



HAL
open science

Macroscopic properties and dynamical large deviations of the boundary driven Kawasaki process with long range interaction

Mustapha Mourragui, Enza Orlandi

► **To cite this version:**

Mustapha Mourragui, Enza Orlandi. Macroscopic properties and dynamical large deviations of the boundary driven Kawasaki process with long range interaction. 2011. hal-00634205v1

HAL Id: hal-00634205

<https://hal.science/hal-00634205v1>

Preprint submitted on 20 Oct 2011 (v1), last revised 30 Sep 2012 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

MACROSCOPIC PROPERTIES AND DYNAMICAL LARGE DEVIATIONS OF THE BOUNDARY DRIVEN KAWASAKI PROCESS WITH LONG RANGE INTERACTION

MUSTAPHA MOURRAGUI AND ENZA ORLANDI

ABSTRACT. We consider a boundary driven exclusion process associated to particles evolving under Kawasaki (conservative) dynamics and long range interaction in a regime in which at equilibrium phase separation might occur. We show that the empirical density under the diffusive scaling solves a non linear integro differential evolution equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions and we prove the associated dynamical large deviations principle. Further, tuning suitable the intensity of the interaction, in the uniqueness phase regime, we show that under the stationary measure the empirical density solves a non local, stationary, transport equation.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last years there has been several papers devoted in understanding macroscopic properties of non equilibrium and non reversible systems. Typical examples are systems in contact with two thermostats at different temperature or with two reservoirs at different densities. A mathematical model of open systems is provided by stochastic models of interacting particles systems performing a local reversible dynamics (for example a reversible hopping dynamics) in a domain and some external mechanism of creation and annihilation of particles on the boundary of the domain, modeling the reservoirs, which makes the full process non reversible. The stationary non equilibrium states are characterized by a flow of mass through the system and long range correlations are present. We refer to [3] and [6] for two reviews on this topic. We study a model with such features but in a regime in which at equilibrium phase separation might occur.

We consider particles models which are dynamic version of lattices gas with long-range Kac potentials, i.e. the interaction energy between two particles, say one at x and the other at y (x and y are both in \mathbb{Z}^d), is given by $J_N(x, y) = N^{-d}J(\frac{x}{N}, \frac{y}{N})$ where J is a smooth symmetric probability kernel with compact support and N is a positive integer which is sent to ∞ . The equilibrium states for these models have been investigated thoroughly [13], [19] and [23], and have provided great mathematical insight into the static aspects of phase transition phenomena. The dynamical version of these lattice gases, in a periodic setting, i.e. with no reservoirs, has been analyzed in [9], [10], [11] and [1]. In this paper we start studying the dynamics of

Date: October 20, 2011.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 82C22; Secondary 60F10, 82C35.

Key words and phrases. Kawasaki process, Kac potential, Large deviations, Stationary nonequilibrium states.

M.M. supported by ANR Blanc LHMSHE, ANR-2010-BLANC-0108, Grefi- Mefi 2010.

E.O. supported by MURST/Cofin Prin2011, ROMA TRE University, Rouen University.

these systems in a non reversible setting, i.e with reservoirs, to understand their qualitative behavior in the range of the parameter when at equilibrium there is phase segregation. Let us describe informally the dynamics. We consider a one dimensional lattice gas with particles reservoirs at the endpoints. The restriction on the dimension is done only for simplicity. In no argument this is essential. Given an integer $N > 1$ and boundary densities $0 < \rho^- \leq \rho^+ < 1$ at any given time each site of the interval $\{-N, \dots, N\}$ is either occupied by one particle either empty. The interaction energy among particles is given by a modified version of the Kac potential J_N and it is tuned by a positive parameter β . The modification of the Kac potential, see (2.2), takes into account that the particles are confined in a bounded domain. We do not make any assumption on its sign. In the bulk each particle jumps at random times to the right or to the left nearest neighborhood, if the chosen site is empty, at a rate which depends on the particle configuration through the Kac potential, weighted by a parameter $\beta \geq 0$. When $\beta = 0$ we have the simple exclusion process. The jump times for the bulk dynamics are chosen according to a probability distribution which is reversible with respect to the equilibrium Gibbs measure associated to the chosen Kac potential, parametrized by β and the chemical potential. At the boundary sites $\pm N$ particles are created and removed for the local density to be ρ_{\pm} : at rate ρ_{\pm} a particles is created at $\pm N$ if the site is empty and at rate $1 - \rho_{\pm}$ the particle at $\pm N$ is removed if the site is occupied.

The dynamics described above defines an *irreducible*, i.e. there is a strictly positive probability to go from any state to any other, Markov jump process on a finite state space. By the general theory on Markov process [18], the invariant measure μ_N^{stat} is unique and encodes the long time behavior of the system. Let $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N^{stat}}^{\beta, N}$ be the stationary process i.e. the distribution on the path space induced by the Markov process with initial condition distributed according to the invariant measure μ_N^{stat} . Since μ_N^{stat} is invariant, the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N^{stat}}^{\beta, N}$ is invariant with respect to time shifts. The measure $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N^{stat}}^{\beta, N}$ is invariant under time reversal if and only if the measure μ_N^{stat} is reversible for the process, i.e if the generator of the process satisfies the detailed balance condition with respect to μ_N^{stat} . In the case at hand μ_N^{stat} is stationary and reversible only if $\beta = 0$ and $\rho^+ = \rho^- = \rho$. In such case the invariant, reversible measure is the Bernoulli product measure with marginals ρ . When $\beta > 0$ and /or $\rho^+ \neq \rho^-$ then μ_N^{stat} is not reversible. In such case the corresponding process is denoted *non reversible*. We consider this last case. One could choose a different dynamics at the boundary in order to have as invariant measure, when $\rho^+ = \rho^- = \rho$ the Gibbs measure with parameter β associated to the Kac type interaction and with chemical potential conjugate to ρ . But this choice would only add more technicality in the proofs, without shading any insights.

We scale the lattice space by $\frac{1}{N}$ and the time by N^2 (this is so called *diffusive limit*) and study the behavior, as $N \uparrow \infty$, of the empirical density of the particles evolving according to the dynamics described above. We apply the entropy method, see [12], adapted to deal with the boundary dynamics, to derive the law of large numbers for the empirical density. We obtain a (deterministic) evolution law for the macroscopic density ρ . It is the solution of a boundary value problem for a quasilinear integro differential parabolic equation, see (2.10). In addition to this we show, when β is small enough, that the empirical density field obeys a law of large numbers with respect to the stationary measures (hydrostatic). The result is

obtained characterizing the support of any limit points of $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N^{stat}}^{\beta, N}$. This intermediate result holds for any $\beta \geq 0$. Then we exploit that for β small enough, $\beta < \beta_0$ where $\beta_0 = \beta_0(\Lambda, J)$, the stationary solution of the boundary problem (2.10) is unique and is a global attractor for the macroscopic evolution. We need to show that the rate of decay toward the stationary solution is uniform with respect to any initial datum. Namely the quasilinear non local parabolic equation does not satisfy a comparison principle, which is the main tool used in previous papers, see for example [21] and [8], to conclude the argument. For value larger than β_0 we are not able to show the uniqueness of the stationary solution of the boundary value problem (2.10). We stress that $\beta_0 < \beta_c$ where β_c is the value above which at equilibrium there is phase segregation; with our choice of parameters and variables $\beta_c = \frac{1}{4}$, see page 1712 of [10]. We then prove the associated dynamical large deviation principle, i.e we compute the asymptotic probabilities of observing a large deviations in the dynamics of the empirical density. The large deviations functional is not convex as function of the density, it is lower semicontinuous and has compact level sets. Since the large deviations functional is not convex and the underlying dynamics does not satisfy any comparison principle care need to be taken for proving the lower bound. Namely, the basic strategy in the proof of the lower bound consists in obtaining this bound for smooth paths and then applying a density argument. Given a path ρ with a finite rate functional which we denote by $I(\rho)$ one constructs a sequences of smooth paths ρ_n so that $\rho_n \rightarrow \rho$ in a suitable topology and $I(\rho_n) \rightarrow I(\rho)$. When the large deviations functional is convex, this argument is easily implemented. In our case, because of the lack of convexity we modify the definition of the rate functional declaring it infinite if a suitable energy estimate does not hold. In this way the modified rate functional when finite provides the necessary compactness to close the argument. This argument has been developed by [22] and we adapted to our model. The modification of the rate functional helps in showing the lower bound but makes more difficult the upper bound. One needs to show that the energy estimate holds with probability super exponentially close to one. A similar arguments was applied in [21] and [4].

In a recent paper, De Masi and alias, [5], constructed, in the phase transition regime, a stationary solution of a boundary value problem equivalent to (2.10) in which the density ρ is replaced by the magnetization $m = 2\rho - 1$. They did not study the derivation of the boundary value problem from the particles system but they investigated the qualitative behavior of a constructed stationary solution of (2.10) as the diameter of the domain goes to infinity.

