# COERCIVE INEQUALITIES FOR GIBBS MEASURES

LORENZO BERTINI BOGUSLAW ZEGARLINSKI

Abstract. We prove the Generalized Nash and Logarithmic Nash inequalities for Gibbs measures with Dirichlet form associated to the Kawaski dynamics.

## 1. A Strategy for the Nash Inequalities

Let $\mathbb{Z}^d$ be the $d$-dimensional integer lattice with the Euclidean metric $\mathrm{d}(\cdot,\cdot)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of finite sets in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For a set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, by $|\Lambda|$ we denote its cardinality (volume) and we define $R$-boundary of $\Lambda$ by $\partial_R \Lambda \equiv \{j \in \complement\Lambda : \mathrm{d}(j,\Lambda) \leq R\}$, where $\complement\Lambda \equiv \mathbb{Z}^d \diagdown \Lambda$. Let $\Omega \equiv \mathbb{M}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be the product space defined with a compact metric space $\mathbb{M}$. By $\Sigma_\Lambda$, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we denote the smallest $\sigma$-algebra of subsets in $\Omega$ with respect to which all the coordinate functions $\omega \longmapsto \omega_i$, $i \in \Lambda$, are measurable and we set $\Sigma \equiv \Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. For a probability measure $\mu$ on $(\Omega, \Sigma)$, we denote by $\mu\,(f) \equiv \mu f$ the corresponding expectation of the $\mu$-integrable function $f$ and we use the following notation $\mu(f;g) \equiv \mu fg - \mu f \mu g$ for the covariance of the functions $f$ and $g$. By $\mu_0$ we denote the free measure on $(\Omega, \Sigma)$, i.e. a product measure of uniform probability measures on $(\mathbb{M}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{M}})$. The related conditional expectations with respect to $\Sigma_{\complement\Lambda}$ will be denoted by $\mu_{0,\Lambda}$, or in a special case $\mu_{0,\{i\}} \equiv \mu_{0,i}$. Given $x \in \mathbb{M}^\Lambda$ and $y \in \mathbb{M}^{\complement\Lambda}$ , we define a configuration $x \bullet_\Lambda y \in \Omega$ as follows

$$(x \bullet_\Lambda y)_j \equiv \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } j \in \Lambda \\ y_j & \text{if } j \in \complement\Lambda \end{cases}$$

In particular if $\Lambda = \{i\}$ , for some $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we will use a simplified notation $x \bullet_{\{i\}} y \equiv x \bullet_i y$. If $\mathbb{M}$ is a smooth Riemannian manifold and for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ a function $\mathbb{M} \ni x \longmapsto f(x|\omega) \equiv f(x \circ_i \omega)$ is differentiable, we introduce the gradient $\nabla_i$ with respect to the coordinate $\omega_i$ , $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, by

$$\nabla_i f(\omega) \equiv (\partial_{\mathbb{M}} f(\cdot|\omega))\,(\omega_i)$$

where $\partial_{\mathbb{M}}$ denotes the corresponding gradient operator on the manifold $\mathbb{M}$ and we compute its length using the corresponding scalar product in the tangent space $T_{\omega_i}\mathbb{M}$ as follows

$$|\nabla_i f(\omega)| \equiv \left((\partial_{\mathbb{M}} f(\cdot|\omega))\,(\omega_i), (\partial_{\mathbb{M}} f(\cdot|\omega))\,(\omega_i)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{T_{\omega_i}\mathbb{M}}$$

If $\mathbb{M}$ is a finite space, we define a discrete gradient

$$\nabla_i f(\omega) \equiv f(\omega) - \left(\mu_{0,i} f\right)(\omega)$$

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60K35, 46N55; Secondary 82C22, 82C20 .

*Key words and phrases.* Generalized Nash, log-Nash Inequalitites, Gibbs measures, Kawasaki dynamics.

We would like to acknowledge the support by EPSRC grant GR/K 76801.

and in this case its length is simply the absolute value of this expression. The gradient with respect to the coordinates in a set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ will be denoted by $\nabla_\Lambda f \equiv (\nabla_i f)_{i\in\Lambda}$ and in case when $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^d$, we simply set $\nabla_{\mathbb{Z}^d} f \equiv \nabla f$. We define the square of the gradient as follows

$$|\nabla_\Lambda f|^2 \equiv \sum_{i\in\Lambda} |\nabla_i f|^2$$

We introduce a space $\mathcal{C}_q \equiv \mathcal{C}_q(\Omega)$, $q \in [1,\infty)$ of functions for which the following Lipschitz type seminorm is finite

$$|||f|||_q \equiv \left( \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d} || \, |\nabla_i f| \, ||_u^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

where $||\cdot||_u$ denotes the supremum norm in $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. One notes that $\mathcal{C}_q \supset \mathcal{C}_p$ if $q \geq p$.

We will use the following definitions

**Definition 1.1.**

- *A probability measure $\mu$ satisfies* ***Standard Spectral Gap*** *inequality iff there is $M_\mu \in (0,\infty)$ such that*

**(SSG)**
$$M_\mu \cdot \mu(f - \mu f)^2 \leq \mu|\nabla f|^2$$

*for any $f$ for which the right hand side is finite*

- *A probability measure $\mu$ satisfies* ***Standard Logarithmic Sobolev*** *inequality iff there is $c_\mu \in (0,\infty)$ such that*

**(SLS)**
$$\mu(f \log \frac{f}{\mu f}) \leq c_\mu \cdot \mu|\nabla f^{\frac{1}{2}}|^2$$

*for any nonnegative function $f$ for which the right hand side is finite*

Let $\mathcal{E} = \{\mu_\Lambda^\omega : \Lambda \in \mathcal{F}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ be a local (respectively of range $R$) specification on $(\Omega, \Sigma)$ , i.e. a family consisting of probability kernels such that for any bounded measurable (respectively $\Sigma_\Lambda$-measurable) function $f$, the function $\omega \longmapsto \mu_\Lambda^\omega(f)$ is $\Sigma_{\complement\Lambda}$ (respectively $\Sigma_{\partial_R\Lambda}$)-measurable and the following compatibility condition is satisfied

$$\forall \Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{F} \qquad \mu_{\Lambda_2}^\omega \mu_{\Lambda_1}^{\cdot}(f) = \mu_{\Lambda_2}^\omega(f)$$

A probability measure $\mu$ on $(\Omega, \Sigma)$ satisfying

**(DLR)**
$$\forall \Lambda \in \mathcal{F} \qquad \mu\left(\mu_\Lambda^{\cdot}(f)\right) = \mu(f)$$

for any bounded measurable function $f$, is called **a Gibbs measure** for $\mathcal{E}$. The (convex) set of all Gibbs measures for $\mathcal{E}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$ and by $\partial\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$ the set of its extremal points

**Definition 1.2.** *Let $\mathcal{E} = \{\mu_\Lambda^\omega : \Lambda \in \mathcal{F}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ be a local specification of range $R$ and let $\varphi_{jk} \equiv \varphi(j-k) \in [0,1]$, for $j,k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, be such that for any cube $\Lambda$ and any $j \in \partial_R \Lambda$ we have*

$$||\nabla_j \mu_\Lambda f||_u \leq \sum_{k \in \Lambda \cup j} \varphi_{jk} \cdot ||\nabla_k f||_u$$

- *The local specification $\mathcal{E}$ will be called* **Strongly Mixing** *iff for any $j,k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have*

$$\textbf{(SM)} \qquad \varphi_{jk} \equiv \varphi(j-k) \leq \varphi_0 e^{-M_0 d(j,k)}$$

  *with some constants $\varphi_0, M_0 \in (0,\infty)$.*

It is known that (**SM**) implies (**SSG**) and (**SLS**), respectively, (see e.g. [1] and [14] - [16], [9] - [11], [8], [6],.., respectively).

Suppose for $X \in \mathcal{F}$, $diam(X) \leq R$, and every $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we are given a Markov generator $L_{X+j}$ in $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ such that

(i) If $f$ is $\Sigma_{X+j}$ - measurable that $L_{X+j} f$ is $\Sigma_{(X \cup \partial_R X)+j}$ - measurable, and
(ii) For any $f,g$ in its domain $\mathcal{D}(L_{X+j})$ we have

$$\mu_{X+j}^\omega (f L_{X+j} g) = \mu_{X+j}^\omega (g L_{X+j} f)$$

For $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ , we introduce a finite volume Markov generator $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda$ as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda \equiv \sum_{X_\alpha + j \subseteq \Lambda, \alpha} L_{X_\alpha + j}$$

with summation over a finite set of $\alpha$'s. Let $P_t^\Lambda \equiv e^{t\mathcal{L}_\Lambda}$ denotes the corresponding Markov semigroup on $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$.We introduce also a densely defined on smooth cylinder function Markov pre - generator

$$\mathcal{L} f \equiv \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \alpha} L_{X_\alpha + j} f = \lim_{\Lambda \to \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{L}_\Lambda f$$

For $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda$ the corresponding Dirichlet form with the measure $\mu$ and $\mu_\Lambda^\omega$ will be denoted by

$$\mathbf{D}_\mu(f) \equiv \mu\left(f(-\mathcal{L}f)\right)$$

and

$$\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda,\omega}(f) \equiv \mathbf{D}_{\mu_\Lambda^\omega}(f) \equiv \mu_\Lambda^\omega\left(f(-\mathcal{L}_\Lambda f)\right)$$

respectively.

