v^\alpha(\omega', z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega')}{\int d\mathcal{P}(\omega')} = v^\alpha(z). \quad (2.17)$$

Indeed, let u be continuous on $\Omega \times \mathcal{B}$ and $\phi \in C_o^\infty(G)$ and use (2.14) and the integration by parts formula (2.16) to get that

$$\int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} -\varepsilon \int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Since u is continuous, it is bounded. Note that $(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \alpha(e) \leq n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)$. Besides,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \int_G \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) (\nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z))^2 d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \leq C_1(\alpha) \|\phi\|_\infty + C_2(\alpha) \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty < \infty.$$

We conclude that, as ε tends to 0, the expression

$$\int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z)$$

remains bounded and therefore

$$\lim_{\varepsilon} -\varepsilon \int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = 0$$

and

$$\int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = 0.$$

By (2.3) we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) n^\omega(0) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} dQ(\omega) \\
&= - \int u \nabla^{(\omega)} v^\alpha(\cdot, z) dM.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have proved that

$$\int_G \phi(z) dz \int u \nabla^{(\omega)} v^\alpha(\cdot, z) dM = 0,$$

for any $\phi \in C_o^\infty(G)$ and continuous u . We deduce that Q_0 -a.s., for any $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\omega(b) = 1$ and for Lebesgue almost any z , then $v^\alpha(b, \omega, z) = v^\alpha(\omega, z)$. Integrating this equality on a path between 0 and $x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$, we then get that Q_0 -a.s. for any $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ and for Lebesgue almost any z , then $v^\alpha(\omega, z) = v^\alpha(x, \omega, z)$. Therefore, since μ_ω^ε only charges $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$, the ergodic theorem yields:

$$v^\alpha(\omega, z) = \frac{\int_G v^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z', \omega, z) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z')}{\int_G d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z')} \rightarrow \frac{\int v^\alpha(\omega', z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega')}{\int d\mathcal{P}(\omega')} = v^\alpha(z),$$

Q_0 -a.s in ω and for Lebesgue almost any $z \in G$.

Step 3: we now prove that $v^\alpha(z)$ does not depend on z . To this end, we first prove that for any smooth $\phi \in C_o^\infty(G)$ and any continuous $u \in L_{sol}^2$ we have

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \left(\int_G dz v^\alpha(z) \nabla \phi(z) \cdot e \right) \left(\int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \right) = 0, \quad (2.18)$$

where $\tilde{u}(\omega, e) = \frac{\omega(e)}{n^\omega(0)} u(\omega, e)$.

We have:

$$\left(\int_G dz v^\alpha(z) \nabla \phi(z) \cdot e \right) \left(\int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G (\nabla \phi(z) \cdot e) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\phi \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) - \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.14) in the first equality and the regularity of ϕ for the second and third equalities. Using integration by parts and the definition of \tilde{u} , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\phi \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\phi \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \frac{(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \alpha(e)}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} u(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since $u \in L_{sol}^2$ and therefore $\nabla^{(\omega)*} u = 0$.

We now turn to the second term. Keep in mind that $\nabla_e^\varepsilon (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) = G_{b_0}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e)$. Thus, as an application of (2.13),

$$\lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = \left(\int_G \phi(z) dz \right) \left(\int_\Omega G_{b_0}(\omega, e) \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \right).$$

Replacing \tilde{u} and \mathcal{P} by their definition, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_\Omega G_{b_0}(\omega, e) \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_\Omega G_{b_0}(\omega, e) \omega(e) u(\omega, e) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} dQ(\omega) \\
&= \int G_{b_0} u dM = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since $G_{b_0} \in L_{pot}^2$ and $u \in L_{sol}^2$. We conclude that (2.18) holds.

(2.18) was proved for any continuous $u \in L_{sol}^2$. By density it also holds for any $u \in L_{sol}^2$.

It remains to check the following fact: for any direction $e \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists $u \in L_{sol}^2$ such that $\int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \neq 0$. Indeed, first note that

$$\int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} \omega(e) u(\omega, e) dQ(\omega).$$

Define the random field \tilde{e} by $\tilde{e}(\omega, b) = \mathbf{1}_{b=e}$. (e is kept fixed.) Let G be the orthogonal projection of $-\tilde{e}$ on L_{pot}^2 and let $u = G + \tilde{e} \in L_{sol}^2$. We write that u and $u - \tilde{e} = G$ are orthogonal:

$$\int_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} \omega(e) u(\omega, e) dQ(\omega) = \int u \tilde{e} dM = \int u^2 dM \neq 0,$$

because $\tilde{u} \notin L_{sol}^2$.

Thus we can deduce from (2.18) that $\int_G dz v^\alpha(z) \nabla \phi(z) \cdot e = 0$ for any smooth ϕ and any direction e . Therefore v^α is Lebesgue almost surely constant.