The paper is organized as following. In Section 2 we state the precise feature of the model, notations and results. In Section 3 we collect some basic estimates needed along the paper. In Section 4 we show the hydrodynamic and hydrostatic limits. Section 5 is splitted in 5 subsections and deals with dynamical large deviations. We prove in Section 6 the weak uniqueness of the solution of the PDE equation and we show that for β small enough the stationary solution is unique, it is a global attractor in L^2 and we show that the rate of the decay is uniform on the initial datum.

2. NOTATION AND RESULTS

Fix an integer $N \geq 1$. Call $\Lambda_N = \{-N, \dots, N\}$ and $\Gamma_N = \{-N, +N\}$ the boundary points. The sites of Λ_N are denoted by x, y and z . The configuration

space is $\mathcal{S}_N \equiv \{0, 1\}^{\Lambda_N}$ which we equip with the product topology. Elements of \mathcal{S}_N , called configurations, are denoted η so that $\eta(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ stands for the number of particles at site x of the configuration η .

We denote $\Lambda = (-1, 1)$ ($\bar{\Lambda} = [-1, 1]$) the macroscopic open (closed) interval, $\Gamma = \{-1, 1\}$ its boundary and $u \in [-1, 1]$ the macroscopic space coordinate.

2.1. The interaction. To define the interaction between particles we introduce a smooth, symmetric, translational invariant probability kernel of range 1, i.e $J(u, v) = J(0, v - u)$ for u and v in \mathbb{R} , $\int J(0, u) du = 1$. When both u and v are in Λ the interaction is given by $J(u, v)$. When $u \in \Lambda$, but the distance from the boundary of Λ is less than the range of the interaction we need to make a rule. We impose a reflection rule: i.e $u \in \Lambda$ interacts with v when $v \in \Lambda$ and when $v \notin \Lambda$ interacts with one of the reflected points of v , where reflections are the ones with respect to the left and right boundary of Λ . For this reason we denote it ‘‘Neuman’’ interaction. More precisely we introduce the reflection operator $R_\Lambda : [-2, 2] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ defined as following

$$R_\Lambda(v) = \begin{cases} v & \text{when } v \in [-1, 1], \\ 2 - v & \text{when } v > 1, \\ -2 - v, & \text{when } v < -1, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $2 - v$ is the image of v under reflections on the right boundary $\{1\}$ and $-2 - v$ is the image of v under reflections on the left boundary $\{-1\}$. We then define for u and v in Λ

$$J^{neum}(u, v) := \sum_{v' \in R_\Lambda^{-1}(v)} J(u, v'). \quad (2.2)$$

Explicitly we have $J^{neum}(u, v) = J(u, v) + J(u, 2 - v) + J(u, -2 - v)$. By the assumption on J , $J^{neum}(u, v) = J^{neum}(v, u)$ and $\int J^{neum}(u, v) dv = 1$ for all $u \in \Lambda$. The pair interaction between x and y in Λ_N is given by

$$J_N(x, y) = N^{-1} J^{neum}\left(\frac{x}{N}, \frac{y}{N}\right).$$

The total interaction energy among particles is given by the following Hamiltonian

$$H_N(\eta) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, y \in \Lambda_N} J_N(x, y) \eta(x) \eta(y). \quad (2.3)$$

The choice to define by boundary reflections the interaction (2.2) has the advantage to keep J^{neum} a symmetric probability kernel. This choice has been already done in [5].

2.2. The dynamics. We denote by $\eta^{x,y}$ the configuration obtained from η by interchanging the values at x and y :

$$(\eta^{x,y})(z) := \begin{cases} \eta(y) & \text{if } z = x \\ \eta(x) & \text{if } z = y \\ \eta(z) & \text{if } z \neq x, y, \end{cases}$$

and by $\sigma^x \eta$ the configuration obtained from η by flipping the occupation number at site x :

$$(\sigma^x \eta)(z) := \begin{cases} 1 - \eta(x) & \text{if } z = x \\ \eta(z) & \text{if } z \neq x. \end{cases}$$

We denote for $f : \mathcal{S}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $x, y \in \Lambda_N$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_N$,

$$(\nabla_{x,y} f)(\eta) = f(\eta^{x,y}) - f(\eta).$$

The microscopic dynamics is specified by a continuous time Markov chain on the state space \mathcal{S}_N with infinitesimal generator given by

$$\mathcal{L}_N = \mathbb{L}_{\beta,N} + \mathbb{L}_{-,N} + \mathbb{L}_{+,N}, \quad (2.4)$$

where for function $f : \mathcal{S}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$(\mathbb{L}_{\beta,N} f)(\eta) = \sum_{\substack{x \in \Lambda_N, y \in \Lambda_N \\ |x-y|=1}} C_N^\beta(x, y; \eta) [(\nabla_{x,y} f)(\eta)], \quad (2.5)$$

with rate of exchange occupancies C_N^β given by

$$C_N^\beta(x, y; \eta) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{\beta}{2} [H_N(\eta^{x,y}) - H_N(\eta)] \right\}, \quad (2.6)$$

where H_N is the Hamiltonian (2.3);

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{L}_{-,N} f)(\eta) &= c_-(\eta(-N)) [f(\sigma^{-N} \eta) - f(\eta)], \\ (\mathbb{L}_{+,N} f)(\eta) &= c_+(\eta(N)) [f(\sigma^N \eta) - f(\eta)], \end{aligned}$$

where for any $\rho_\pm \in (0, 1)$, $c_\pm : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are given by

$$c_\pm(\zeta) := \rho_\pm(1 - \zeta) + (1 - \rho_\pm)\zeta.$$

The generator $\mathbb{L}_{\beta,N}$ describes the bulk dynamics which preserves the total number of particles whereas $\mathbb{L}_{\pm,N}$, which is a generator of a birth and death process acting on Γ_N , models the particles reservoir at the boundary of Λ_N . The rate of the bulk dynamics $\{C_N^\beta(x, y; \eta), x \in \Lambda_N, y \in \Lambda_N\}$, see (2.6), satisfies the detailed balance with respect to the Gibbs measure associated to (2.3) with chemical potential $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mu_N^{\beta,\lambda}(x) = \frac{1}{Z_N^{\beta,\lambda}} \exp\{-\beta H_N(\eta) + \lambda \sum_{x \in \Lambda_N} \eta(x)\}, \quad \eta \in \mathcal{S}_N, \quad (2.7)$$

where $Z_N^{\beta,\lambda}$ is the normalization constant. For the bulk rates this means

$$C_N^\beta(x, y; \eta) = e^{-\beta[H_N(\eta^{x,y}) - H_N(\eta)]} C_N^\beta(y, x; \eta^{x,y}).$$

For the generator it means that $\mathbb{L}_{\beta,N}$ is a self-adjoint w.r.t. the Gibbs measure (2.7), for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. The corresponding process is denoted reversible.

For a positive function $\rho : \Lambda_N \rightarrow (0, 1)$ we denote by $\nu_N^\rho(\cdot)$ the Bernoulli measure with marginals

$$\nu_N^{\rho(\cdot)}(\eta(x) = 1) = \rho(x/N) = 1 - \nu_N^\rho(\eta(x) = 0), \quad x \in \Lambda_N, \eta \in \mathcal{S}_N. \quad (2.8)$$

The boundary process $\mathbb{L}_{+,N}$ ($\mathbb{L}_{-,N}$) is invariant with respect to the Bernoulli measure $\nu_N^{\rho^+}$ (ν^{ρ^-}).

The Markov process associated to the generator \mathcal{L}_N , see (2.4), is *irreducible* and we denote by $\mu_N^{stat} = \mu_N^{stat}(\beta, \rho_-, \rho_+)$ the unique invariant measure. In the notation we stress only the dependence on the parameters relevant to us. This means that for any $f : \mathcal{S}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{L}_N f(\eta) d\mu_N^{stat}(\eta) = 0,$$

but the generator \mathcal{L}_N is *not* self-adjoint with respect to μ_N^{stat} . The corresponding process is called *non reversible*. The only case where the process is reversible is

when $\rho_- = \rho_+$ and $\beta = 0$. In such case the product measure associated to $\rho_- = \rho_+$ is invariant and the process with generator \mathcal{L}_N is also reversible.

We denote by \mathcal{M} the space of positive densities bounded by 1:

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{ \rho \in L_\infty([-1, 1], du) : 0 \leq \rho \leq 1 \right\},$$

where du stands for the integration with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $[-1, 1]$. We equip \mathcal{M} with the topology induced by the weak convergence of measures and denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the duality mapping. A sequence $\{\rho^n\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ converges to ρ in \mathcal{M} if and only if

$$\langle \rho^n, G \rangle = \int_\Lambda \rho^n(u) G(u) du \rightarrow \langle \rho, G \rangle$$

for any continuous function $G : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Note that \mathcal{M} is a compact Polish space that we consider endowed with the corresponding Borel σ -algebra. The empirical density of the configuration $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_N$ is defined as $\pi^N(\eta)$ where the map $\pi^N : \mathcal{S}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$\pi^N(\eta)(u) := \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} \eta(x) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \left[\frac{x}{N} - \frac{1}{2N}, \frac{x}{N} + \frac{1}{2N} \right) \right\}(u),$$

in which $\mathbf{1}\{A\}$ stands for the indicator function of the set A . Let $\{\eta^N\}$ be a sequence of configurations with $\eta^N \in \mathcal{S}_N$. If the sequence $\{\pi^N(\eta^N)\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ converges to ρ in \mathcal{M} as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we say that $\{\eta^N\}$ is *associated* to the macroscopic density profile $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$.

