Flow approach to the gKPZ equation

Based on a joint work with Ajay Chandra (Imperial College), 2402.03101

Léonard Ferdinand

IJCLab, Université Paris Saclay

Rencontre de l'ARN Smooth, Université Bretagne Occidentale, Brest

May 23, 2024

Contents

1. Gibbs measures and renormalization group
2. The flow approach to singular SPDEs
3. The generalized KPZ equation

EQFT measures

Aim: make sense of the formal expression

$$\nu(\mathrm{d}\phi) \propto e^{-V(\phi)} \mathtt{g}(\mathrm{d}\phi)\,,$$

where $\mathtt{g} = \mathcal{N}\big(0, (1-\Delta)^{-1}\big)$.

- ä (strong) UV problem: $\int \phi^4 = \infty$ a.s.;
- ä IR problem: ϕ has no decay as $\Lambda \uparrow \mathrm{R}^d$;
- ä large field problem: the potentiel V needs to be bounded below;
- ä (week) UV problem: even in perturbation, *convergent* subamplitudes create new divergences in the IR (called renormalon).

Let $\mathtt{g}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{N}\big(0, e^{-\varepsilon(1-\Delta)}/(1-\Delta)\big)$, and find V_ε such that

$$\nu_\varepsilon(\mathrm{d}\phi) = \frac{1}{Z_\varepsilon} e^{-V_\varepsilon(\phi)} \mathtt{g}_\varepsilon(\mathrm{d}\phi)$$

has a weak limit as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

For $\mu > \varepsilon$,

$$\phi = \phi_{<\mu} + \phi_{>\mu} \,,$$

where

$$\mathrm{Law}(\phi_{<\mu}) = \mathcal{N}\big(0, (e^{-\varepsilon(1-\Delta)} - e^{-\mu(1-\Delta)})/(1-\Delta)\big) \,, \text{ and } \mathrm{Law}(\phi_{>\mu}) = \mathsf{g}_\mu \,.$$

One is interested in observables F such that

$$F(\phi) = F(\phi_{>\mu}) \,, \text{ for some } \mu > 0 \,.$$

They verify

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_{\nu_\varepsilon}[F(\phi)] &= \frac{1}{Z_\varepsilon}\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{g}_\varepsilon}[F(\phi)e^{-V_\varepsilon(\phi)}] = \frac{1}{Z_\varepsilon}\mathsf{E}_{>\mu}\Big[F(\phi_{>\mu})\mathsf{E}_{<\mu}[e^{-V_\varepsilon(\phi_{<\mu}+\phi_{\geqslant\mu})}]\Big] \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_\varepsilon}\mathsf{E}_{>\mu}[F(\phi_{>\mu})e^{-V_{\varepsilon,\mu}(\phi_{\geqslant\mu})}] \,, \end{aligned}$$

where we set $V_{\varepsilon,\mu}(\phi_{>\mu}) := -\log \mathsf{E}_{<\mu}[e^{-V_\varepsilon(\phi_{<\mu}+\phi_{\geqslant\mu})}]$.

Polchinski's flow equation [Polchinski, Kopper,...]

Hope: for any $\mu > \varepsilon$, $V_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ can be controlled uniformly in ε, provided one made the correct choice of "initial condition" $V_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \equiv V_{\varepsilon,0} = V_\varepsilon$.
By Gaussian integration, setting $C_{\varepsilon,\mu} = \int_\varepsilon^\mu e^{-t(1-\Delta)}dt$ and $\dot{C}_\mu = e^{-\mu(1-\Delta)}$, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^{-V_{\varepsilon,\mu}} &= e^{\frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla_\phi,\nabla_\phi\rangle_{C_{\varepsilon,\mu}}}\left(e^{-V_\varepsilon}\right) \\
\Rightarrow \partial_\mu e^{-V_{\varepsilon,\mu}} &= \frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla_\phi,\nabla_\phi\rangle_{\dot{C}_\mu} e^{-V_{\varepsilon,\mu}} \\
\Rightarrow \partial_\mu V_{\varepsilon,\mu} &= \frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla_\phi,\nabla_\phi\rangle_{\dot{C}_\mu} V_{\varepsilon,\mu} - \frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla_\phi V_{\varepsilon,\mu},\nabla_\phi V_{\varepsilon,\mu}\rangle_{\dot{C}_\mu}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Case $V(\phi) = \lambda\phi^4$. Try an ansatz, and expand

$$
V_{\varepsilon,\mu}(\phi) = \sum_{i>1}\lambda^i \sum_{n>0}\int V^{i,n}_{\varepsilon,\mu}(dx_1,\cdots,dx_n)\phi(x_1)\cdots\phi(x_n)\,.
$$