Under very general conditions, see e.g. [5, 10], it extends to a Markov generator (denoted later on by the same symbol) of the semigroup $P_t \equiv e^{t\mathcal{L}}$ and on cylinder functions we have

$$P_t f \equiv \lim_{\Lambda \to \mathbb{Z}^d} P_t^\Lambda f$$

**Definition 1.3.**

- *The family $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}}$ is called* ***locally conservative*** *iff for every cube $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$, the subspace $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda \subset \mathbb{L}_2(\mu_\Lambda^\omega)$ of $\Sigma_\Lambda$ - measurable functions which satisfy*

$$(\circledast) \qquad \mathcal{L}_\Lambda f = 0$$

  *is nontrivial, i.e. contains nonconstant functions.*

- *The family* $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ *has a* ***local Spectral Gap property*** *iff, for every cube* $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$*, there is* $m_\Lambda \in (0,\infty)$ *such that*

$$(*) \qquad m_\Lambda \cdot \mu^\omega_\Lambda(f-\mu^\omega_\Lambda f)^2 \le \mathbf{D}_{\Lambda,\omega}(f)$$

*for every* $\omega\in\Omega$ *and any* $f$ *belonging to the set* $\aleph_\Lambda$ *of* $\Sigma_\Lambda$ *- measurable functions orthogonal to* $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda$ *for which the right hand side is finite*

- *The family* $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ *satisfies a* ***local Logarithmic Sobolev inequality*** *iff for every cube* $\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}$ *there is* $c_\Lambda\in(0,\infty)$ *such that*

$$(**) \qquad \mu^\omega_\Lambda(f\log\frac{f}{\mu^\omega_\Lambda f}) \le c_\Lambda\cdot \mathbf{D}_{\Lambda,\omega}(f^{\frac12})$$

*for every* $\omega\in\Omega$ *and any nonnegative function* $f\in\aleph_\Lambda$ *for which the right hand side is finite*

Later on we will consider nonnegative (nonlinear) convex functionals $\{A_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ defined on a dense domain in $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ and vanishing on constants. Such functional will be called *subadditive* iff

$$(1.1) \qquad \forall \Lambda_1,\Lambda_2\in\mathcal{F},\ \Lambda_1\cap\Lambda_2=\emptyset \qquad A_{\Lambda_1}(f)+A_{\Lambda_2}(f)\le A_{\Lambda_1\cup\Lambda_2}(f)$$

We will restrict ourselves to the homogenous functionals of degree 2, i.e. such that for ever $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}^+$, we have

$$(1.2) \qquad A_\Lambda(\lambda f) = \lambda^2 A_\Lambda(f)$$

Let $A$ denote the functional defined by

$$(1.3) \qquad A(f) \equiv \lim_{\Lambda\to\mathbb{Z}^d} A_\Lambda(f)$$

In our further considerations the following additional properties of the stochastic dynamic will play an important role.

**Definition 1.4.**

- *A locally conservative family* $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ *is called* ***asymptotically diffusive*** *iff for every cube* $\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}$*, there are* $m_\Lambda\equiv m(|\Lambda|)\in(0,\infty)$*,* $m_\Lambda\to_{|\Lambda|\to\infty}0$ *and* $\varepsilon_\Lambda\equiv\varepsilon(|\Lambda|)\in(0,\infty)$*,* $\varepsilon_\Lambda\to_{|\Lambda|\to\infty}0$*, such that we have*

$$(\circledast\circledast) \qquad \mu^\omega_\Lambda(f-\mu^\omega_\Lambda f)^2 \le m_\Lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda,\omega}(f)+\varepsilon_\Lambda\cdot A_\Lambda(f)$$

*with some subadditive functional* $A_\Lambda(\cdot)$*, for any function* $f$ *for which the right hand side is finite.*

- *A locally conservative family* $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ *is called* ***S-asymptotically diffusive*** *iff for every cube* $\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}$*, there are* $c_\Lambda\in(0,\infty)$*,* $c_\Lambda\equiv c(|\Lambda|)\to_{|\Lambda|\to\infty}\infty$ *and* $\varepsilon_\Lambda\in(0,\infty)$*,* $\varepsilon_\Lambda\equiv\varepsilon(|\Lambda|)\to_{|\Lambda|\to\infty}0$*, such that we have*

$$(\circledast\circledast\circledast) \qquad \mu^\omega_\Lambda(f\log\frac{f}{\mu^\omega_\Lambda f}) \le c_\Lambda\cdot\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda,\omega}(f^{\frac12})+\varepsilon_\Lambda\cdot A_\Lambda(f^{\frac12})$$

*with some subadditive functional* $A_\Lambda(\cdot)$ *satisfying*

$$(1.4) \qquad A_\Lambda((Ef)^{\frac12}) \le A_\Lambda(f^{\frac12})$$

*with any conditional expectation* $E$*, for all nonnegative functions* $f$ *for which the right hand side of* $(\circledast\circledast\circledast)$ *is finite.*

In this Section we prove the following general result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose the local specification $\mathcal{E}$ of range $R$ satisfies* Strong Mixing condition.

(I) *If a locally conservative family $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ is* asymptotically diffusive, *then the following inequality is true*

$$\mu(f-\mu f)^2 \leq m_\Lambda^{-1}\cdot \mathbf{D}_\mu(f) + \widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda \cdot \widetilde{A}(f) \tag{1.5}$$

*with some $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda \in (0,\infty)$, $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda \to_{\Lambda\to\mathbb{Z}^d} 0$ and some functional $\widetilde{A}(\cdot)$, for any function $f$ for which the right hand side is finite.*

(II) *If a locally conservative family $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ is* S-asymptotically diffusive, *then the following inequality is true*

$$\mu(f\log\frac{f}{\mu f}) \leq c_\Lambda \cdot \mathbf{D}_\mu(f^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda \cdot \widetilde{A}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}) \tag{1.6}$$

*with some $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda \in (0,\infty)$, $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda \to_{\Lambda\to\mathbb{Z}^d} 0$ and some functional $\widetilde{A}(\cdot)$, for any non-negative function $f$ for which the right hand side is finite.*

*Proof of Theorem* 1.1, (I): Let $\Lambda_0$ be a reference cube of side $L$ in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For $i\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\Lambda_i := \Lambda_0 + i(L+2R)$ be the translate of $\Lambda_0$ by a vector $i(L+2R)\in\mathbb{Z}^d$. It will be convenient to label all these translated cubes by a natural number; we thus obtain a family of cubes $\{\Lambda_\ell\}_1^\infty$such that for $\ell\neq\ell'$, $\mathrm{d}(\Lambda_\ell,\Lambda_{\ell'})\geq 2R$. Let $\{Y_\ell\}_0^\infty$ be the increasing sequence defined by $Y_0:=\emptyset$, $Y_\ell := \bigcup_{\ell'\leq\ell}\Lambda_{\ell'}$, if $\ell\geq 1$. Let $\Gamma_0\equiv\bigcup_\ell Y_\ell$. To $\{Y_\ell\}_0^\infty$ we associate a family $\{E_\ell\}_0^\infty$ of conditional expectations defined by $E_0 f = f$ and for $\ell>0$, $E_\ell f(\omega) := \mu_{Y_\ell}^\omega f$, for any $f\in\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$.

We then have

$$f(\omega) - \mu_{\Gamma_0}^\omega\, f = \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty (f_{\ell-1}(\omega) - f_\ell(\omega)) \tag{1.7}$$

where $f_\ell := E_\ell f = \mu_{\Lambda_\ell}^\omega f_{\ell-1}$. The series on the right hand side of (1.7) is actually a finite sum when $f$ is a cylinder function (i.e. depends only on a finite number of coordinates) and is absolutely convergent if $f\in\mathcal{C}_1(\Omega)$

Since the sequence $f_\ell$ has orthogonal increments, we get

$$\mu\,(f-\mu\, f)^2 \;=\; \mu\,(\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\, f - \mu\, f)^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \mu\,(f_{\ell-1}-f_\ell)^2 \tag{1.8}$$

$$=\; \mu\,(\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\, f - \mu\, f)^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \mu\,\left(\mu_{\Lambda_\ell}^{\cdot}(f_{\ell-1} - \mu_{\Lambda_\ell}^{\cdot} f_{\ell-1})^2\right) \tag{1.9}$$

We estimate first every term in the infinite sum on the right hand side. We note that keeping the variables outside $\Lambda_\ell$ fixed, we can use the asymptotic diffusivity inequality (1.1) for the cube $\Lambda_\ell$ (of side $L$) and the function $f_{\ell-1}$to get

$$\mu_{\Lambda_\ell}^\omega\left(f_{\ell-1} - \mu_{\Lambda_\ell}^\omega f_{\ell-1}\right)^2 \leq m(L^d)^{-1}\cdot \mathbf{D}_{\Lambda_\ell,\omega}(f_{\ell-1}) + \varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A_{\Lambda_\ell}(f_{\ell-1}) \tag{1.10}$$

Using the fact that our cubes are separated by $2R$ and our local specification is of range $R$, we have

$$\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda_\ell,\omega}(f_{\ell-1}) = \mathbf{D}_{\Lambda_\ell,\omega}(\mu_{Y_{\ell-1}}^{\cdot} f) \leq \mu_{Y_\ell}^\omega\left(\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda_\ell,\omega}(f)\right) \tag{1.11}$$