2.3. Functional Spaces. Fix a positive time T , let $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ and respectively $D([0, T], \mathcal{S}_N)$ be the set of right continuous with left limits trajectories $\pi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, resp. $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_N$, endowed with the Skorohod topology and equipped with its Borel σ -algebra. Take μ_N on \mathcal{S}_N and denote by $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ the Markov process with generator $N^2 \mathcal{L}_N$ starting, at time $t = 0$, by η_0 distributed according to μ_N . Notice that the generator of the process has been speeded up by N^2 . This corresponds to the diffusive scaling. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N}$ the probability measure on the path space $D([0, T], \mathcal{S}_N)$ corresponding to the Markov process $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and by $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N}$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N}$. We denote by π^N the map from $D([0, T], \mathcal{S}_N)$ to $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ defined by $\pi^N(\eta)_t = \pi^N(\eta_t)$ and by $Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N} = \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N} \circ (\pi^N)^{-1}$ the law of the process $(\pi^N(\eta_t))_{t \geq 0}$. For $m \in L_\infty([-1, 1])$ and $u \in \Lambda$ we denote

$$(J^{\text{neum}} \star m)(u) = \int_\Lambda J^{\text{neum}}(u, v) m(v) dv.$$

We need some more notations. For integers n and m we denote by $C^{n, m}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ the space of functions $G = G_t(u) : [0, T] \times [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with n derivatives in time and m derivatives in space which are continuous up to the boundary. We denote by $C_0^{n, m}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ the subset of $C^{n, m}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ of functions vanishing at the boundary of $[-1, 1]$, i.e. $G_t(-1) = G_t(1) = 0$ for $t \in [0, T]$. We denote by $C_c^{n, m}([0, T] \times (-1, 1))$ the subset of $C^{n, m}([0, T] \times (-1, 1))$ of functions with compact support in $[0, T] \times (-1, 1)$.

2.4. Results. We denote $\chi(\rho) = \rho(1 - \rho)$ and $\sigma(\rho) := 2\chi(\rho)$. We have that $\beta\chi(\rho)$ and $\beta\sigma(\rho)$ are respectively the compressibility and the mobility of the system. Further we denote by ∇f , resp. Δf , the gradient, resp. the laplacian with respect to u of a function f . For $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$, $\rho \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ denote

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_G^\beta(\rho, \rho_0) &:= \langle \rho_T, G_T \rangle - \langle \rho_0, G_0 \rangle - \int_0^T dt \langle \rho_t, \partial_t G_t \rangle \\ &\quad - \int_0^T dt \langle \rho_t, \Delta G_t \rangle + \rho_+ \int_0^T dt \nabla G_t(1) - \rho_- \int_0^T dt \nabla G_t(-1) \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^T \langle \sigma(\rho_t), (\nabla G_t) \cdot \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t) \rangle dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Denote by $\mathcal{A}_{[0, T]} \subset D([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ the set

$$\mathcal{A}_{[0, T]} = \left\{ \rho \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda)) : \forall G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda), \ell_G^\beta(\rho, \rho_0) = 0 \right\}.$$

Theorem 2.1. *For any sequence of initial probability measures $(\mu_N)_{N \geq 1}$, the sequence of probability measures $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N})_{N \geq 1}$ is weakly relatively compact and all its converging subsequences converge to some limit $Q^{\beta, *}$ that is concentrated on the absolutely continuous measures whose density $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_{[0, T]}$. Moreover, if for any $\delta > 0$ and for any continuous function $G : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow 0} \mu^N \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_N} \eta(x) G(x/N) - \int_\Lambda \gamma(u) G(u) du \right| \geq \delta \right\} = 0,$$

for an initial profile $\gamma : \Lambda \rightarrow (0, 1)$, then the sequence of probability measures $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N})_{N \geq 1}$ converges to the Dirac measure concentrated on the unique weak solution of the following boundary value problem on $(t, u) \in (0, T) \times \Lambda$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho_t(u) + \beta \nabla \cdot \left\{ \rho_t(u) (1 - \rho_t(u)) \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t)(u) \right\} = \Delta \rho_t(u) \\ \rho_t(\mp 1) = \rho_\mp \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \rho_0(u) = \gamma(u). \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 2.2. *By weak solution of the boundary value problem (2.10) we mean $\ell_G^\beta(\rho, \gamma) = 0$ for $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$.*

Theorem 2.3. *There exists β_0 depending on Λ and J^{neum} so that, for any $\beta < \beta_0$, for any $G \in C_0^2([-1, 1])$, for any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu_N^{\text{stat}} \left[\left| \langle \pi_N, G \rangle - \langle \bar{\rho}, G \rangle \right| \geq \delta \right] = 0,$$

where $\bar{\rho}$ is the unique weak solution of the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \rho(u) - \beta \nabla \cdot \left\{ \rho(u) (1 - \rho(u)) \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho)(u) \right\} = 0, \quad u \in \Lambda, \\ \rho(\mp 1) = \rho_\mp. \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

We prove Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 in Section 4. Recall that the stationary measure μ_N^{stat} depends on β .

Next we state the large deviations principle associated to the law of large numbers stated in Theorem 2.1. Let $\mathcal{J}_G^\beta = \mathcal{J}_{T, G, \gamma}^\beta : D([0, T], \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the functional

given by

$$\mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi) := \ell_G^\beta(\pi, \gamma) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle, \quad (2.12)$$

and $\hat{I}_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma) : D([0, T], \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ the functional defined by

$$\hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) := \sup_{G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])} \mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi). \quad (2.13)$$

To define the large deviation rate functional, we introduce the energy functional $\mathcal{Q} : D([0, T], \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ given by

$$\mathcal{Q}(\pi) = \sup_G \left\{ \int_0^T dt \langle \pi_t, \nabla G_t \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t) G_t, G_t \rangle \right\}, \quad (2.14)$$

where the supremum is carried over all $G \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times (-1, 1))$. From the concavity of $\sigma(\cdot)$ it follows immediately that \mathcal{Q} is convex and therefore lower semicontinuous. Moreover $\mathcal{Q}(\pi)$ is finite if and only if $\pi \in L^2([0, T]; H^1(\Lambda))$, and

$$\mathcal{Q}(\pi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_{-1}^1 du \frac{(\nabla \pi_t(u))^2}{\sigma(\pi_t(u))}. \quad (2.15)$$

If (2.15) holds, then an integration by parts and Schwarz inequality imply that (2.14) is finite. The converse needs to be proven, for a proof of it we refer to [4], subsection 4.1. The rate functional $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma) : D([0, T], \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is given by

$$I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) = \begin{cases} \hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) & \text{if } \mathcal{Q}(\pi) < +\infty, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

We show in Lemma 5.6 that $I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) = 0$ if and only if $\pi_t(\cdot)$ solves the problem (2.10) with initial datum $\pi_0(\cdot) = \gamma(\cdot)$.

We have the following dynamical large deviations principle.

Theorem 2.4. *Fix $T > 0$ and an initial profile γ in \mathcal{M} . Consider a sequence $\{\eta^N : N \geq 1\}$ of configurations associated to γ . Then, the sequence of probability measures $\{Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} : N \geq 1\}$ on $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ satisfies a large deviation principle with speed N and rate function $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$, defined in (2.16):*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}(\pi^N \in \mathcal{C}) &\leq - \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{C}} I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) \\ \underline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}(\pi^N \in \mathcal{O}) &\geq - \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{O}} I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

for any closed set $\mathcal{C} \subset D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ and open set $\mathcal{O} \subset D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$. The functional $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$ is lower semi-continuous and has compact level sets.

We prove Theorem 2.4 in Section 5.

3. BASIC ESTIMATE

Next lemma states some properties of the potential $J^{\text{neum}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ easily obtained by its definition.