Conclusion of the proof of Lemma (2.2): since ψ^ε has vanishing mean on G - Remember this is the way we chose a_ε - then v^α also has vanishing mean in G . And since, by steps 2 and 3, v^α is almost surely constant, we must have that Q_0 -a.s. and for Lebesgue almost any z , $v^\alpha(\omega, z) = 0$. \blacksquare

Scaling and strong L^2 convergence of χ :

To conclude the proof of the Theorem, we still have to prove the strong L^2 convergence in (2.6). It will be a consequence of the weak convergence (2.15) and of a scaling argument.

We choose a parameter $\delta > 0$. We chop the box $[-1, 1]^d$ into smaller boxes of side length of order δ : for $z \in \delta \mathbb{Z}^d$ s.t. $|z| \leq 1$, let B_z (resp. C_z) be the box of center z and side length $M\delta$ (resp. side length δ).

M is a constant whose value will be chosen later. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we use the notation $B_z(\varepsilon) = (\frac{1}{\varepsilon}B_z) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $C_z(\varepsilon) = (\frac{1}{\varepsilon}C_z) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$.

The following version of the Poincaré inequality is proved in [1], see Definition 1.7, Theorem 2.18, Lemma 2.13 and Proposition 2.17: there exist constants $M > 1$ and β such that Q_0 .a.s. for any $\delta > 0$, for small enough ε , for any $z \in \delta\mathbb{Z}^d$ s.t. $|z| \leq 1$ and for any function $u : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$\frac{1}{\#C_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{x \sim y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap B_z(\varepsilon)} \omega(x,y) (u(x) - u(y))^2.$$

We use this inequality for the function $\varepsilon\chi$, to get that

$$\frac{1}{\#C_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - \varepsilon\chi(\omega, y))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap B_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x,y) (G_b(\omega, e))^2.$$

Denoting with $a_\varepsilon(z)$ the mean value of $\varepsilon\chi(\omega, \cdot)$ on the set $\mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)$, we get that for all z ,

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon(z))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap B_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x,y) (G_b(\omega, e))^2,$$

and summing over all values of z ,

$$\sum_z \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon(z))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x,y) (G_b(\omega, e))^2.$$

(Remember that the value of β is allowed to change from line to line.) Multiplying by ε^d and applying the spatial ergodic theorem as before, we get that

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \sum_z \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon(z))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \int (G_b)^2 dM.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (2.15) that, for any z , $a_\varepsilon(z) - a_\varepsilon$ converges to 0. Therefore we must also have

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \varepsilon^d \sum_z \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \int (G_b)^2 dM,$$

and

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \int (G_b)^2 dM,$$

and, since this holds for any $\delta > 0$, we deduce that

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 \rightarrow 0,$$

Q_0 .a.s. ■

References

- [1] Barlow, M.T. (2004)
Random walks on supercritical percolation clusters
Ann. Probab. **32**, 3024-3084.
- [2] Berger, N., Biskup, M. (2005)
Quenched invariance principle for simple random walk on percolation clusters. Preprint.
<http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/math.PR/0503576>.
- [3] De Masi, A., Ferrari, P., Goldstein, S., Wick, W.D. (1989)
An invariance principle for reversible Markov processes. Applications to random motions in random environments
Journ. Stat. Phys. **55** (3/4), 787-855.
- [4] Ethier, S.N., Kurtz, T.G. (1986)
Markov processes
John Wiley, New York.
- [5] Grimmett, G. (1999)
Percolation
Springer-Verlag, Berlin (Second edition).
- [6] Grimmett, G., Marstrand, J. (1990)
The supercritical phase of percolation is well behaved
Proc. Royal Society (London) Ser. A. **4306**, 429-457.
- [7] Helland, I (1982)
Central limit theorems for martingales with discrete or continuous time
Scand. Journ. Stat. **9**, 79-94.
- [8] Jikov, V.V., Kozlov, S.M., Oleinik, O.A. (1994)
Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals.
Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [9] Jikov, V.V., Piatnitski, A.L. (2005)
Homogenization of random singular structures and measures.
Preprint (in Russian).
- [10] Kozlov, S.M. (1985)
The method of averaging and walks in inhomogeneous environments
Russian Math. Surveys **40** (2), 73-145.
- [11] Krengel, U (1985)
Ergodic theorems
Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- [12] Mathieu, P., Remy, E. (2004)
Isoperimetry and heat kernel decay on percolations clusters
Ann. Probab. **32**, 100-128.
- [13] Sidoravicius, V., Sznitman, A-S. (2004)
Quenched invariance principles for walks on clusters of percolation or among random conductances
Prob. Th. Rel. Fields **129**, 219-244.