In $d = 3$, one ends up with

$$
V_{\varepsilon,0} = \lambda\phi^4 + (a\lambda\varepsilon^{-1} + b\lambda^2\log\varepsilon^{-1})\phi^2 + (c\lambda\varepsilon^{-2} + d\lambda^2\varepsilon^{-1} + e\lambda^3\log\varepsilon^{-1})\,.
$$

The large field problem

- The UV problem is solved, in the sense that we identified V_ε;
- The week UV problem too, since we were working with an *IR cut-o* ;
- This is not the case of the large field problem: since V_ε is *not bounded below* (uniformly in $\varepsilon > 0$). This corresponds to the fact that the formal series defining $V_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ is divergent.

Two main options to handle this large field problem:

- Rather perform a discreet renormalization group: good factors coming from high convergent graphs can tame the divergence of V_ε;
- Combine the Langevin dynamic

$$(\partial_t + 1 - \Delta)\phi = -\nabla_\phi V(\phi) + \xi$$

with some PDE techniques.

Discrete flow approach [Kupiainen 2014]

In 2014, Kupiainen introduced a framework to solve singular SPDEs, based on a discrete renormalization group idea.

He deals with the dynamical Φ^4_3 equation:

$$(\partial_t + 1 - \Delta)\phi_\varepsilon = -\lambda\phi_\varepsilon^3 + \mathfrak{c}_\varepsilon\phi_\varepsilon + \xi_\varepsilon =: S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]$$
$$\Rightarrow \phi_\varepsilon = G\big(\mathbf{1}_{t>0}S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon] + \delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0)\big)\,.$$

For simplicity, assume that formally, we are in the stationary case

$$\phi_\varepsilon(0) = G\big(1_{t\leqslant 0}S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\big)(0)$$

so that $\phi_\varepsilon = G\big(S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\big)$.

Define the *e ective field*

$$\phi_{>\mu} \equiv \phi_{\varepsilon,\mu} := G_\mu\big(S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\big)\,, \text{ where } G_\mu \text{ is cut-off at scale } \mu\,,$$

along with the *e ective force* by the relation

$$S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] = S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\,.$$

Discrete flow approach [Kupiainen 2014]

Note that a priori one does not have $\mathrm{D}V_{\varepsilon,\mu} = \mathsf{E}[S_{\varepsilon,\mu}]$.

On the other hand, recall that it holds

$$\mathsf{E}[e^{-V_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}]}] = \mathsf{E}[e^{-V_{\varepsilon}[\phi_{\varepsilon}]}]\,.$$

This motivates the definition of the effective force: by making $S_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ random, one has more room to require $S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] = \mathrm{cte}_{\varepsilon}$.

With a fixed point argument, Kupiainen constructed for a random $m \in \mathsf{N}$ a family

$$(S_{\varepsilon,2^{-n}})_{n>m}$$

starting from $S_{\varepsilon,2^{-\infty}} = S_{\varepsilon}$.

Involves tedious computations of stochastic objects.

The solution to the RG flow is local in scale, hence the solution to the equation is local in time.

The flow equation [Duch 21]

Recall that formally,

$$S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] = S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\,, \text{ and } \phi_{\varepsilon,\mu} = G_\mu\big(S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\big)\,.$$

Thus, one obtains a *flow equation*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\mu} S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon] = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\mu} S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] = \partial_\mu S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] + \mathrm{D}S_{\varepsilon,\mu}\partial_\mu\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu} \\ \Rightarrow 0 &= \partial_\mu S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] + \mathrm{D}S_{\varepsilon,\mu}\dot{G}_\mu S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}]\,. \end{aligned}$$

Looks very much like the Polchinski flow equation.

Again, combined with an appropriate ansatz for $S_{\varepsilon,\mu}$

$$S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi](x) = \sum_{i>1} \lambda^i \sum_{n>0} \int \xi^{i,n}_{\varepsilon,\mu}(x, \mathrm{d}y_1, \cdots, \mathrm{d}y_n)\phi(y_1)\cdots\phi(y_n)\,,$$

where the *force coe cients* $(\xi^{i,n}_{\varepsilon,\mu})$ are a collection of random variables polynomial in the noise, similar to the model of regularity structures.