Lemma 3.1. *The potential $J^{neum}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a symmetric probability kernel. Moreover for any regular function $G : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have the following:*

$$\nabla \left(\int_{\Lambda} J^{neum}(u, v) G(v) dv \right) = \int_{\Lambda} J^{neum}(u, v) \nabla G(v) dv.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \left(\int_{\Lambda} J^{neum}(u, v) G(v) dv \right) &= \int_{\Lambda} \partial_u J^{neum}(u, v) G(v) dv \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \left[J(u, v) - J(u, 2-v) - J(u, -2-v) \right] \nabla G(v) dv = \int_{\Lambda} J^{neum}(u, v) \nabla G(v) dv \end{aligned}$$

□

For any $G : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $x, x+1 \in \Lambda_N$ denote by $\nabla^N G(\frac{x}{N})$ the discrete gradient:

$$\nabla^N G(x/N) = N \left[G((x+1)/N) - G(x/N) \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Next, we show that the rate C_N^β of $\mathbb{L}_{\beta, N}$ is a perturbation of the rate of the symmetric simple exclusion generator.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $x \in \Lambda_N$, with $x+1 \in \Lambda_N$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_N$,*

$$C_N^\beta(x, x+1; \eta) = 1 \mp \frac{\beta}{2} (\eta(x+1) - \eta(x)) N^{-1} \nabla^N \left[(J^{neum}) \star \pi(\eta) \right] (x/N) + O(N^2).$$

Proof. By definition of H_N , for all $x, y \in \Lambda_N$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_N$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_{x,y} H_N)(\eta) &= \frac{1}{N} (\eta(x) - \eta(y))^2 \left(J^{neum}\left(\frac{x}{N}, \frac{y}{N}\right) - J^{neum}(0) \right) \\ &\quad + (\eta(x) - \eta(y)) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{z \in \Lambda_N} \eta(z) \left[J^{neum}\left(\frac{x}{N}, \frac{z}{N}\right) - J^{neum}\left(\frac{y}{N}, \frac{z}{N}\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

We start recalling the definitions of relative entropy and Dirichlet form, that are the main tools in the [12] approach. Let $h : \Lambda \rightarrow (0, 1)$ and $\nu_N^{h(\cdot)}$ be the product Bernoulli measure defined in (2.8). Given μ , a probability measure on \mathcal{S}_N , denote by $H(\mu | \nu_N^{h(\cdot)})$ the relative entropy of μ with respect to $\nu_N^{h(\cdot)}$:

$$H(\mu | \nu_N^{h(\cdot)}) = \sup_f \left\{ \int f(\eta) \mu(d\eta) - \log \int e^{f(\eta)} \nu_N^{h(\cdot)}(d\eta) \right\},$$

where the supremum is carried over all bounded functions on \mathcal{S}_N . Since $\nu_N^{h(\cdot)}$ gives a positive probability to each configuration, μ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\nu_N^{h(\cdot)}$ and we have an explicit formula for the entropy:

$$H(\mu | \nu_N^{h(\cdot)}) = \int \log \left\{ \frac{d\mu}{d\nu_N^{h(\cdot)}} \right\} d\mu. \quad (3.2)$$

Further, since there is at most one particle per site, there exists a constant C , that depends only on $h(\cdot)$, such that

$$H(\mu | \nu_N^{h(\cdot)}) \leq CN \quad (3.3)$$

for all probability measures μ on \mathcal{S}_N (cf. comments following Remark V.5.6 in [16]).

3.1. Dirichlet form estimates. One of the main step for deriving the hydrodynamic limit and the large deviations, is a super exponential estimate which allows the replacement of local functions by functionals of the empirical density. One needs to estimate expression such as $\langle Z, f \rangle_{\mu^N}$ in terms of Dirichlet form $N^2 \langle -\mathcal{L}_N \sqrt{f(\eta)}, \sqrt{f(\eta)} \rangle_{\mu^N}$, where Z is a local function and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mu^N}$ represents the inner product with respect to some probability measure μ^N . In the context of boundary driven process, the fact that the invariant measure is not explicitly known introduces a technical difficulty. We fix as reference measure a product measure $\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}$, see (2.8), where θ is a smooth function with the only requirement that $\theta(\mp 1) = \rho_{\mp}$. There is therefore no reasons for $N^2 \langle -\mathcal{L}_N \sqrt{f(\eta)}, \sqrt{f(\eta)} \rangle_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}}$ to be positive. Next lemma estimates this quantity.

Define the following functionals from $h \in L^2(\nu)$ to \mathbb{R}^+ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(h, \nu) &= \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int (h(\eta^{x,x+1}) - h(\eta))^2 d\nu(\eta), \\ \mathcal{D}_{+,N}(h, \nu) &= \frac{1}{2} \int c_+(\eta(N)) (h(\sigma^{N-1}\eta) - h(\eta))^2 d\nu(\eta), \\ \mathcal{D}_{-,N}(h, \nu) &= \frac{1}{2} \int c_-(\eta(-N)) (h(\sigma^{-N+1}\eta) - h(\eta))^2 d\nu(\eta). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\theta : \bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a smooth function such that $\theta(\mp 1) = \rho_{\mp}$. There exists a positive constant $C_0 \equiv C_0(\|\nabla\theta\|_{\infty})$ so that for any $a > 0$ and for $f \in L^2(\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)})$,*

$$\int_{S_N} f(\eta) \mathbb{L}_{\beta,N} f(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) \leq -(1-a) \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}) + \frac{C_0}{a} N^{-1} \|f\|_{L^2(\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)})}^2, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\int_{S_N} f(\eta) \mathbb{L}_{\pm,N} f(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) = -\mathcal{D}_{\pm,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}). \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. The proof of (3.6) follows from the reversibility of the Bernoulli measure $\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}$ with respect to $\mathbb{L}_{\pm,N}$. Next, we show (3.5). By Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_N} f(\eta) \mathbb{L}_{\beta,N} f(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) &\leq \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int [(\nabla^{x,x+1} f)(\eta)] f(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) \\ &\quad + \frac{A_1}{N} \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int |(\nabla^{x,x+1} f)(\eta)| f(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for some positive constant A_1 depending only on β and J . We write the first term of the right hand side of (3.7) as

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int [(\nabla^{x,x+1} f)(\eta)]^2 d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) \\ & + \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int R_N(x, x+1; \theta, \eta) [(\nabla^{x,x+1} f)(\eta)] f(\eta^{x,x+1}) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$R_N(x, x+1; \theta, \eta) = [1 - e^{-N^{-1} \nabla^N \lambda(\theta(x/N)) (\nabla^{x,x+1} \eta(x))}] , \quad (3.9)$$

λ is the chemical potential defined by

$$\lambda(r) = \log [r/(1-r)] \quad (3.10)$$

and ∇^N stands for the discrete derivative defined in (3.1). By the inequality

$$\text{for all } A, B \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a > 0, \quad AB \leq \frac{a}{2}A^2 + \frac{1}{2a}B^2 \quad (3.11)$$

and Taylor expansion, the formula (3.8) is bounded by

$$-(1 - \frac{a}{2}) \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int [(\nabla^{x,x+1} f)(\eta)]^2 d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) + \frac{A_2}{a} N^{-1} \|f\|_{L^2(\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)})}^2 \quad (3.12)$$

for all $a > 0$. Here A_2 is a positive constant.

The second term on the right hand side of (3.7) is handled in the identical way. It is bounded by

$$\frac{a}{2} \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int [(\nabla^{x,x+1} f)(\eta)]^2 d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) + \frac{A_3}{a} N^{-1} \|f\|_{L^2(\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)})}^2. \quad (3.13)$$

The lemma follows from (3.7), (3.8), (3.12) and (3.13). \square

Denote for $h \in L^2(\nu)$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\beta,N}(h, \nu) = \sum_{x=-N}^{N-1} \int C_N^\beta(x, x+1; \eta) (h(\eta^{x,x+1}) - h(\eta))^2 d\nu(\eta).$$

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a positive constant $C_1 = C_1(\beta, J)$ such that, for any measure ν and for $h \in L^2(\nu)$,*

$$(1 - \frac{C_1}{N}) \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(h, \nu) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\beta,N}(h, \nu) \leq (1 + \frac{C_1}{N}) \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(h, \nu).$$

Proof. The proof is elementary since $|C_N^\beta(x, x+e_i, \eta) - 1|$ is uniformly bounded in N , x and η . \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\rho, \rho_0 : \bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be two smooth functions. There exists a positive constant $C'_0 \equiv C'_0(\|\nabla \rho_0\|_\infty, \|\nabla \rho\|_\infty)$ such that for any probability measure μ^N on \mathcal{S}_N ,*

$$\mathcal{D}_{0,N} \left(\sqrt{\frac{d\mu^N}{d\nu_N^{\rho(\cdot)}}}, \nu_N^{\rho(\cdot)} \right) \leq 2 \mathcal{D}_{0,N} \left(\sqrt{\frac{d\mu^N}{d\nu_N^{\rho_0(\cdot)}}}, \nu_N^{\rho_0(\cdot)} \right) + C'_0 N^{-1}. \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. Denote by $f(\eta) = \frac{d\mu^N}{d\nu_N^{\rho(\cdot)}}(\eta)$ and $h(\eta) = \frac{d\mu^N}{d\nu_N^{\rho_0(\cdot)}}(\eta)$. Since $f(\eta) = h(\eta) \frac{d\nu_N^{\rho_0(\cdot)}(\eta)}{d\nu_N^{\rho(\cdot)}(\eta)}$ we obtain for $-N \leq x \leq N-1$ the following

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{S}_N} \left[\nabla_{x,x+1} \sqrt{f}(\eta) \right]^2 d\nu_N^{\rho(\cdot)}(\eta) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_N} \left[\sqrt{h}(\eta^{x,x+1}) R_2(x, x+1; \eta) + \nabla_{x,x+1} \sqrt{h}(\eta) \right]^2 d\nu_N^{\rho_0(\cdot)}(\eta) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{S}_N} \left[\nabla_{x,x+1} \sqrt{h}(\eta) \right]^2 d\nu_N^{\rho_0(\cdot)}(\eta) \\ &+ 2 \int_{\mathcal{S}_N} h(\eta^{x,x+1}) [R_N(x, x+1; \rho, \eta)]^2 d\nu_N^{\rho_0(\cdot)}(\eta), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_2(x, x+1; \eta) = \exp \left\{ (1/2)N^{-1} \nabla^N [\lambda(\rho(x/N)) - \lambda(\rho_0(x/N))] \nabla_{x, x+1} \eta(x) \right\} - 1$$

and λ is the chemical potential defined by (3.10). We conclude the proof using Taylor expansion and integration by parts. \square