Also by convexity of our subadditive functionals we get

$$A_{\Lambda_\ell}(f_{\ell-1}) \leq A_{\Lambda_\ell}(f) \tag{1.12}$$

This together with (1.8) give

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\,(f-\mu\ f)^2 &\leq \mu\,(\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f-\mu\ f)^2+\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}\left\{m(L^d)^{-1}\cdot\mu\,(\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda_\ell,\omega}(f))+\varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A_{\Lambda_\ell}(f)\right\} \\ &\leq m(L^d)^{-1}\cdot\mathbf{D}_\mu(f)+\varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A(f)+\mu(\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f-\mu\ f)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

where in the last step we have used the definitions of our Dirichlet forms and our assumption about the subadditivity of the family $\{A_{\Lambda_\ell}\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$. To estimate the last term on the right hand side of (1.13) we note that, under the Strong Mixing condition, the measure satisfies (**SSG**) inequality, [1],.... Therefore we have

$$\mu(\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f-\mu\ f)^2 \leq M_\mu^{-1}\cdot\mu|\nabla\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f|^2 \tag{1.14}$$

We observe that

$$|\nabla\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f|^2=\sum_{j\in\complement\Gamma_0}|\nabla_j\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f|^2 \tag{1.15}$$

and that by our construction for every $j\in\complement\Gamma_0$ there is a unique cube $\Lambda_{\ell(j)}$ such that $j\in\partial_R\Lambda_{\ell(j)}$ which implies

$$|\nabla_j\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f|^2 \leq ||\nabla_j\mu_{\Lambda_{\ell(j)}}^{\cdot}\ f||_u^2 \tag{1.16}$$

Thus using (1.14)-(1.16) together with the Strong Mixing condition, we get

$$\mu(\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f-\mu\ f)^2 \leq M_\mu^{-1}\cdot\sum_{\ell}\sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_\ell}\left(\sum_{k\in\Lambda_\ell\cup j}\varphi_{jk}\cdot||\nabla_k f||_u\right)^2 \tag{1.17}$$

which with the use of Hölder inequality can be transformed to the following

$$\mu(\mu_{\Gamma_0}^{\cdot}\ f-\mu\ f)^2 \leq M_\mu^{-1}\cdot\sup_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_0}\left(\sum_{k\in\Lambda_0\cup j}\varphi_{jk}\right)\cdot\sum_{\ell}\sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_\ell}\sum_{k\in\Lambda_\ell\cup j}\varphi_{jk}\cdot||\nabla_k f||_u^2 \tag{1.18}$$

Using this and (1.13) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\,(f-\mu\ f)^2 &\leq m(L^d)^{-1}\cdot\mathbf{D}_\mu(f)+\varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A(f)+ \\ &+M_\mu^{-1}\cdot\sup_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_0}\left(\sum_{k\in\Lambda_0\cup j}\varphi_{jk}\right)\cdot\sum_{\ell}\sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_\ell}\sum_{k\in\Lambda_\ell\cup j}\varphi_{jk}\cdot||\nabla_k f||_u^2 \end{aligned} \tag{1.19}$$

Now we take an advantage of the fact that the position of our standard cube $\Lambda_0$ was arbitrary and thus we can replace the inequality (1.19) by its average with respect to the translations $a=(a^1,...,a^d)$ in the cube $\overline{\Lambda}_0$ of side $L+R$ centered at the origin. Using the Strong Mixing condition we have

$$\frac{1}{(L+R)^d}\sum_{a\in\overline{\Lambda}_0}\sum_{\ell}\sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_\ell+a}\sum_{k\in(\Lambda_\ell+a)\cup j}\varphi_{jk}\cdot||\nabla_k f||_u^2 \leq \tag{1.20}$$

$$\leq \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{(L+R)^d} \left\{ \sum_{a\in\overline{\Lambda}_0} \sum_{\ell:[(\Lambda_\ell\cup\partial_R\Lambda_\ell)+a]\ni k} \sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_\ell+a} \varphi_{jk} \right\} \cdot ||\nabla_k f||_u^2$$

$$\leq C\frac{1}{L}\cdot \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} ||\nabla_k f||_u^2$$

with

$$C \equiv \max_{L\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(L+R)^{d-1}} \cdot \left\{ \sum_{a\in\overline{\Lambda}_0} \sum_{\ell:[(\Lambda_\ell\cup\partial_R\Lambda_\ell)+a]\ni k} \sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda_\ell+a} \varphi_{jk} \right\}$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\mu\,(f-\mu\ f)^2 \leq m(L^d)^{-1}\cdot \mathbf{D}_\mu(f) + \varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A(f) + C\frac{1}{L}\cdot\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}||\nabla_k f||_u^2 \tag{1.21}$$

Choosing

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}(L^d) \equiv \max\{\varepsilon(L^d), C\frac{1}{L}\} \tag{1.22}$$

and

$$\widetilde{A}(f) \equiv A(f) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}||\nabla_k f||_u^2 \tag{1.23}$$

we get the first part of the Theorem *1.1.*

*Proof of Theorem 1.1,* (II): The proof of the second part is similar. We use first the following martingale decomposition of entropy

$$\mu f\log\frac{f}{\mu f} = \mu\left(\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f\log\frac{\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f}{\mu\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f}\right) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}\mu\left(\mu^{\cdot}_{\Lambda_\ell}(f_{\ell-1}\log\frac{f_{\ell-1}}{\mu^{\cdot}_{\Lambda_\ell}f_{\ell-1}}\right) \tag{1.24}$$

We estimate each term in the sum on the right hand side using S-asymptotic diffusivity property as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda_\ell}(f_{\ell-1}\log\frac{f_{\ell-1}}{\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda_\ell}f_{\ell-1}}) &\leq c(L^d)\cdot\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda_\ell,\omega}(f^{\frac12}_{\ell-1}) + \varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A_{\Lambda_\ell}(f^{\frac12}_{\ell-1}) \\ &\leq c(L^d)\cdot\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda_\ell,\omega}(f^{\frac12}) + \varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A_{\Lambda_\ell}(f^{\frac12}) \end{aligned} \tag{1.25}$$

(where in the second line we have used our assumption (1.4)). This implies the following bound

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}\mu\left(\mu^{\cdot}_{\Lambda_\ell}(f_{\ell-1}\log\frac{f_{\ell-1}}{\mu^{\cdot}_{\Lambda_\ell}f_{\ell-1}}\right) \leq c(L^d)\cdot\mathbf{D}_\mu(f^{\frac12}) + \varepsilon(L^d)\cdot A(f^{\frac12}) \tag{1.26}$$

The first term on the right hand side of (1.24) is estimated using the Standard Logarithmic Sobolev inequality for the measure $\mu$. We get

$$\mu\left(\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f\log\frac{\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f}{\mu(\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f)}\right) \leq c_\mu\cdot\mu|\nabla(\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f)^{\frac12}|^2 \leq c_\mu\cdot\sum_{j\in\complement\Gamma_0}||\nabla_j(\mu^{\cdot}_{\Gamma_0} f)^{\frac12}||_u^2 \tag{1.27}$$

Since one can show, see e.g. [9, 11], that under the Strong Mixing condition we have

$$|\nabla_j(\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda}\ f)^{\frac12}| \leq \sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda}\sum_{k\in\Lambda\cup j}\widetilde{\varphi}_{jk}||\nabla_k f^{\frac12}||_u \tag{1.28}$$

with

$$\sum_{j\in\partial_R\Lambda}\sum_{k\in\Lambda\cup j}\widetilde{\varphi}_{jk}\leq C_1(\log L)^d \tag{1.29}$$

for some constant $C_1\in(0,\infty)$, by similar arguments as before one can get the following estimate

$$\frac{1}{L^d}\sum_{a\in\overline{\Lambda}_0}\mu\left(\mu_{\Gamma_0+a}^{\cdot}\, f\log\frac{\mu_{\Gamma_0+a}^{\cdot}\, f}{\mu\mu_{\Gamma_0+a}^{\cdot}\, f}\right)\leq C_2\frac{(\log L)^{2d}}{L}\cdot\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}||\nabla_k f^{\frac{1}{2}}||_u^2 \tag{1.30}$$

with some constant $C_2\in(0,\infty)$. Using (1.24) - (1.30) we get the desired **(LN)** inequality with

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}(L^d)\equiv\max\{\varepsilon(L^d),C_2\frac{(\log L)^{2d}}{L}\} \tag{1.31}$$

and

$$\widetilde{A}(f^{\frac{1}{2}})\equiv A(f^{\frac{1}{2}})+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}||\nabla_k f^{\frac{1}{2}}||_u^2 \tag{1.32}$$

This ends the proof of the second part and so of Theorem 1.1.

**Remark 1.1.** *In the continuous case the factor* $(\log L)^{2d}$ *can be omitedomitted..*

□

## 2. The Nash Inequalities for Gibbs Measures.

In this Section we show that the strategy described in the previous Section can be applied in nontrivial situation of particle systems with nonzero interaction.