Duch's cumulant flow equation [Duch 21]

The previous *flow equation* rewrites as a hierarchy of equations for the force coefficients

$$\partial_\mu \xi^{i,n}_{\varepsilon,\mu} = -\sum_j \sum_m (m+1)\xi^{i-j,m+1}_{\varepsilon,\mu} \dot{G}_\mu \xi^{j,n-m}_{\varepsilon,\mu}\,.$$

Duch made the following crucial remark: there exists a similar hierarchical system of equations for the cumulants

$$K^I_{\varepsilon,\mu} := \kappa_p\left(\xi^{i_1,n_1}_{\varepsilon,\mu},\ldots,\xi^{i_p,n_p}_{\varepsilon,\mu}\right)\,,\ I = \big((i_1,n_1),\ldots,(i_p,n_p)\big)$$

of the force coefficients, reading

$$\partial_\mu K^I_{\varepsilon,\mu} = \sum_J C_{IJ}\dot{G}_\mu K^J_{\varepsilon,\mu} + \sum_{M,L} \tilde{C}_{IML} K^M_{\varepsilon,\mu} \dot{G}_\mu K^L_{\varepsilon,\mu}\,.$$

- ä It is therefore possible to construct all the cumulants (and therefore all the moments) of the force coefficients by induction, starting from the covariance of the noise;
- ä This analysis avoids much of the algebraic considerations present in regularity structures/higher paracontrolled calculus.

Beyond polynomial interactions

The generalized KPZ equation

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)\phi = g_{ij}(\phi)\partial_i\phi\partial_j\phi + h(\phi)\xi\,.$$

General case of semi-linear singular parabolic SPDE with non-polynomial interaction, including

ä the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation,

ä the multiplicative SHE, or parabolic Anderson model.

The equation is subcritical as long as the expected regularity of the solution is > 0 (i.e. $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^{-2+\alpha}$, $\alpha > 0$).

Falls outside the scope of the work by Duch, where

ä the flow equation is implemented for a polynomial interaction;

ä the solution theory is limited to the case where the regularity of the equation is negative.

Another motivation coming from the quantization of gauge theories:

$$\Phi_t(A_0^{g_0}) = \big(\Phi_t A_0\big)^{g_t} \text{ for } g^{-1}\partial_t g = -\mathrm{d}^*_{\Phi_t A_0}(g^{-1}\mathrm{d}g)\,.$$

Main result

For simplicity, we focus on gPAM:

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)\phi_\varepsilon = h(\phi_\varepsilon) + \mathfrak{c}_\varepsilon(h, \phi_\varepsilon, \partial_x \phi_\varepsilon)\,.$$

Theorem 1 [Chandra, F.]

- Fix $\alpha \in (0 \vee (1/2 - n/4), 1]$, and let $\Gamma := \lfloor 2/\alpha - 1 \rfloor$;
- fix a function h in $C^{1+\Gamma+3N_1^{\Gamma+1}}(\mathbb{R})$;
- fix an initial condition $\phi_\varepsilon(0)$ in $C^{4N_1^{\Gamma+1}+1}(\mathbb{T}^n)$.

Then, there exists a random variable $0 < T \leqslant 1$ such that for any deterministic $\tilde{T} \in (0, 1]$ the following holds on the event $\{\tilde{T} \leqslant T\}$: gPAM is well posed on $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha-}([0, \tilde{T}] \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ with solutions ϕ_ε which converges (in probability) to a limit ϕ in $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha-}([0, \tilde{T}] \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Ansatz for the effective force

Basis for the flow equation spanned by multi-indices $a \in \mathrm{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ (for gPAM) corresponding to some product of derivatives of h:

$$\Upsilon^a[\phi](y^a) := \prod_{i \in \mathrm{supp}(a)} \prod_{j \in [a_i]} h^{(i)}\left(\phi(y^a_{ij})\right).$$

The multi-indices need to be *populated*, that is to say

$$\mathfrak{o}(a) := \sum_{i > 0} i a_i = 1 + \sum_{i > 0} a_i \,.$$

Subcriticality implies that it is sufficient to go to a certain order, after which all the force coefficients are *irrelevant*. In practice, for gPAM with $\alpha \in (2/3, 1]$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi](x) &= \sum_{a : \mathfrak{o}(a) \leqslant 1} \langle \xi^a_{\varepsilon,\mu}, \Upsilon^a[\phi] \rangle (x) \\ &= \int \xi^{1,0,\cdots}_{\varepsilon,\mu}(x, \mathrm{d}y) h\big(\psi(y)\big) + \int \xi^{1,1,\cdots}_{\varepsilon,\mu}(x, \mathrm{d}y, \mathrm{d}z) h\big(\psi(y)\big) h'\big(\psi(z)\big) \\ &= \circ_\varepsilon h[\psi] + \circ\!\!-\!\!\circ_{\varepsilon,\mu}(hh')[\psi] \,. \end{aligned}$$