3.2. Superexponential estimates. For a positive integer ℓ and $x \in \Lambda_N$ denote by

$$\Lambda_\ell(x) = \Lambda_{N, \ell}(x) = \{y \in \Lambda_N : |y - x| \leq \ell\}.$$

When $x = 0$, we shall denote $\Lambda_\ell(0)$ simply by Λ_ℓ , that is, for all $1 \leq \ell \leq N$,

$$\Lambda_\ell \equiv \Lambda_{N, \ell}(0) = \{-\ell, \dots, \ell\}.$$

Denote the empirical mean density on the box $\Lambda_\ell(x)$ by $\eta^\ell(x)$:

$$\eta^\ell(x) = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_\ell(x)|} \sum_{y \in \Lambda_\ell(x)} \eta(y). \quad (3.15)$$

For a cylinder function Ψ , that is a function on $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ depending on $\eta(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, only through finitely many x , denote by $\tilde{\Psi}(\rho)$ the expectation of Ψ with respect to ν^ρ , the Bernoulli product measure with density ρ :

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\rho) = E^{\nu^\rho}[\Psi]. \quad (3.16)$$

Further, denote for $G \in \mathcal{C}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ and $\varepsilon > 0$

$$V_{N, \varepsilon}^{G, \Psi}(s, \eta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_N} G_s(x/N) \left[\tau_x \Psi(\eta) - \tilde{\Psi}(\eta^{[\varepsilon N]}(x)) \right], \quad (3.17)$$

where the sum is carried over all x such that the support of $\tau_x \Psi$ belongs to Λ_N and $[\cdot]$ denotes the lower integer part.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\{\mu_N : N \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of probability measures on \mathcal{S}_N . For every $\delta > 0$,*

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N} \left[\left| \int_0^T V_{N, \varepsilon}^{G, \Psi}(s, \eta_s) ds \right| > \delta \right] = -\infty.$$

Proof. Fix $c > 0$ that will decrease to 0 after ε and a smooth function $\rho_c : \Lambda \rightarrow (0, 1)$ which is constant in $\Lambda_{(1-c)} = [-1+c, 1-c]$ and equal to ρ_\pm at the boundary, i.e. $\rho_c(\pm 1) = \rho_\pm$. The constant can be arbitrarily chosen and we denote it γ_0 . Divide Λ_N in two subsets, $\Lambda_{[(1-2c)N]}$ and $\Lambda_N \setminus \Lambda_{[(1-2c)N]}$ and split the sum over x in the definition of $V_{N, \varepsilon}^{G, \Psi}$ into the sum over these two sets. Since

$$\sup_{\eta, \varepsilon, N, x \in \Lambda_N} \left\{ G_s(x/N) \left[\tau_x \Psi(\eta) - \tilde{\Psi}(\eta^{[\varepsilon N]}(x)) \right] \right\} < \infty,$$

we have that

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_N \setminus \Lambda_{[(1-2c)N]}} G_s(x/N) \left[\tau_x \Psi(\eta) - \tilde{\Psi}(\eta^{[\varepsilon N]}(x)) \right] \right| \leq cTK_0 \quad (3.18)$$

for some positive constant K_0 which depends on G . By Chebyshev exponential inequality, for all $a > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N} \left[\left| \int_0^T V_{N, \varepsilon}^{G, \Psi}(s, \eta_s) ds \right| > \delta \right] \\ & \leq -a(\delta - TK_0c) + \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N} \left[\exp \left(aN \left| \int_0^T \mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(s, \eta_s) ds \right| \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

where

$$\mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(s, \eta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_{[(1-2c)N]}} G_s(x/N) \left[\tau_x \Psi(\eta) - \tilde{\Psi}(\eta^{\varepsilon N}(x)) \right]. \quad (3.20)$$

It is immediate to see that the Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N}}{d\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}}((\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}) = \frac{d\mu_N}{d\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}} \leq e^{NK_1(c)}$$

for some positive $K_1(c)$ that depends on c . The right hand side of (3.19) is bounded by

$$-a(\delta - TK_0c) + K_1(c) + \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}}^{\beta, N} \left[\exp \left(aN \left| \int_0^T \mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(s, \eta_s) ds \right| \right) \right]. \quad (3.21)$$

Since $e^{|x|} \leq e^x + e^{-x}$ and

$$\overline{\lim} N^{-1} \log \{a_N + b_N\} \leq \max \{ \overline{\lim} N^{-1} \log a_N, \overline{\lim} N^{-1} \log b_N \}, \quad (3.22)$$

we may remove the absolute value in the third term of (3.21), provided our estimates remain in force if we replace G by $-G$. Denote by

$$(\mathcal{L}_N)^s = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}_N + \mathcal{L}_N^*)$$

where \mathcal{L}_N^* is the adjoint of \mathcal{L}_N in $L^2(\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)})$. By the Feynman-Kac formula,

$$\frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}}^{\beta, N} \left[\exp \left(aN \int_0^T \mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(s, \eta_s) ds \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{N} \int_0^T \lambda_{N, \varepsilon}(G_s) ds, \quad (3.23)$$

where $\lambda_{N, \varepsilon}(G_s)$ is the largest eigenvalue of $\{N^2(\mathcal{L}_N)^s + Na\mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(G_s, \cdot)\}$. By the variational formula for the largest eigenvalue, for each $s \in [0, T]$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \lambda_{N, \varepsilon}(G_s) = \sup_f \left\{ \int a\mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(G_s, \eta) f(\eta) \nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}(d\eta) + N \langle \mathcal{L}_N \sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}} \right\}. \quad (3.24)$$

In this formula the supremum is carried over all densities f with respect to $\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}$. By Lemma 3.3, since (3.6) gives a negative contribution, it is enough, to get the result, to choose c such that $c < \frac{\delta}{TK_0}$ and to show that, there exists $M > 0$ that depends only on G and c , such that, for all $a > 0$

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_f \left\{ \int a\mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(G_s, \eta) f(\eta) \nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}(d\eta) - N\mathcal{D}_{0, N}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}) \right\} \leq M.$$

We then let $a \uparrow \infty$. Notice that for N large enough the function $\mathbb{V}_{N, \varepsilon}^{c, G, \Psi}(G_s, \eta)$ depends on the configuration η only through the variables $\{\eta(x), x \in \Lambda_{(1-c)N}\}$.

Since ρ_c is equal to γ_0 , in Λ_c , we replace $\nu_N^{\rho_c(\cdot)}$ in the previous formula by $\nu_N^{\gamma_0}$ with respect to which the operator $\mathbb{L}_{0,N}$ is reversible. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_{0,N}(\cdot, \nu_N^{\gamma_0})$ is the Dirichlet form associated to the generator $\mathbb{L}_{0,N}$. Since the Dirichlet form is convex, it remains to show that

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_f \left\{ \int a \mathbb{V}_{N,\varepsilon}^{c,G,\Psi}(G_s, \eta) f(\eta) \nu_N^{\gamma_0}(d\eta) - N \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_N^{\gamma_0(\cdot)}) \right\} = 0,$$

for any $a > 0$. This follows from the usual one block and two blocks estimates (cf. Chap 5 of [16]). \square

For $x = \pm N$, a configuration η and $\ell \geq 1$, let

$$W_N^{\pm, \ell}(\eta) = |\eta^\ell(\pm N) - \rho_\pm|, \quad (3.25)$$

where, see (3.15), $\eta^\ell(N) = \frac{1}{\ell+1} \{\eta(N-\ell) + \dots + \eta(N)\}$ and $\eta^\ell(-N) = \frac{1}{\ell+1} \{\eta(-N+\ell) + \dots + \eta(-N)\}$.