We choose now a configuration space to be given by $\Omega\equiv\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ . Let $\Phi\equiv\{\Phi_X\}_{X\in\mathcal{F}}$ be a translation interaction potential of a finite range $R>0$, i.e. a family consisting of continuous real functions such that for every $X\in\mathcal{F}$ the function $\Phi_X$ is $\Sigma_X$ measurable and we have $\Phi_Y\equiv 0$ if $\mathrm{diam}(Y)>R$. Let $||\Phi||\equiv\sum_{X\ni 0}||\Phi_X||_u$. For the reasons which will more clear later, we distinguish the one particle potential $\Phi^{(1)}\equiv\{\Phi_{\{i\}}\equiv-\lambda\sigma_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$, where $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma_i$ is called a chemical potential and the coordinate function at the point $i\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, respectively. One defines a finite volume energy $U_\Lambda$ in $\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}$ corresponding to the interaction potential $\Phi$, by

$$U_\Lambda\equiv\sum_{X\in\mathcal{F}:X\cap\Lambda\neq\emptyset}\Phi_X$$

and a finite volume Gibbs measure $\mu_\Lambda^\omega$ at $\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}$ with boundary conditions given by a configuration $\omega\in\Omega$ as follows

$$\mu_\Lambda^\omega(f)\equiv\frac{\mu_{0|\Lambda}\left(e^{-U(\widetilde{\omega}\bullet_\Lambda\omega)}f(\widetilde{\omega}\bullet_\Lambda\omega)\right)}{\mu_{0|\Lambda}\left(e^{-U(\widetilde{\omega}\bullet_\Lambda\omega)}\right)} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mu_{0|\Lambda}$ denotes the integration with respect to symmetric product measure on $\Omega$ restricted to $\Sigma_\Lambda$. To stress the dependence of $\mu_\Lambda^\omega$ on the one particle potential $\Phi^{(1)}$, we will also use a notation $\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega=\mu_\Lambda^\omega$. It is standard that the family $\mathcal{E}_\lambda\equiv\{\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega:\omega\in\Omega,\,\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}\}$ is a local specification. For the rest of this paper we will take on the following

**Assumption:**

*The local specification $\mathcal{E}_\lambda \equiv \{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda} : \omega \in \Omega,\ \Lambda \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is Strongly Mixing.*

Let

$$\delta_{ij} f(\omega) \equiv f(T_{ij}\omega) - f(\omega)$$

where $T_{ij}$ is a measurable bijection on $\Omega$ defined by

$$(T_{ij}\omega)_l \equiv \begin{cases} \omega_j \text{ if } l = i \\ \omega_i \text{ if } l = j \\ \omega_l \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For later purposes we note that

$$\delta_{ij} f(\omega) = [\omega_i(1-\omega_j) + \omega_j(1-\omega_i)] \cdot (\nabla_i - T_{i,j}\nabla_j) f(\omega) \tag{2.2}$$

where, in this section,

$$\nabla_i f(\omega) := f(\omega^i) - f(\omega)$$

with $\omega^i(j) := 1 - \omega(i)$, if $j = i$ and $\omega(j)$ otherwise.

We introduce the following elementary Markov operator

$$\mathcal{L}_{ij} f(\omega) \equiv c_{ij}(\omega)\delta_{ij} f(\omega) \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$c_{ij}(\omega) \equiv \frac{e^{-\delta_{ij}U_{\{ij\}}}}{(1 + e^{-\delta_{ij}U_{\{ij\}}})} \tag{2.4}$$

We remark that $c_{ij}(\omega) = c_{ji}(\omega)$ and that these coefficients are independent of the one particle potential . Moreover we have

$$0 < \left(1 + e^{2\sup\limits_{ij} \|\delta_{ij}U_{\{ij\}}\|_u}\right)^{-1} \leq c_{ji}(\omega) \leq 1 \tag{2.5}$$

the lower bound being also independent of the one particle potential. It is not difficult to see that for any $\Lambda \ni i, j$ we have

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(g\mathcal{L}_{ij} f) = \mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f\mathcal{L}_{ij} g) \tag{2.6}$$

Let us introduce a Markov (pre-)generator $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda$, $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ defined (on the dense set $\mathcal{C}_1$), as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda \equiv \sum_{\langle ij\rangle \subset \Lambda} \mathcal{L}_{ij} \tag{2.7}$$

where the summation is running over the nearest neighbors pairs $\langle ij\rangle$ of points contained in the set $\Lambda$. If $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^d$ , we will suppress the corresponding subscript from the notation.

We note that the family $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}}$ is *locally conservative.* In fact it is not difficult to see that for any characteristic function

$$\chi_{\Lambda,n}(\omega) \equiv \chi(N_\Lambda(\omega) = n) \tag{2.8}$$

with $n = 0, ..., |\Lambda|$, and where

$$N_\Lambda(\omega) \equiv \sum_{i\in\Lambda} \omega_i$$

we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda \chi_{\Lambda,n} = 0 \tag{2.9}$$

Thus $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda$ vanishes on all functions which are measurable with respect to the $\sigma$-algebra $\Sigma(N_\Lambda) \subset \Sigma_\Lambda$ generated by $N_\Lambda$. In particular this is satisfied on any function of the form

$$\psi_{\Lambda,n} \equiv \sum_{X \in \mathcal{F}_n(\Lambda)} \omega_X \tag{2.10}$$

where $\omega_X \equiv \prod_{i\in X} \omega_i$ and $\mathcal{F}_n(\Lambda) \equiv \{X \subset \Lambda : |X| = n\}$. The functions $\psi_{\Lambda,n}$, $n = 1, ..., |\Lambda|$, together with a constant function span $\mathbb{L}_2(\Sigma(N_\Lambda), \mu^\omega_\Lambda \restriction \Sigma(N_\Lambda))$.

It is a standard matter to show that $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda$ extends to a Markov generator, [5], denoted later on by the same symbol. Let $P^{(\Lambda)}_t \equiv e^{t\mathcal{L}_\Lambda}$ and $P_t \equiv e^{t\mathcal{L}}$ be the corresponding Markov semigroup, respectively. Using the property (2.6) one can show that for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any Gibbs measure $\mu \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}_\lambda)$ we have

$$\mu(g\mathcal{L}f) = \mu(f\mathcal{L}g) \tag{2.11}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{C}_1$, and similarly for any finite set $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ and any boundary condition $\omega \in \Omega$, we have

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(g\mathcal{L}_\Lambda f) = \mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f\mathcal{L}_\Lambda g) \tag{2.12}$$

This in particular implies that the set of all invariant measures for $P_t$ contains an uncountable set $\cup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}_\lambda)$. For more information about the structure of the set of invariant measures see [3, 12].

We will like to study the ergodic properties of the infinite volume Markov semigroup via the strategy based on general Nash coercive inequalities, (i.e. some lower bounds on the corresponding Dirichlet form of the generator). Under the condition (2.5), it is sufficient to study the following equivalent quadratic form

$$\mathbf{D}_\lambda(f) \equiv \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle} \mu_\lambda |\delta_{ij} f|^2 \tag{2.13}$$

where $\mu_\lambda \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}_\lambda)$ (is - under the Strong Mixing assumption - the unique Gibbs measure for $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$). Respectively in a finite volume $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$, instead of the quadratic form of $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda$ in $\mathbb{L}_2(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda})$, it will be more convenient to study the following equivalent form

$$\mathbf{D}^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f) \equiv \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\subset\Lambda} \mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda} |\delta_{ij} f|^2 \tag{2.14}$$

Using this forms give us the advantage that all our inequalities remain true for other generators constructed with rates given by

$$c'_{ij} = a_{ij} c_{ij}$$

where $a_{ij}$ is symmetric in $i$ and $j$, uniformly bounded and strictly positive functions independent of $\omega_i$ and $\omega_j$.

To formulate the main result of this Section let us introduce the following seminorm

$$|||f|||_{\Lambda,q} \equiv \left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda} ||\nabla_i f||^q_u\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \tag{2.15}$$

In this Section we prove the following result.

**Theorem 2.1.**

(i) *The family* $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ *is asymptotically diffusive in the sense that for any* $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$, $q\in[1,2)$ *and any cube* $\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}$, $\omega\in\Omega$, *we have*

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f-\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}f)^2 \le m_\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{D}^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f)+\varepsilon_\Lambda|||f|||^2_{\Lambda,q} \tag{2.16}$$

*with*

$$m_\Lambda \equiv m_0^{-1}|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}$$

$$\varepsilon_\Lambda \equiv \varepsilon_0|\Lambda|^{-(\frac{2}{q}-1)}$$

*for some constants* $m_0$ *and* $\varepsilon_0$ *independent of* $\Lambda$, $\omega$, $q$ *and any function* $f$.

(ii) *The family* $\{\mathcal{L}_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}}$ *is* $S$ *- asymptotically diffusive in the sense that for any* $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$, $q\in[1,2)$ *and any cube* $\Lambda\in\mathcal{F}$, $\omega\in\Omega$, *we have*

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\log\frac{f}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}f}\right) \le c_\Lambda\mathbf{D}^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f^{\frac{1}{2}})+\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda|||f^{\frac{1}{2}}|||^2_{\Lambda,q} \tag{2.17}$$

*with*

$$c_\Lambda \equiv c_0|\Lambda|^{1+\frac{2}{d}}$$

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\Lambda \equiv \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0|\Lambda|^{-(\frac{2}{q}-1)}$$

*for some constants* $c_0$ *and* $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0$ *independent of* $\Lambda$, $\omega$, $q$ *and a function* $f$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 : Asymptotic Diffusivity.