Renormalization

The force coefficients verify the flow equations

$$\partial_\mu \circ_{\varepsilon,\mu}(x,\mathrm{d}y) = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \circ_{\varepsilon,\mu}(x,\mathrm{d}y) = \circ_\varepsilon(x,\mathrm{d}y) = \xi_\varepsilon(x)\delta_x(\mathrm{d}y) \text{ for all } \mu > 0\,,$$

and

$$\partial_\mu {}_{\circ}\!\!/\!{}^{\circ}{}_{\varepsilon,\mu}(x,\mathrm{d}y,\mathrm{d}z) = -\circ_\varepsilon(x,\mathrm{d}z)\int \dot{G}(z-w)\circ_\varepsilon(w,\mathrm{d}y)\mathrm{d}w\,.$$

The latter equation can not be solved forward in μ since $\|\partial_\mu {}_{\circ}\!\!/\!{}^{\circ}{}_{\varepsilon,\mu}\|_{L^\infty} \propto \mu^{-3+2\alpha}$, and is solved backward up to a (deterministic, diverging as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$) value

$${}_{\circ}\!\!/\!{}^{\circ}{}_{\varepsilon,0}(x,\mathrm{d}y,\mathrm{d}z) = \mathfrak{c}_\varepsilon \delta_x(\mathrm{d}y)\delta_x(\mathrm{d}z)\,.$$

The counterterms are *local*.

Note that if we considered larger objects (of order larger than one), then they would vanish as $\mu \downarrow 0$.

The week UV problem in the flow approach

In the context of singular SPDEs, the new divergences caused by the terms convergent in the UV take the following from:

ä they result in the fact that whenever $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha>0}$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta<0}$, fg is only $\mathcal{C}^{\beta}$ and not $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+\beta}$.

Dealing with this difficulty is a the core of any solution theory to singular SPDEs:

ä putting an IR cut-off on f, rather working with $f \succeq g$, suggests that the other piece $f \prec g$ should be added to a *paracontrolled ansatz*;

ä recentering f, rather working with $\big(f - f(x)\big)g$ for some given base point x, suggests to add $f(x)g$ to the ansatz, and ultimately to view the solution as *modelled* by g, with coefficient $f(x)$;

ä in the flow approach, an IR is directly implemented, in the sense that

$$ {}^{\circ}\!\!\diagup\!\!{}_{\circ}\,{}_{\varepsilon,\mu} = \circ_{\varepsilon}(G - G_{\mu})\circ_{\varepsilon} + \mathfrak{c}_{\varepsilon}\delta \,, $$

and the fluctuation propagator $G - G_{\mu} \propto \mu^{2}$ vanishes at short scales, so that indeed one has $\|{}^{\circ}\!\!\diagup\!\!{}_{\circ}\,{}_{\varepsilon,\mu}\|_{L^{\infty}} \;.\; \mu^{-2+2\alpha}$.

Construction of the solution 1: the non-stationary force

Going back to the original context, recall that we wanted to solve

$$\phi_\varepsilon = G\big(\mathbf{1}_{t>0} S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon] + \delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0)\big)\,,\ S_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon] = h[\phi_\varepsilon]\xi_\varepsilon + \mathfrak{c}_\varepsilon(hh')[\phi_\varepsilon]\,.$$

We constructed a ***stationary*** solution $S_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ to the flow equation truncated at order 1, with initial condition S_ε.

ä To deal with parabolic problems, a good choice of UV cut-off is

$$G_\mu(t,x) := \chi(t/\mu^2)e^{t\Delta}(x)\,,\ \text{supp}(\chi) = [1,\infty) \text{ and } \chi \quad [2,\infty) = 1\,.$$

Ensures that $\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ is supported after time μ^2.

ä Given the trajectory $(S_{\varepsilon,\mu})_{\mu>0}$, Duch showed that one can construct ***without any additional renormalization*** a trajectory $(F_{\varepsilon,\mu})_{\mu>0}$ solving the truncated flow equation with initial condition $\mathbf{1}_{t>0}S_\varepsilon$. Indeed, the stationary and non-stationary force coefficients agree after a time of order μ, and the small size of the remaining interval can be leveraged to complete the construction.

ä The renormalization is therefore independent of time.

Construction of the solution 2: the remainder equation

To simplify, set $\phi_\varepsilon(0) = 0$, so that $\phi_\varepsilon = G\big(F_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\big)$.