Proposition 3.7. *Fix a sequence $\{\mu_N : N \geq 1\}$ of probability measures on \mathcal{S}_N . For every $\delta > 0$,*

$$\overline{\lim}_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N} \left[\int_0^T W_N^{\pm, \ell}(\eta_s) ds > \delta \right] = -\infty.$$

Proof. Consider first the limit the term $W_N^{+, \ell}$. Fix a smooth function $\gamma : \bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ such that $\gamma(-1) = \rho_-$, and $\gamma(u) = \rho_+$ for $u \in [0, 1]$. Since the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\mu_N}{d\nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}}$ is bounded by $\exp(NK_1)$ for some positive constant K_1 , it is enough to show that

$$\overline{\lim}_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}}^{\beta, N} \left[\int_0^T W_N^{+, \ell}(\eta_s) ds > \delta \right] = -\infty.$$

We follow the same steps as in Proposition 3.6. Applying Chebyshev exponential inequality and Feynman-Kac formula, the expression in the last limit is bounded for all $a > 0$ by

$$-a\delta + \frac{T}{N} \tilde{\lambda}_{N,\varepsilon}(a), \quad (3.26)$$

where for all $a > 0$, $\frac{1}{N} \tilde{\lambda}_{N,\varepsilon}(a)$ is the largest eigenvalue of the $\nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}$ -reversible operator

$$f \rightarrow N(\mathcal{L}_N)^s(f) + a(W_N^{+, \ell})f.$$

Here $(\mathcal{L}_N)^s$ is the symmetric part of the operator \mathcal{L}_N in $L^2(\nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)})$. By the variational formula for the largest eigenvalue, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \tilde{\lambda}_{N,\varepsilon}(a) = \sup_f \left\{ \int a W_N^{+, \ell}(\eta) f(\eta) \nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}(d\eta) \right. \\ \left. + N \langle \mathcal{L}_N \sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this formula the supremum is carried over all densities f with respect to $\nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}$. By Lemma 3.3, we just need to show that, there exists $M > 0$, such that, for all $a > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_f \left\{ \int a W_N^{+, \ell}(\eta) f(\eta) \nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}(d\eta) \right. \\ \left. - N \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}) - N \mathcal{D}_{+,N}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}) \right\} \leq M. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the profile γ is constant equal to ρ_+ on $[0, 1]$. Since $W_N^{+, \ell}(\eta)$ depends only on coordinates in a box $\Lambda_\ell(N)$, we replace $\nu_N^{\gamma(\cdot)}$ in the previous formula by $\nu_N^{\rho_+}$. On the other hand, $\nu_N^{\rho_+}$ is reversible for $\mathbb{L}_{0,N} + \mathbb{L}_{+,N}$ and therefore $\mathcal{D}_{0,N}(\cdot, \nu_N^{\rho_+}) + \mathcal{D}_{+,N}(\cdot, \nu_N^{\rho_+})$ is the Dirichlet form associated to the generator $\mathbb{L}_{0,N} + \mathbb{L}_{+,N}$. Since the Dirichlet form is convex, it remains to show that

$$\overline{\lim}_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_f \left\{ \int a W_N^{+, \ell}(\eta) f(\eta) \nu_N^{\rho_+}(d\eta) - N \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_N^{\rho_+}) - N \mathcal{D}_{+,N}(\sqrt{f}, \nu_N^{\rho_+}) \right\} = 0.$$

for any $a > 0$. This follows from the law of large numbers by applying the same device used in the proof of the one block and two blocks estimates, (cf. Chap 5 of [16]). \square

3.3. Energy estimate. We prove in this subsection an energy estimate which is one of the main ingredient in the proof of large deviations and hydrodynamic limit. It allows to prove Lemma 4.3 and to exclude paths with infinite energy in the large deviation regime. For $\delta > 0$, $G \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Lambda)$ define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_G^\delta(\pi) = \int_0^T dt \langle \pi_t, \nabla G_t \rangle - \delta \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t) G_t, G_t \rangle, \quad (3.27)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^\delta(\pi) = \sup_{G \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Lambda)} \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_G^\delta(\pi) \right\}. \quad (3.28)$$

Notice that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^\delta(\pi) = \frac{1}{2\delta} \mathcal{Q}(\pi),$$

where $\mathcal{Q}(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.14).

For a function m in \mathcal{M} , let $m^\varepsilon : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be given by

$$m^\varepsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{[u-\varepsilon, u+\varepsilon] \cap \Lambda} m(v) dv.$$

When $u \in [-1 + \varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, $m^\varepsilon(u) = (m * \iota_\varepsilon)(u)$, where ι_ε is the approximation of the identity defined by

$$\iota_\varepsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}\{[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]\}(u).$$

Lemma 3.8. *There exists a positive constant C_1 depending only on ρ_\pm so that for any given $\delta_0 > 0$, for any δ , $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, for any sequence $\{\eta^N \in \mathcal{S}_N : N \geq 1\}$ and for any $G \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Lambda)$, we have*

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left[\exp(\delta N \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_G^{\delta_0}(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon)) \right] \leq C_1(T + 1).$$

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that ε is small enough so that the support of $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ is contained in $[0, T] \times [-1 + \varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. Let $\theta : \bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a smooth function such that $\theta(\mp 1) = \rho_\mp$. Since $\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta^N) \geq \exp\{-C'_1 N\}$ for some finite constant C'_1 depending only on θ , it is enough to prove the lemma with $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}}^{\beta, N}$ in place of $\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}$.

Set $\Psi_1(\eta) = [\eta(1) - \eta(0)]^2$ and note that $\tilde{\Psi}_1(a) = E^{\nu^a}[\Psi_1] = \sigma(a) = 2a(1-a)$, where ν^a is the Bernoulli measure with parameter $a \in [0, 1]$. Denote $B_{N,\varepsilon,\delta_0}^{G,\Psi_1}$ the set of trajectories $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0,T]}$ so that

$$B_{N,\varepsilon,\delta_0}^{G,\Psi_1} = \left\{ \eta \in D([0,T], \mathcal{S}_N) : \left| \int_0^T V_{N,\varepsilon}^{G^2,\Psi_1}(t, \eta_t) dt \right| \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0^2} \right\},$$

where $V_{N,\varepsilon}^{G^2,\Psi_1}$ is defined in (3.17). By (3.22) and Proposition 3.6, it is enough to show

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}}^{\beta,N} \left[e^{(\delta N \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_G^{\delta_0}(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon))} \mathbb{1}_{\{B_{N,\varepsilon,\delta_0}^{G,\Psi_1}\}} \right] \leq C_1(T+1).$$

Recalling the definition $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_G^\delta$, see (3.27), we have

$$\int_0^T dt \langle \pi_t^N * \iota_\varepsilon, \nabla G \rangle = \int_0^T dt \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} \{\eta_t(x) - \eta_t(x+1)\} G_t(x/N) + O_G(\varepsilon).$$

Further on the set $B_{N,\varepsilon,\delta_0}^{G,\Psi_1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_0 \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t^N * \iota_\varepsilon), G_t^2 \rangle &\geq \delta_0 \int_0^T dt \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t^2(x/N) \tau_x \Psi_1(\eta_t) \\ &\quad - \delta_0 O_{G^2}(N, \varepsilon) - \frac{1}{\delta_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where $O_G(\varepsilon)$ is absolutely bounded by a constant which vanishes as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and $O_{G^2}(N, \varepsilon)$ is absolutely bounded by a constant which vanishes as $N \uparrow \infty$. Therefore to conclude the proof it is enough to show that

$$\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}}^{\beta,N} \left[\exp \left(N \int_0^T dt V_G^\delta(t, \eta_t) \right) \right] \leq C_1 T \quad (3.29)$$

for any $\delta \leq \delta_0$, where

$$V_G^\delta(t, \eta) = \delta \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t(x/N) [\eta(x) - \eta(x+1)] - \frac{\delta^2}{N} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t^2(x/N) \tau_x \Psi_1(\eta).$$

Now, observe that $V_G^\delta = V_{\delta G}^1$. Therefore, to prove the lemma, we need to show that for any smooth function G ,

$$\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}}^{\beta,N} \left[\exp \left(N \int_0^T dt V_G^1(t, \eta_t) \right) \right] \leq C_1 T \quad (3.30)$$

for some constant C_1 that not depends on G . By Feynman-Kac formula and the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition 3.6, the expression of the limit in the right hand side of (3.30) is bounded above by

$$\int_0^T dt \sup_f \left\{ \int V_G^1(t, \eta) f^2(\eta) \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(d\eta) + N \langle \mathcal{L}_N f, f \rangle_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}} \right\},$$

where the supremum is over all functions f in $L^2(\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)})$ such that $\langle f, f \rangle_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}} = 1$. By Lemma 3.3, we replace $N \langle \mathcal{L}_N f, f \rangle_{\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}}$ by $-N(1-b)\mathcal{D}_{0,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}) + \frac{C_0}{b}$, where

$b \in (0,1)$ is arbitrarily chosen and C_0 is a constant depending only on ρ_{\pm} . It remains, therefore, to show that

$$\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T dt \sup_f \left\{ \int V_G^1(t, \eta) f^2(\eta) \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(d\eta) - N(1-b) \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}) \right\} \leq C_1 T. \quad (3.31)$$

We split

$$\int V_G^1(t, \eta) f^2(\eta) \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(d\eta) = I_1 - I_2,$$

where

$$I_1 = \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t(x/N) \int \{\eta(x) - \eta(x+1)\} f^2(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta),$$

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t^2(x/N) \int f^2(\eta) \tau_x \Psi_1(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta).$$

We estimate I_1 in term of I_2 and $\mathcal{D}_{0,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)})$. By changing variables $\eta' = \eta^{x,x+1}$, we have that