We begin by observing that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f-\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}f)^2 &= \mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\left[f-\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\right]^2\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\right)\\ &\quad+\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)-\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f)\right)^2\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

with $\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\cdot\middle|N_\Lambda\right)$ denoting the conditional expectation knowing $N_\Lambda$ associated to the measure $\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}$ and is given by

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda=k\right)=\frac{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_{\Lambda,k}f)}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_{\Lambda,k})}\equiv\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f) \tag{2.19}$$

where the notation introduced on the right hand side emphasizes the fact that this conditional expectation is independent of the chemical potential $\lambda$. To estimate the first term on the right hand side of (2.18) we note that, [6], there is a constant $a_0\in(0,\infty)$ such that for any $n=1,..,|\Lambda|$ we have

$$\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f-\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda f)^2\le a_0|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f) \tag{$\mathbf{SG}(\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda)$}$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f)\equiv\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\subset\Lambda}\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda|\delta_{ij}f|^2$$

Therefore we get

$$\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\left[f-\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\right]^2\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\right)\leq a_0|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f) \tag{2.20}$$

To estimate the second term on the right hand side of (2.18) we note that under assumption of strong mixing the finite volume measures satisfy the following *Standard Spectral Gap inequality*

$$\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}(g-\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}g)^2\leq M^{-1}\cdot\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}|\nabla_i g|^2 \tag{\textbf{SSG}}$$

with some constant $M\in(0,\infty)$ independent of $\Lambda,\omega$ and $f$, (in fact a weaker mixing

property suffices, [1]). To apply this in our situation we will need the following simple lemma proven in [2], (see proof of the lemma in the Appendix)

**Lemma 2.2.** *For any real function $F$ and any finite set $\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}^d$ we have*

(2.21)

$$\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left|\nabla_i F\left(\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\,|N_\Lambda\right)\right)\right|^2=\sum_{k=1}^{|\Lambda|}\left|F\left(\mu^{k,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)\right)-F\left(\mu^{k-1,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)\right)\right|^2 k\cdot\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\,\chi_k+$$

$$+\sum_{k=0}^{|\Lambda|-1}\left|F\left(\mu^{k+1,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)\right)-F\left(\mu^{k,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)\right)\right|^2(|\Lambda|-k)\cdot\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\,\chi_k$$

Using (**SSG**) together with (2.21) for $F(x)=x$, we obtain

$$M\ \mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)-\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f)\right)^2\leq \tag{2.22}$$

$$\leq\sum_{k=1}^{|\Lambda|}\left|\mu^{k,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)-\mu^{k-1,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)\right|^2 k\cdot\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_k)+\sum_{k=0}^{|\Lambda|-1}\left|\mu^{k+1,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)-\mu^{k,\omega}_{\Lambda}(f)\right|^2(|\Lambda|-k)\cdot\mu^{\omega}_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_k)$$

The estimate of the right hand side will be based on the following lemma

**Lemma 2.3.** *There are constants $a_1,a_2$ depending only on $\Phi$, such that for any cube $\Lambda$ and any boundary condition $\omega$, we have*

(2.23)

$$\left|\mu^{k,\omega}_{\Lambda}f-\mu^{k-1,\omega}_{\Lambda}f\right|^2\leq a_1\frac{1}{\max(k,|\Lambda|-k)}\cdot\mu^{k,\omega}_{\Lambda}\left(f-\mu^{k,\omega}_{\Lambda}f\right)^2+a_2\cdot\left(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u\right)^2$$

*for any $k=1,\dots,|\Lambda|$*

We will prove this lemma later. Now assuming it, we see that if the estimate $\mathbf{SG}(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega})$ is true, [6], then using Lemma 2.3 to bound the first and the second sum from the right hand side (2.22), respectively, one easily gets the following estimate

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)-\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f)\right)^2\le \tag{2.24}$$

$$\le 2a_1M^{-1}\cdot|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f)+2a_2M^{-1}\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u\right)^2$$

Combining this together with (2.18) - (2.20) we arrive at the following inequality

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f-\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}f)^2\le m_0^{-1}\cdot|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f)+\varepsilon_0\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u\right)^2 \tag{2.25}$$

with some constants $m_{0,}\ \varepsilon_0\in(0,\infty)$. From this the general case with $q\in[1,2)$ follows by a simple use of Hölder inequality. This ends the proof of asymptotic diffusivity estimate (2.16) assuming Lemma 2.3. □

*Proof of Lemma* 2.3.We begin from recalling a lemma, [6, Lemma 3.1], which allows us to compare the (mutually singular) measures $\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}$ and $\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}$. Let

$$G_i(\eta):=(1-\eta_i)\exp\{-\nabla_i U_\Lambda(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)\} \tag{2.26}$$

$$\widehat{G}_i(\eta):=\eta_i\exp\{-\nabla_i U_\Lambda(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)\} \tag{2.27}$$

We have

**Lemma 2.4.** *(*[6, Lemma 3.1]*)*

*The following identities hold for any bounded $\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}^d$ and each $\omega\in\Omega$*

(a)

(2.28)
$$\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f-\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}f=\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i\nabla_i f)-\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;G_i)/\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i)$$

(b)

(2.29)
$$\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}f-\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f=\frac{1}{|\Lambda|-k}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}((1-\eta_i)\nabla_i f)-\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(f;\widehat{G}_i)/\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\widehat{G}_i)$$

*for any $k=0,\dots,|\Lambda|-1$ and all functions $f$ on $\Omega_\Lambda$.*

*Proof of Lemma* 2.4. By the definition (2.19) of the measure $\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}$, we have

$$\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}f=\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i f)= \tag{2.30}$$

$$=-\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i\nabla_i f)+\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i f(\eta^i))$$

Now we need to study the second sum from the right hand side of (2.30). By the change of variable $\eta^i = \zeta$, we get

$$\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i f(\eta^i)) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(k+1,\omega)} \sum_{\eta\in\Omega_\Lambda} e^{-U_\Lambda(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)}\chi_{k+1}(\eta)\cdot\eta_i\cdot f(\eta^i) =$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(k+1,\omega)} \sum_{\zeta\in\Omega_\Lambda} e^{-\nabla_i U_\Lambda(\zeta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)}\chi_{\Lambda,k}(\zeta)\cdot[1-\zeta_i]\cdot f(\zeta) = \frac{Z_\Lambda(k,\omega)}{Z_\Lambda(k+1,\omega)}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(fG_i) = \\ &= \frac{Z_\Lambda(k,\omega)}{Z_\Lambda(k+1,\omega)}\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;G_i) + \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f\cdot\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}G_i\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $Z_\Lambda(k,\omega)$ and $Z_\Lambda(k+1,\omega)$ denote the corresponding normalization constants and $\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;G_i)$ the covariance of related functions. On the other hand by choosing $f\equiv 1$ and summing over $i\in\Lambda$ the above identity we find

$$\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}G_i = \frac{Z_\Lambda(k+1,\omega)}{Z_\Lambda(k,\omega)}$$

Whence

$$\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i f(\eta^i)) = \frac{\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;G_i)}{\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i)} + \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f$$

and thus (2.28) follows from (2.30). The dual identity (2.29) is proven in the similar way.

□

Now we note first that the first terms on the right hand sides of both cases in Lemma 2.4 have the same bound.

$$e^{4||\Phi||}\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\cdot\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u$$

This is because we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i\nabla_i f)\right| &\le \frac{1}{k+1}\cdot\sup_{i\in\Lambda}\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\eta_i)\right)\cdot\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u \\ &\le e^{4||\Phi||}\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\cdot\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{1}{|\Lambda|-k}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}((1-\eta_i)\nabla_i f)\right| &\le \frac{1}{|\Lambda|-k}\cdot\sup_{i\in\Lambda}\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(1-\eta_i)\right)\cdot\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u \\ &\le e^{4||\Phi||}\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\cdot\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

where the second step in these two inequalities is justified by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.5.** *([6, Lemma 3.3])*

*For any cube $\Lambda \subset \mathbf{Z}^d$ and each $\omega \in \Omega_{\Lambda^c}$*

$$e^{-4||\Phi||}\frac{k}{|\Lambda|} \leq \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_i) \leq e^{4||\Phi||}\frac{k}{|\Lambda|} \tag{2.33}$$

*and*

$$e^{-4||\Phi||}\left(1-\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\right) \leq \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(1-\eta_i) \leq e^{4||\Phi||}\left(1-\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\right) \tag{2.34}$$

*for any $k = 0, \dots, |\Lambda|$ and all $i \in \Lambda$.*

*Proof of Lemma* 2.5. We note that

$$\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_i) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(k,\omega)}\mu_{0|\Lambda}\left(e^{-U_\Lambda(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)}\chi_{\Lambda,k}(\eta)\cdot\eta_i\right) \leq$$

$$\leq e^{2||\Phi||}\frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(k,\omega)}\mu_{0|\Lambda}\left(e^{-(U_\Lambda(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)-U_i(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)-U_j(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega))}\chi_{\Lambda,k}(\eta)\cdot\eta_i\right) =$$

$$= e^{2||\Phi||}\frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(k,\omega)}\mu_{0|\Lambda}\left(e^{-(U_\Lambda(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)-U_i(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega)-U_j(\eta\bullet_\Lambda\omega))}\chi_{\Lambda,k}(\eta)\cdot\eta_j\right) \leq e^{4||\Phi||}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j) \tag{2.35}$$

and by similar arguments

$$e^{-4||\Phi||}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j) \leq \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_i) \tag{2.36}$$

Thence the desired bound (2.33) follows by averaging with respect to $j$ with use of the fact that by the definition of $\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}$ one has

$$\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\sum_{j\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j) = \frac{k}{|\Lambda|} \tag{2.37}$$

The bound (2.34) can be proven in a similar way. This ends the proof of Lemma 2.5. □

Now we need only to estimate the second term from the right hand side of (2.28) and (2.29), respectively, and finally, for a given $k$, choose the most convenient estimate. For this we note that by Hölder inequality, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;G_i)\right)^2 \leq \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;f)\cdot\left(\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i;G_j)\right) \tag{2.38}$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(f;\widehat{G}_i)\right)^2 \leq \mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(f;f)\cdot\left(\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\widehat{G}_i;\widehat{G}_j)\right) \tag{2.39}$$

Thus we need to estimate the following ratios

$$\frac{\left(\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i;G_j)\right)}{\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i)\right)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\left(\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\widehat{G}_i;\widehat{G}_j)\right)}{\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\widehat{G}_i)\right)^2} \tag{2.40}$$

To this end we note first that, using (2.26) and (2.27) together with Lemma 2.5, we have

$$e^{-4||\Phi||}(|\Lambda| - k) \leq \sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i) \tag{2.41}$$

and

$$e^{-4||\Phi||}(k+1) \leq \sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}\left(\widehat{G}_i\right) \tag{2.42}$$

Thus to get the bounds of the ratios from (2.40), we will need the following lemma which is proven in the Appendix A.