To compensate the fact that $F_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ only solves a truncated flow equation, we make the assumption that there exists a random time $T > 0$ along with a *remainder* $(R_{\varepsilon,\mu})_{\mu\in[0,\sqrt{T}]}$ such that for $\mu \in [0, \sqrt{T}]$,

$$F_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon] = F_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] + R_{\varepsilon,\mu} .$$

Again using $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\mu}F_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon] = 0$, one can derive the equation

$$\partial_\mu R_{\varepsilon,\mu} = -\mathrm{D}F_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}]\dot{G}_\mu R_{\varepsilon,\mu} - (\partial_\mu + \mathrm{D}F_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}]\dot{G}_\mu)F_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\mu}] ,$$

that can be solved by a fixed point argument, but *locally in scale* up to a scale $\sqrt{T}$ (this is where the large field problem comes back into play).

On the other side, the solution reads

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_\varepsilon = G\big(F_\varepsilon[\phi_\varepsilon]\big) &= G\big(F_{\varepsilon,\sqrt{T}}[\phi_{\varepsilon,\sqrt{T}}] + R_{\varepsilon,\sqrt{T}}\big) \\ &= G\big(F_{\varepsilon,\sqrt{T}}[0] + R_{\varepsilon,\sqrt{T}}\big) \text{ on } [0, T] , \end{aligned}$$

and is therefore constructed.

Construction of the solution 3: the initial value problem

Let us go back to the initial value problem. $\delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0)$ being too rough a forcing, one rather shifts by the harmonic completion of the initial condition

$$H := G\big(\delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0)\big) = e^{t\Delta}\big(\phi_\varepsilon(0)\big)\,,$$

looking at $\psi_\varepsilon := \phi_\varepsilon - H$ which solves

$$\psi_\varepsilon = G\big(\mathbf{1}_{t>0} S_\varepsilon[\psi_\varepsilon + H]\big) = G\big(\mathbf{1}_{t>0} S_\varepsilon[\psi_\varepsilon + H]\big) = G\big(\mathbf{1}_{t>0}(S_\varepsilon[\psi_\varepsilon + H] - \delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0))\big)\,.$$

In the polynomial case, Duch noted that given the trajectory $(S_{\varepsilon,\mu})_{\mu>0}$ solving the (possibly truncated) flow equation with initial condition S_ε,

$$\tilde{S}_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\psi] := S_{\varepsilon,\mu}[\psi + H_\mu] - \delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0)\,,\ H_\mu = G_\mu\big(\delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0)\big)$$

is a solution too, with initial condition $S_\varepsilon[\psi_\varepsilon + H] - \delta_{t=0} \otimes \phi_\varepsilon(0)$.

When the solution is of *negative* regularity say $\varsigma \leqslant 0$, $\tilde{S}_{\varepsilon,\mu}$ can be easily constructed, since H_μ shares the behavior of $(G - G_\mu)\circ_\varepsilon$, in the sense that one has

$$\|H_\mu\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \mu^\varsigma\,.$$

The initial value problem for gKPZ

In the case where the solution is of positive regularity $\alpha > 0$, things are different, since H_μ can definitely not behave like $(G - G_\mu)\circ_\varepsilon$.

Indeed, in the flow approach, being of positive regularity implies vanishing, while one has $H_\mu \to H$.

That would not be a problem if we had

$$\|H - H_\mu\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \mu^\alpha .$$

However, the above estimate is wrong, since for $t \leqslant \mu^2$, $H_\mu(t) = 0$.

Actually, it only holds

$$\|t^{\alpha/2}(H - H_\mu)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \mu^\alpha .$$

The presence of many non-compactly supported kernels makes the flow equation with weights pretty involved.

As in other approaches, subcriticality is not the only limitation on the value of α.

Since ${}_{\circ}\!\diagup\!{}^{\circ}{}_{\varepsilon,\mu} \propto \mu^{-2+2\alpha}$, one has

$$\mathrm{Cov}({}_{\circ}\!\diagup\!{}^{\circ}{}_{\varepsilon,\mu}, {}_{\circ}\!\diagup\!{}^{\circ}{}_{\varepsilon,\mu}) \propto \mu^{-4+4\alpha} \in L^1 \Leftrightarrow -4 + 4\alpha + d + 2 > 0\,.$$

In $d = 1$, we need $\alpha > 1/4$.

Hairer showed in a very similar context, and in the marginal case $\alpha = 1/4$, that ${}_{\circ}\!\diagup\!{}^{\circ}{}_{\varepsilon}$ converges to a new noise ${}_{\circ}\!\diagup\!{}^{\circ}$ independent from $\circ$.

Moreover, the solution to the original KPZ equation converges to the solution to the KPZ equation driven by ${}_{\circ}\!\diagup\!{}^{\circ}$.

Is there a way to "renormalize" the covariance?

Thank you!