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t(x/N) \int \{\eta(x) - \eta(x+1)\} \{f^2(\eta) - f^2(\eta^{x,x+1})\} d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t(x/N) \int \{\eta(x) - \eta(x+1)\} R_N(x, x+1; \theta, \eta) f^2(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta), \quad (3.32)$$

where $R_N(x, x+1; \theta, \eta)$ is defined in (3.9). For the first term of (3.32), by inequality (3.11) and Taylor expansion, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t(x/N) \int \{\eta(x) - \eta(x+1)\} \{f^2(\eta) - f^2(\eta^{x,x+1})\} d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta)$$

$$\leq \frac{aN}{4} \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4aN} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t^2(x/N) \int \tau_x \Psi_1(\eta) [f(\eta) + f(\eta^{x,x+1})]^2 d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) \quad (3.33)$$

$$\leq \frac{aN}{4} \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}) + \frac{1}{aN} C(G)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{aN} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} G_t^2(x/N) \int \tau_x \Psi_1(\eta) f^2(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta)$$

where $C(G)$ is some constant that depends on G . For the second term of (3.32), by (3.11) and Taylor expanding R_N we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-2} G_t(x/N) \int \{\eta(x) - \eta(x+1)\} R_N(x, x+1; \theta, \eta) f^2(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta) \right| \\ & \leq C a + \frac{1}{N a} \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} \int G_t(x/N)^2 \tau_x \Psi_1(\eta) f^2(\eta) d\nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}(\eta), \\ & = C a + \frac{1}{a} I_2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

for all $a > 0$, for some positive constant C depending only on ρ_{\pm} . Taking into account (3.32), (3.34) and (3.33) we have

$$I_1 \leq \frac{2}{a} I_2 + \frac{aN}{4} \mathcal{D}_{0,N}(f, \nu_N^{\theta(\cdot)}) + C a + \frac{1}{aN} C(G) \tag{3.35}$$

We conclude the proof, by taking $a = 2$ and $b = \frac{1}{2}$ in (3.31). \square

The following corollary allows to show Lemma 4.3.

Corollary 3.9. *Fix a sequence $\{G_j : j \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{C}_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Lambda)$, $\delta_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\{\eta^N \in \mathcal{S}_N : N \geq 1\}$ of configurations. There exists a positive constant C_1 depending only on the values ρ_{\mp} , such that for any $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ and any $k \geq 1$*

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left[\exp \left(\delta N \sup_{1 \leq j \leq k} \tilde{Q}_{G_j}^{\delta_0}(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon) \right) \right] \leq C_1(T+1). \tag{3.36}$$

Proof. From (3.22), the limit in (3.36) is bounded above by

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\{ \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left[\exp \left(\delta N \tilde{Q}_{G_j}^{\delta_0}(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon) \right) \right] \right\}.$$

By Lemma 3.8 the thesis follows. \square

4. HYDRODYNAMIC AND HYDROSTATIC LIMITS

We prove in this section the hydrodynamic and hydrostatic limit for our system. The proof is based on the method introduced in [12] and [17] for hydrodynamic and in [8] for hydrostatic, taking into account, as explained in the introduction, of the lack of comparison and maximum principle for (2.10).

4.1. The steps to prove Theorem 2.1. Following [12] we divide the proof of the hydrodynamic behavior in three steps: tightness of the measures $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N})$, an energy estimate to provide the needed regularity for functions in the support of any limit point of the sequence $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N})$, and identification of the support of limit point of the sequence $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N})$ as weak solution of (2.10). We then refer to [17], Chapter 4, that present arguments, by now standard, to deduce the hydrodynamic behavior of the empirical measures from the preceding results and the uniqueness of the weak solution to equation (2.10).

Lemma 4.1. (Tightness) *The sequence $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta,N})$ is tight and all its limit points Q^* are concentrated on the following set*

$$Q^* \left\{ \pi : 0 \leq \pi_t(u) \leq 1, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u \in [-1, 1] \right\} = 1. \quad (4.1)$$

We then show that Q^* is supported on densities ρ that satisfy (2.10) in the weak sense.

We start defining for $G \in \mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^{G,N} &= \int_\Lambda G_T(u) \pi^N(\eta_T)(u) du - \int_\Lambda G_0(u) \pi^N(\eta_0)(u) du \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \int_\Lambda \partial_s G_s(u) \pi^N(\eta_s)(u) duds - \int_0^T \int_\Lambda \Delta G_s(u) \pi^N(\eta_s)(u) duds \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_N} \int_0^T (\nabla G_s)(x/N) \left\{ \sigma(\eta_s^{[\varepsilon N]}(x)) \nabla^N (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi^N(\eta_s))(x/N) \right\} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^T dt [\rho_+(\nabla G_t)(+1) - \rho_-(\nabla G_t)(-1)], \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where $\eta_s^{[\varepsilon N]}(x)$ is the local mean defined in (3.15) and $\nabla^N G_s(x/N)$ stands for the discrete gradient of $G_s(x/N)$ defined in (3.1).

Proposition 4.2. (Identification of the limit equation). *For any function G in $\mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda)$ and any $\delta > 0$ we have*

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta,N} (|\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^{G,N}| \geq \delta) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

The last statement is an energy estimate. Every limit point Q^* of the sequence $(Q_{\mu_N}^\beta)$ is concentrated on paths whose densities $\rho \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Lambda))$.

Lemma 4.3. (Energy estimate) *Let Q^* be a limit point of the sequence $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta,N})$. Then,*

$$Q^* \left[L^2(0, T; H^1(\Lambda)) \right] = 1. \quad (4.4)$$

4.2. Proof of Proposition 4.2. Let Q^* be a limit point of the sequence $(Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta,N})_{N \geq 1}$ and assume, without loss of generality, that $Q_{\mu_N}^{\beta,N}$ converges to Q^* . Fix a function G in $\mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda)$. Consider the $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta,N}$ martingales with respect to the natural filtration associated with $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, $M_t^G \equiv M_t^{G,N,\beta}$ and $\mathcal{N}_t^G \equiv \mathcal{N}_t^{G,N,\beta}$, $t \in [0, T]$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} M_t^G &= \langle \pi_t^N, G_t \rangle - \langle \pi_0^N, G_0 \rangle - \int_0^t (\langle \pi_s^N, \partial_s G_s \rangle + N^2 \mathcal{L}_N^\beta \langle \pi_s^N, G_s \rangle) ds, \\ \mathcal{N}_t^G &= (M_t^G)^2 \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \left\{ N^2 \mathcal{L}_N^\beta (\langle \pi_s^N, G_s \rangle)^2 - 2 \langle \pi_s^N, G_s \rangle N^2 \mathcal{L}_N^\beta \langle \pi_s^N, G_s \rangle \right\} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

A computation of the integral term of \mathcal{N}_t^G shows that the expectation of the quadratic variation of M_t^G vanishes as $N \uparrow \infty$. Therefore, by Doob's inequality, for

every $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}^{\beta, N} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t^G| > \delta \right] = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Since for any $s \in [0, T]$ the function G_s vanishes at the boundary of Λ , a summation by parts permits to rewrite the integral term of M_t^G as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \langle \pi_s^N, \partial_s G_s \rangle ds \\ & - \int_0^t N \left\{ \sum_{x=-N+1}^{N-1} (\nabla^N G_s)(x/N) C_N^\beta(x, x+1, \eta_s) (\nabla_{x, x+1} \eta_s(x)) \right\} ds, \end{aligned}$$

where ∇^N is defined in (3.1).

From Lemma 3.2, a summation by parts and Taylor expansion permit to rewrite the last expression as

$$\begin{aligned} & O(N) + \int_0^t \langle \pi_s^N, \partial_s G_s \rangle ds + \int_0^t \langle \pi_s^N, \Delta G_s \rangle ds \\ & + \int_0^t \left\{ -\nabla G_s(1) \eta_s(N) + \nabla G_s(-1) \eta_s(-N) \right\} ds \\ & + \frac{\beta}{2N} \int_0^t \left\{ \sum_{x \in \Lambda_N} (\nabla G_s)(x/N) (\nabla_{x, x+1} \eta_s(x))^2 \nabla^N (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi^N(\eta_s))(x/N) \right\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the replacement lemma stated in Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.7. We obtain that the integral term of the martingal M_t^G can be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \langle \pi_s^N, \partial_s G_s \rangle ds + \int_0^t \langle \pi_s^N, \Delta G_s \rangle ds \\ & + \int_0^t \left\{ -\nabla G_s(1) \rho_+ + \nabla G_s(-1) \rho_- \right\} ds \\ & + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{x \in \Lambda_N} (\nabla G_s)(x/N) \sigma(\eta^{\varepsilon N}(x)) \nabla^N (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi^N(\eta_s))(x/N) \right\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

4.3. Steps to prove Theorem 2.3. Let $\mu_N^{\text{stat}} = \mu_N^{\text{stat}}(\beta, \rho_-, \rho_+)$ be the unique stationary measure of the irreducible Markov process $(\eta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with generator \mathcal{L}_N . From Tchebyshev's inequality, we need to show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E^{\mu_N^{\text{stat}}} \left[\left| \langle \pi^N, G \rangle - \langle \bar{\rho}, G \rangle \right| \right] = 0, \quad (4.7)$$

where $E^{\mu_N^{\text{stat}}}$ stands for the expectation with respect to the stationary measure μ_N^{stat} . It is enough to prove that any subsequence of the sequence of real numbers in the limit (4.7) vanishes. Without loss of generality we consider a sequence in (4.7) as a subsequence along which the limit exists.