**Lemma 2.6.** *There is a constant $C \in (0,\infty)$ such that for any $k = 0, ..., |\Lambda| - 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i; G_j) \leq C \cdot (|\Lambda| - k) \tag{2.43}$$

*and*

$$\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\widehat{G}_i;\widehat{G}_j) \leq C \cdot (k+1) \tag{2.44}$$

With the above bounds we can now finish estimating the ratios given in (2.40). Using Lemma 2.5 together with (2.41), (respectively (2.42) in the second case), we get

$$\frac{\left(\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i; G_j)\right)}{\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i)\right)^2} \leq Ce^{8||\Phi||}\frac{1}{|\Lambda| - k} \tag{2.45}$$

and respectively in the second case

$$\frac{\left(\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}(\widehat{G}_i;\widehat{G}_j)\right)}{\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k+1,\omega}\left(\widehat{G}_i\right)\right)^2} \leq Ce^{8||\Phi||}\frac{1}{k+1} \tag{2.46}$$

From this and we obtain

$$2\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f; G_i)/\sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i)\right)^2 \leq 2Ce^{8||\Phi||}\frac{1}{|\Lambda| - k} \cdot \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(f - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega} f\right)^2 \tag{2.47}$$

and

$$2\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;\widehat{G}_i)/\sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(\widehat{G}_i\right)\right)^2 \leq 2Ce^{8||\Phi||}\frac{1}{k+1} \cdot \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(f - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega} f\right)^2 \tag{2.48}$$

Combining these bounds together with (2.31) and (2.32), we arrive at the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega} f - \mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega} f\right|^2 \quad \leq \quad & 2Ce^{8||\Phi||} \cdot \frac{1}{\max(k, |\Lambda| - k)} \cdot \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(f - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega} f\right)^2 \\ & +2e^{8||\Phi||} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\sum_{i\in\Lambda} ||\nabla_i f||_u\right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

This ends the proof of Lemma 2.3, hence of part (i) in Theorem 2.1. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1 : S - Asymptotic Diffusivity.

We begin by observing that

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\log\frac{f}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}f}\right) = \mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\log\frac{f}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)}\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\right) + \mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\log\frac{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}f}\right) \tag{2.50}$$

where, we recall,

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda=k\right)=\frac{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_{\Lambda,k}f)}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_{\Lambda,k})}\equiv\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f) \tag{2.51}$$

To estimate the first term on the right hand side of (2.50) we note that, [13], there is a constant $\overline{c}_0\in(0,\infty)$ such that for any $n=0,..,|\Lambda|$ we have

$$\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda\Big(f\log\frac{f}{\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda f}\Big)\le\overline{c}_0|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f^{\frac12}) \tag{$\mathbf{LN}(\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda)$}$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f^{\frac12})\equiv\frac12\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\subset\Lambda}\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda|\delta_{ij}f^{\frac12}|^2$$

Therefore we get

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\log\frac{f}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)}\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\right)\le\overline{c}_0|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(f^{\frac12}) \tag{2.52}$$

To estimate the second term on the right hand side of (2.50) we note that under assumption of strong mixing the finite volume measures satisfy the following *Standard Logarithmic Sobolev inequality*

$$\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\Big(g\log\frac{g}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}g}\Big)^2\le\overline{c}\cdot\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}|\nabla_i g^{\frac12}|^2 \tag{$\mathbf{SLN}$}$$

with some constant $\overline{c}\in(0,\infty)$ independent of $\Lambda,\omega$ and $f$.

Applying **SLN** and using Lemma 2.2 with $F$ denoting the square root we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)\log\frac{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}\left(f\middle|N_\Lambda\right)}{\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}f}\right)&\le\\ \le\ \overline{c}\sum_{k=1}^{|\Lambda|}&\left|\left(\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f)\right)^{\frac12}-\left(\mu^{k-1,\omega}_\Lambda(f)\right)^{\frac12}\right|^2k\cdot\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_k)\\ +\overline{c}\sum_{k=0}^{|\Lambda|-1}&\left|\left(\mu^{k+1,\omega}_\Lambda(f)\right)^{\frac12}-\left(\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda(f)\right)^{\frac12}\right|^2(|\Lambda|-k)\cdot\mu^\omega_{\Lambda,\lambda}(\chi_k)\end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

The estimate of the right hand side will be based on the following lemma

**Lemma 2.7.** *There are constants $b_1, b_2$ dependent only on $\Phi$, such that for any cube $\Lambda$ and any boundary condition $\omega$, we have*

$$\left|\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left(\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^2 \leq b_1 \cdot |\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}} \cdot \left[\mathbf{D}_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \mathbf{D}_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}})\right] + b_2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\sum_{i\in\Lambda} ||\nabla_i f^{\frac{1}{2}}||_u\right)^2 \tag{2.54}$$

*for any $k = 1, ..., |\Lambda|$.*

We will prove this lemma later. Now assuming it, we see that if the estimate $\mathbf{LN}(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega})$ is true, [13], then using Lemma 2.7 to bound the first and the second sum, respectively, from the right hand side of (2.53), one gets the following estimate

$$\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega\left(\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega(f|N_\Lambda)\log\frac{\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega(f|N_\Lambda)}{\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega f}\right) \leq$$

$$\leq 2b_1\overline{c}\cdot|\Lambda|^{1+\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega(f) + 2b_2\overline{c}\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u\right)^2 \tag{2.55}$$

Combining this together with (2.50) - (2.52) we arrive at the following inequality

$$\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega\left(f\log\frac{f}{\mu_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega f}\right) \leq c_0\cdot|\Lambda|^{1+\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\omega(f) + \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f||_u\right)^2 \tag{2.56}$$

with some constants $c_0$, $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0 \in (0,\infty)$. From this the general case with $q \in [1,2)$ follows by a simple use of Hölder inequality. This ends the proof of S - asymptotic diffusivity estimate (2.17) assuming Lemma 2.7. □

*Proof of Lemma* 2.7 We note first that we have

$$\left|\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left(\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right| = \left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f) - \mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right|\cdot\left|\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^{-1} \tag{2.57}$$

and

$$\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f) - \mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right| = \left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\otimes\widetilde{\mu}_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f-\widetilde{f})\right| = \left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\otimes\widetilde{\mu}_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\widetilde{f}^{\frac{1}{2}})(f^{\frac{1}{2}}+\widetilde{f}^{\frac{1}{2}})\right| \leq$$

$$\leq 2\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\otimes\widetilde{\mu}_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\widetilde{f}^{\frac{1}{2}})^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\cdot\left(\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \tag{2.58}$$

where $\widetilde{f}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is integrated with respect to the isomorphic copy $\widetilde{\mu}_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}$ of $\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}$. Using this we get

$$\left|\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left(\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right| \leq 4\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\otimes\widetilde{\mu}_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\widetilde{f}^{\frac{1}{2}})^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \tag{2.59}$$

$$\leq 2\left\{\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}})^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|\right\}$$

and from this

$$\left|\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}-\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^2\leq$$

$$\leq 12\left[\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}})^2+\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}})^2\right]+12\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^2 \tag{2.60}$$

Now we use the spectral gap inequality $\mathbf{SG}(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega})$ to estimate the first part from the right hand side of (2.60) as follows

$$12\left[\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}})^2+\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}})^2\right]\leq 12a_0|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\left[\mathbf{D}_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}})+\mathbf{D}_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}})\right] \tag{2.61}$$

The last part from the right hand side (2.60) can be estimated using Lemma 2.3 and $\mathbf{SG}(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega})$ as follows

$$12\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k-1,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^2\leq$$

$$\leq 12a_1\frac{1}{\max(k,|\Lambda|-k)}\cdot\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(f^{\frac{1}{2}}-\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}f^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2+12a_2\cdot\left(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f^{\frac{1}{2}}||_u\right)^2$$

$$\leq 12a_1\frac{1}{\max(k,|\Lambda|-k)}\cdot a_0|\Lambda|^{\frac{2}{d}}\cdot\mathbf{D}_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f^{\frac{1}{2}})+12a_2\cdot\left(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\sum_{i\in\Lambda}||\nabla_i f^{\frac{1}{2}}||_u\right)^2 \tag{2.62}$$

Combining (2.57) — (2.61) and (2.62), we arrive at the desired estimate. This ends the proof of Lemma 2.7. □

## 3. Some Final Remarks

In this paper we have shown that there is a systematic method of proving of coercive inequalities for a general class of nontrivial infinite dimensional models. In particular under general assumptions concerning the mixing property of a local specfication which assures that the corresponding unique Gibbs measure satisfies the Standard Spectral Gap and the Standard Logarithmic Sobolev inequality, we have shown that also a family of Generalized Nash and Logarithmic Nash inequalitites hold. The later type of inequalities provides us with new interesting bounds on entropy in terms of a Dirichlet forms related to some stochastic dynamics with a diffusive behaviour. On the other hand it can be considered as an interesting characterization of the domain of the generator of this dynamics.

To get another profit from our inequalities in the form of a control of the decay to equilibrium in $\mathbb{L}_2$ or entropy sense, one needs to get more information about monotonicity properties of the related $A$ functionals. For this it would be useful to have more information about monotone or bounded functionals for a given stochastic dynamics. In general it is a difficult and wide open question how characterize them and should be studied in a future. Here we would like to point out that in fact to get some decay it is sufficient to have a weaker property than monotonicity or boundedness, and for example the following fact is true.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let $\mu$ satisfies the General Nash Inequality*

$$\mu\,(f-\mu f)^2 \le \mathbf{D}(f)^\alpha A(f)^{1-\alpha} \tag{3.1}$$

*for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and a functional $A$ satisfying*

$$A(P_t f) \le \max\{1, t^\varepsilon\} B(f) \tag{3.2}$$

*for some $\varepsilon \in [0, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha})$ and a functional $B$ densely defined on some domain $\mathcal{D}(B)$. Let $\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$, then*

$$\mu\,(P_t f-\mu f)^2 \le \gamma^\gamma\,\frac{B(f)}{t^{\gamma-\varepsilon}} \tag{3.3}$$

*for any $t \ge \max\{1, (\frac{2\varepsilon}{\gamma+\varepsilon})^{\gamma/(\gamma-\varepsilon)}\}$ and each function $f \in \mathcal{D}(B) \cap \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{D})$.*

*Proof.*

We can assume $\mu f = 0$. Let us define $F(t) := \mu\,(P_t f)^2$; the inequalities (3.1) and (3.2) imply

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(t) = -2\mathbf{D}(P_t f) \le -2F(t)^{1/\alpha}\left(\max\{1,t^\varepsilon\}\right)^{-1/\gamma} B(f)^{-1/\gamma}$$

Solving the above differential inequality we get, for $t \ge 1$,

$$F(t) \le B(f)\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)^\gamma \left[1 + \frac{t^{1-\varepsilon/\gamma}-1}{1-\varepsilon/\gamma}\right]^{-\gamma}$$

and elementary estimates yield (3.3). □

Finally we would like to indicate that our analysis of the product case [2] suggests that, in case of the Kawasaki dynamics, it should be possible to get the coercive inequalities of interest to us also with some functionals which could give some faster decay to equilibrium. This problem should also be studied in a future.

## Appendix A. Covariance estimates for Canonical Gibbs measures

In this appendix we prove the technical estimates used in the proof of Theorem 2.1. We shall need some mixing property for the canonical Gibbs measures $\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}$, which are formulated in the Lemma below, see [6, A.2] and [13].

**Lemma A.1.** *There exist a summable function $\varphi\colon \mathbb{Z}^d \mapsto [0,\infty)$ and a constant $B_0 \in (0,\infty)$ dependent only on the interaction $\Phi$, such that for any cube $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f;g)\right| \le B_0 \cdot |\mathrm{supp} f|\,|\mathrm{supp} g|\,||f||_u\,||g||_u \left[|\Lambda|^{-1} + \varphi\left(d(\mathrm{supp} f, \mathrm{supp} g)\right)\right] \tag{A.1}$$

*for any $k = 0,\dots,|\Lambda|$ and all functions $f, g$ on $\Omega_\Lambda$.*

As a consequence we get the following estimate on the dependence of $\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}$ on the boundary condition $\omega$.

**Lemma A.2.** *([6, Lemma 3.2])There is a constant $B_1 \in (0,\infty)$ dependent only on the interaction $\Phi$, such that for any cube $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and each $i \in \partial_R \Lambda$*

$$\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega^i}(f) - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right| \leq B_1 \cdot |\mathrm{supp} f| \; ||f||_u \left[|\Lambda|^{-1} + \varphi\left(d(i, \mathrm{supp} f)\right)\right] \tag{A.2}$$

*for any $k = 0, \ldots, |\Lambda|$ and any function $f$ on $\Omega_\Lambda$.*

*Proof.* Let $h_i = d\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega^i}/d\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}$ be the Radon–Nikodym derivative; we then have

$$\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega^i}(f) - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right| = \left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left[f; h_i\right]\right|$$

since $\|h_i\|_u \leq \exp\{4\|\Phi\|\}$ and supp $h_i \subset \{j \in \Lambda \ : \ d(i,j) \leq R\}$, we have, by Lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega^i}(f) - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(f)\right| &\leq B_0 e^{4\|\Phi\|} \cdot |\mathrm{supp} f| \; ||f||_u \left[|\Lambda|^{-1} + \varphi\left(d(\mathrm{supp} f, \mathrm{supp} h_i)\right)\right] \\ &\leq B_0 e^{4\|\Phi\|} R^d B(R) \cdot |\mathrm{supp} f| \; ||f||_u \left[|\Lambda|^{-1} + \varphi\left(d(\mathrm{supp} f, i)\right)\right] \\ &\equiv B_1 \cdot |\mathrm{supp} f| \; ||f||_u \left[|\Lambda|^{-1} + \varphi\left(d(i, \mathrm{supp} f)\right)\right] \end{aligned}$$

where $B(R) \equiv \sup\left\{\frac{d(i,l')}{d(i,l)} : i \in \partial_R\Lambda, \; l, l' \in \Lambda \text{ and } d(l,l') \leq R\right\}$. □

From the above estimates we deduce a sharp bound on the covariance between $\eta_i$ and $\eta_j$.

**Lemma A.3.** *There is a constants $B_2 \in (0,\infty)$ dependent only on the interaction $\Phi$, such that for any cube $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(\eta_i; \eta_j\right)\right| \leq B_2 \frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\left(1 - \frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\right)\left[|\Lambda|^{-1} + \varphi\left(d(i,j)\right)\right] \tag{A.3}$$

*for any $k = 0, \ldots, |\Lambda|$ and all $i, j \in \Lambda$.*

**Remark A.1.** *We remark that if there is no interaction, $\Phi \equiv 0$, we have*

$$\mu_\Lambda^k(\eta(i); \eta(j)) = -\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\left(1 - \frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{|\Lambda| - 1}$$

*so that (A.3) catches the correct dependence on $k, |\Lambda|$.*

*Proof.* We note first that we have the following representation of the covariance of interest to us

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_i;\eta_j) &\equiv \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_i\eta_j) - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_i)\cdot\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j) = \\ &= \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j)\mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=1}^{k-1,\omega}(\eta_i) - \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j)\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j)\mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=1}^{k-1,\omega}(\eta_i) + \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(1-\eta_j)\mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=0}^{k,\omega}(\eta_i)\right) \\ &= \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\eta_j)\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(1-\eta_j)\left(\mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=1}^{k-1,\omega}(\eta_i) - \mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=0}^{k,\omega}(\eta_i)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

The first two factors from the right hand side of (A.4) can be estimated using Lemma 2.5. To estimate the last factor on the right hand side of (A.4) we use the following decomposition

$$\left|\mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=1}^{k-1,\omega}(\eta_i) - \mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=0}^{k,\omega}(\eta_i)\right| \leq \left|\mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=1}^{k-1,\omega}(\eta_i) - \mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=1}^{k,\omega}(\eta_i)\right| + \left|\mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=1}^{k,\omega}(\eta_i) - \mu_{\Lambda\setminus j,\eta_j=0}^{k,\omega}(\eta_i)\right|$$

The second term in the above inequality is estimated by applying Lemma A.2; to bound the first term we use Lemma 2.4 (a) or (b), dependent on whether $k \le \frac{|\Lambda|}{2}$ or not. Since both cases are similar, we consider here only the case $k \le \frac{|\Lambda|}{2}$; to simplify the notation we introduce $\Lambda' \equiv \Lambda \setminus j$ and $\omega' \equiv \omega \bullet_j \{\omega_j = 1\}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{\Lambda'}^{k-1,\omega'}(\eta_i) - \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(\eta_i) &= \frac{1}{k}\sum_{l\in\Lambda'} \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(\eta_l \nabla_l \eta_i) - \frac{\sum_{l\in\Lambda'} \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(\eta_i; G_l)}{\sum_{l\in\Lambda'} \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(G_l)} \\
&= \frac{1}{k}\cdot \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(\eta_i(1-2\eta_i)) - \frac{\sum_{l\in\Lambda'} \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(\eta_i; G_l)}{\sum_{l\in\Lambda'} \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(G_l)} \qquad \text{(A.5)}
\end{aligned}
$$

From Lemma 2.5 the first term on the right hand side of (A.5) has the following estimate

$$
\left| \frac{1}{k}\cdot \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(\eta_i(1-2\eta_i)) \right| \le e^{4||\Phi||}\cdot \frac{1}{|\Lambda'|}
$$

Using Lemma A.1 together with estimate (2.41) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{\sum_{l\in\Lambda'} \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(\eta_i; G_l)}{\sum_{l\in\Lambda'} \mu_{\Lambda'}^{k,\omega'}(G_l)} \right| &\le e^{4||\Phi||}(|\Lambda'| - k)^{-1} \sum_{l\in\Lambda'} B_0 \cdot R^d e^{2||\Phi||}\left[ |\Lambda'|^{-1} + B_R \cdot \varphi\left(d(i,l)\right)\right] \\
&\le B_0 \cdot R^d e^{6||\Phi||}\left[ 1 + B_R \cdot \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \varphi\left(d(l,0)\right)\right] (|\Lambda'| - k)^{-1} \qquad \text{(A.6)} \\
&\le 2B_0 \cdot R^d e^{6||\Phi||}\left[ 1 + B_R \cdot \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \varphi\left(d(l,0)\right)\right] \cdot |\Lambda'|^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $B_R \equiv \sup\left\{ \frac{d(i,l')}{d(i,l)} : i \ne l \text{ and } l,l' : d(l,l') \le R \right\}$ and in the last step we have inserted our assumption $k \le \frac{|\Lambda|}{2}$. This ends the proof of Lemma A.3. □

We can now prove Lemma 2.6 which has been used in the proof of the asymptotically diffusive inequality (2.17).

*Proof of Lemma* 2.6.

We shall prove only the inequality (2.43), the proof of (2.44) being similar. We note that

(A.7)

$$
\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i; G_j) = \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left( \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i; G_j | \eta_i, \eta_j)\right) + \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left( \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i|\eta_i,\eta_j); \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_j|\eta_i,\eta_j)\right)
$$

Since $G_i \equiv (1-\eta_i)\exp\{-\nabla_i U_\Lambda(\eta \bullet_\Lambda \omega)\} \equiv (1-\eta_i)g_i$ , for the first term on the right hand side of (A.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i;G_j|\eta_i,\eta_j)\right)\right| &= \sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left((1-\eta_i)(1-\eta_j)\right)\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(g_i;g_j|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0)\right| \\
\text{(A.8)} \qquad &\le \sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} e^{4||\Phi||}\cdot\left(1-\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\right)\cdot\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(g_i;g_j|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0)\right| \\
&\le B_0R^{2d}e^{8||\Phi||}\cdot\left(1-\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\right)\cdot\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\left[|\Lambda|^{-1}+\varphi\left(d(i,j)\right)\right] \\
&\le \left[(1+\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\varphi(i))B_0R^{2d}e^{8||\Phi||}\right]\cdot(|\Lambda|-k)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.5, the definition of $g_i$ together with the fact that the interaction $\Phi$ is of finite range $R$ and Lemma A.1.

It will be useful to represent the second term on the right hand side of (A.7) as follows

$$\text{(A.9)} \quad \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_i|\eta_i,\eta_j);\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(G_j|\eta_i,\eta_j)) =$$

$$= \mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left((1-\eta_i);(1-\eta_j)\right)\cdot\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(g_i|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0)\cdot\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(g_j|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0)-R_\Lambda(i,j)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
R_\Lambda(i,j) \;\equiv\;& R_\Lambda^1(i,j)\,R_\Lambda^2(i,j)\,\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(\eta_i(1-\eta_j)\right)\,\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left((1-\eta_i)\eta_j\right) \\
+\;& R_\Lambda^1(i,j)\,\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(g_j|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0\right)\,\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left((1-\eta_i)\eta_j\right)\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(1-\eta_j\right) \\
+\;& R_\Lambda^2(i,j)\,\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(g_i|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0\right)\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(\eta_i(1-\eta_j)\right)\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(1-\eta_i\right)
\end{aligned}$$

in which

$$R_\Lambda^1(i,j)\equiv\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(g_i|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=1\right)-\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(g_i|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0\right)$$

$$R_\Lambda^2(i,j)\equiv\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(g_j|\eta_i=1,\eta_j=0\right)-\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left(g_j|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0\right)$$

Using Lemma A.3, since$||g_i||_u\le\exp\{2||\Phi||\}$, we can bound the first term on the right hand side of (A.9) as follows

$$\text{(A.10)} \quad \sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\left|\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}\left((1-\eta_i);(1-\eta_j)\right)\times\mu_\Lambda^{k,\omega}(g_i|\eta_i=0,\eta_j=0)\right|\le$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le B_2e^{4||\Phi||}\cdot\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\left(1-\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\right)\sum_{i,j\in\Lambda}\left[|\Lambda|^{-1}+\varphi\left(d(i,j)\right)\right] \\
&\le (1+\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\varphi(d(i,0)))B_2e^{4||\Phi||}\cdot\frac{k}{|\Lambda|}\left(|\Lambda|-k\right)
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to consider the second term on the right hand side of (A.9). For this we proceed as in Lemma A.3:

$$\left|R_\Lambda^1(i,j)\right|\le\left|\mu_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}^{k-1,\widetilde{\omega}}(g_i)-\mu_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}^{k,\widetilde{\omega}}(g_i)\right|+\left|\mu_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}^{k,\widetilde{\omega}^j}(g_i)-\mu_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}^{k,\widetilde{\omega}}(g_i)\right|$$

where $\widetilde{\Lambda} \equiv \Lambda \backslash \{ij\}$, $\widetilde{\omega} \equiv \omega \bullet_{\{ij\}} \{\omega_i = 0, \omega_j = 1\}$. We then bound the first term using Lemma 2.4 (see (A.5)–(A.6)) and the second by applying Lemma A.2. The bound for $R^1_\Lambda(i,j)$ is analogous.. We find

$$\left| R^\ell_\Lambda(i,j) \right| \le B_4 \left( \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} + \varphi\left(d(i,j)\right) \right) \qquad \ell = 1,2$$

for some constant $B_4$ depending only on $\Phi$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(A.11)} \sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} & |R_\Lambda(i,j)| \\
\le \quad & B_4 \sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} \left( \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} + \varphi\left(d(i,j)\right) \right) \left[ 2\mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda (1-\eta_i)\, \mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda (\eta_i) + \mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda (\eta_j)\, \mu^{k,\omega}_\Lambda (1-\eta_j) \right] \\
\le \quad & 3B_4 e^{8\|\Phi\|} \sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} \left( \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} + \varphi\left(d(i,j)\right) \right) \cdot \frac{k}{|\Lambda|} \left( 1 - \frac{k}{|\Lambda|} \right) \\
\le \quad & 3B_4 e^{8\|\Phi\|} \left( 1 + \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \varphi\left(d(0,i)\right) \right) \cdot \frac{k}{|\Lambda|} \left( |\Lambda| - k \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 2.5.

From (A.8)–(A.11) we deduce the estimate (2.43). The proof of (2.44) is similar. This ends the proof of Lemma 2.6. $\square$

## References


[1] Aizenman M. , Holley R. : *Rapid Convergence to Equilibrium of Stochastic Ising Models in the Dobrushin-Shlosman Regime*, pp. 1–11 in *Percolation Theory and Ergodic Theory of Infinite*

[2] Bertini L. and Zegarlinski B. : *Coercive Inequalities for Kawasaki Dynamics: The Product Case;* IC Preprint 1996.

[3] Georgii H.O.: *Canonical Gibbs Measures*, Lec. Notes in Math. **760** , Springer-Verlag 1979

[4] Laroche E.; *Hypercontractivité pour des systèmes de spin de portée infinie,* Probab. Theor. Relat. Fields **101**, 89–132 (1995).

[5] Liggett T.M. : *Interacting particles systems;* Berlin: Springer 1985.

[6] Lu S.L. and Yau H.T. : *Spectral gap and logarithmic Sobolev inequality for Kawasaki and Glauber dynamics;* Commun. Math. Phys. **156**, 399–433 (1993).

[7] Lu S.L. and Yau H.T. : *Logarithmic Sobolev inequality for Kawasaki dynamics: The independent case;* Preprint 1993.

[8] Martinelli F. and Olivieri E. : *Approach to Equilibrium of Glauber Dynamics in the One Phase Region: I. The Attractive case/ II. The General Case.* Commun. Math. Phys. **161**, 447–486 / 487–514 (1994)

[9] Stroock D. W. and Zegarlinski B. : *The Logarithmic Sobolev inequality for Continuous Spin Systems on a Lattice.* J. Funct. Anal. **104**, 299–326 (1992)

[10] Stroock D. W. and Zegarlinski B. : *The Equivalence of the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality and the Dobrushin – Shlosman Mixing Condition*, Commun. Math. Phys. **144**, 303–323 (1992)

[11] Stroock D. W. and Zegarlinski B. : *The Logarithmic Sobolev inequality for Discrete Spin Systems on a Lattice*; Commun. Math. Phys. **149**, 175–193 (1992)

[12] Vanheurverzwijn P., *Anote on the stochastic lattice gas model*, J. Phys. **A14** (1981) 1149-1158

[13] Yau H.T. : *Logarithmic Sobolev inequality for Lattice Gases with Mixing Conditions;* mp_arc Preprint 96-215.

[14] Zegarlinski B. : *On log - Sobolev Inequalities for Infinite Lattice Systems.* Lett. Math. Phys. **20**, 173 -182 (1990).

[15] Zegarlinski B. : *Log - Sobolev Inequalities for Infinite One Dimensional Lattice Systems.* Commun. Math. Phys. **133**, 147-162 (1990).

[16] Zegarlinski B. : *Dobrushin Uniqueness Theorem and Logarithmic Sobolev Inequalities* J. Funct. Anal. **105**, 77-111 (1992).

[17] Zegarlinski B. : *Ergodicity of Markov Semigroups.* pp. 312 - 337, in Proc. of the Conference: Stochastic Partial Differential Equations, Edinburgh 1994, Ed. A. Etheridge, LMS Lecture Notes **216**, Cambridge University Press 1995

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College, London SW7 2BZ, UK
*E-mail address*: l.bertini@ic.ac.uk boz@ic.ac.uk