Denote by $Q^{\beta, N, \text{stat}} := Q_{\mu_N^{\text{stat}}}^{\beta, N}$ the probability measure on the Skorohod space $D([0, T]; \mathcal{M})$ induced by the Markov process $(\pi_t^N) \equiv (\pi_N(\eta_t))$, when the initial measure is μ_N^{stat} .

By the first part of Theorem 2.1 we have that all limit points of the sequence $Q^{\beta, N, \text{stat}}$ are concentrated on $\mathcal{A}_{[0, T]}$ for any $T > 0$, i.e all its limit points are

concentrated on the weak solutions of the hydrodynamic equation for some unknown initial profile.

Let $(Q^{\beta, N_k, stat})$ be a sub-sequence converging to a limit point which we denote by $Q^{\beta, *, stat}$. Note that different subsequences might have different limit points. Let β small enough and denote by $\bar{\rho}$ the unique stationary solution of (2.10), see Theorem 6.2. By stationarity we have for any $\delta > 0$,

$$E^{\mu_{N_k}^{stat}} \left[\left| \langle \pi^N, G \rangle - \langle \bar{\rho}, G \rangle \right| \right] = E^{\mu_{N_k}^{\beta, N_k, stat}} \left[\left| \langle \pi_T^N, G \rangle - \langle \bar{\rho}, G \rangle \right| \right].$$

Since the integrand is bounded we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E^{\mu_{N_k}^{\beta, N_k, stat}} \left\{ \left| \langle \pi_T^N, G \rangle - \langle \bar{\rho}, G \rangle \right| \right\} \\ &= E^{Q^{\beta, *, stat}} \left\{ \left(\left| \langle \rho_T, G \rangle - \langle \bar{\rho}, G \rangle \right| \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{A}_{[0, T]}\}}(\rho) \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \|G\|_2 E^{Q^{\beta, *, stat}} \left\{ \|\rho_T - \bar{\rho}\|_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{A}_{[0, T]}\}}(\rho) \right\} \\ &\leq \|G\|_2 e^{-c(\beta)T} \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

by Theorem 6.2 and $\|v\|_2$ denotes the $L^2(\Lambda)$ norm of v . Then letting $T \rightarrow \infty$ we have the thesis. \square

5. LARGE DEVIATIONS

In this section we prove some properties of the rate function and we present the main steps to derive the large deviations results.

Let $L^2(\Lambda)$ be the Hilbert space of functions $G : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int_{\Lambda} |G(u)|^2 du < \infty$ equipped with the inner product

$$\langle G, J \rangle_2 = \int_{\Lambda} G(u) J(u) du .$$

The norm of $L^2(\Lambda)$ is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_2$.

Let $H^1(\Lambda)$ be the Sobolev space of functions G with generalized derivatives ∇G in $L^2(\Lambda)$. $H^1(\Lambda)$ endowed with the scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1}$, defined by

$$\langle G, J \rangle_{H^1} = \langle G, J \rangle_2 + \langle \nabla G, \nabla J \rangle_2 ,$$

is a Hilbert space. The corresponding norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{H^1}$. Denote by $H^{-1}(\Lambda)$ the Hilbert space, dual of $H_0^1(\Lambda)$, equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{-1}$

$$\|v\|_{-1}^2 = \sup_{G \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Lambda)} \left\{ 2 \langle v, G \rangle_{-1,1} - \int_{\Lambda} \|\nabla G(u)\|^2 du \right\} ,$$

where $\langle v, G \rangle_{-1,1}$ stands for the duality between H_0^1 and H^{-1} . Fix $T > 0$. For a Banach space $(\mathbb{B}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{B}})$ we denote by $L^2([0, T], \mathbb{B})$ the Banach space of measurable functions $U : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ for which

$$\|U\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathbb{B})}^2 = \int_0^T \|U_t\|_{\mathbb{B}}^2 dt < \infty$$

holds.

5.1. **Properties of the rate function.** Denote

$$\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{\rho^\pm} = \{\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M}) : \pi_0(\cdot) = \gamma(\cdot); \quad \pi_t(\pm 1) = \rho_\pm, t \in (0, T)\}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let π be a trajectory in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ such that $\hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$. Then π belongs to $\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{\rho^\pm}$.*

The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 3.5 in [2]. To prove the lower-semicontinuity of the rate function, we need the next results

Lemma 5.2. *For any $\beta \geq 0$, there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(\beta)$ such that*

$$\int_0^T \|\partial_t \pi_t\|_{-1}^2 \leq C_0 \left\{ I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) + \mathcal{Q}(\pi) \right\}, \quad \mathcal{Q}(\pi) \leq C_0 \{1 + I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma)\}$$

for all π in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$.

Proof. The proof is the same as in Proposition 4.3. [22] or Theorem 3.3. in [20], or Lemma 4.9. in [4] \square

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\{\rho^n : n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of functions in $L^2([0, T] \times \Lambda)$ such that*

$$\int_0^T dt \|\rho_t^n\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_0^T dt \|\partial_t \rho_t^n\|_{-1}^2 \leq C_0$$

for some finite constant C_0 and all $n \geq 1$. Suppose that the sequence ρ^n converges weakly in $L^2([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ to some ρ . Then, ρ^n converges strongly in $L^2([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ to ρ .

Proof. Recall that $H^1(\Lambda) \subset L^2(\Lambda) \subset H^{-1}(\Lambda)$. By [26, Theorem 21.A], the embedding $H^1(\Lambda) \subset L^2(\Lambda)$ is compact. Hence, by [24, Lemma 4, Theorem 5], the sequence $\{\rho^n : n \geq 1\}$ is relatively compact in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Lambda))$. In particular, weak convergence of the sequence $\{\rho^n : n \geq 1\}$ implies strong convergence. \square

Theorem 5.4. *The functional $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$ is lower semicontinuous and has compact level sets.*

Proof. Theorem 5.4 is proven applying Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3. See Theorem 3.4. in [20] or Lemma 4.2. in [4]. \square

We provide an explicit representation for the rate function $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$ when it is finite. For $\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$, denote by $H_0^1(\sigma(\pi))$ the Hilbert space induced by $\mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ endowed with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\sigma(\pi)}$ defined by

$$\langle F, G \rangle_{\sigma(\pi)} = \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t), \nabla F_t \cdot \nabla G_t \rangle.$$

Induced means that we first declare two functions F, G in $\mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ to be equivalent if $\langle F - G, F - G \rangle_{\sigma(\pi)} = 0$ and then we complete the quotient space with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\sigma(\pi)}$. The norm of $H_0^1(\sigma(\pi))$ is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{\sigma(\pi)}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Take $\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ with $I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$. Then, it is uniquely determined a function F in $H_0^1(\sigma(\pi))$ such that π is the weak solution of the following boundary value problem:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \pi &= \Delta \pi - \nabla \cdot \{ \sigma(\pi) [\frac{\beta}{2} \nabla (J^{neum} \star \pi) + \nabla F] \} & \text{in } \Lambda \times (0, T), \\ \pi_0(\cdot) &= \gamma(\cdot) & \text{in } \Lambda, \\ \pi_t(\pm 1) &= \rho_\pm & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

Moreover,

$$I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \|F\|_{\sigma(\pi)}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t) \nabla F_t \cdot \nabla F_t \rangle. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. By assumption $I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) = \hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$, defined in (2.13). Then one proceeds as in [17] with the only difference that because the boundary conditions the space is $H_0^1(\sigma(\pi))$. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\rho \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$ be the weak solution of the boundary value problem (2.10) then*

$$I_T^\beta(\rho|\gamma) = \hat{I}_T^\beta(\rho|\gamma) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}(\rho) < \infty.$$

Further if $I_T^\beta(\rho|\gamma) = 0$, then $\rho \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$ is the weak solution of the boundary value problem (2.10).

Proof. We start showing that if $\rho \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$ is the weak solution of the boundary value problem (2.10) then $\mathcal{Q}(\rho) < \infty$. Take $F(\rho) = \rho \log \rho + (1-\rho) \log(1-\rho)$, for $\rho \in [0, 1]$. Since $\int_\Lambda F(\rho_t(u)) du$ is a bounded quantity for all $t \in R^+$, we have that

$$\int_0^T dt \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Lambda F(\rho_t(u)) du = \int_\Lambda [F(\rho_T(u)) - F(\rho_0(u))] du.$$

Notice that

$$F'(\rho) = \log \frac{\rho}{(1-\rho)} \quad \text{and} \quad F''(\rho) = \frac{1}{\rho(1-\rho)} = \frac{1}{\chi(\rho)}$$

are not uniformly bounded for $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Therefore we need some care to derive $F(\rho_t(u))$ with respect to t . We consider a sequence of smooth functions

$$F_n(\rho) = \left(1 + \frac{2}{n}\right)^{-1} \left(\rho + \frac{1}{n}\right) \log\left(\rho + \frac{1}{n}\right) + \left(1 - \rho + \frac{1}{n}\right) \log\left(1 - \rho + \frac{1}{n}\right)$$

so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(a) = F(a)$. We have

$$\int_0^T dt \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Lambda F_n(\rho_t(u)) du = \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda F_n'(\rho_t(u)) \frac{d}{dt} \rho_t(u). \quad (5.3)$$

To avoid boundary terms, take a smooth function $b(\cdot)$ defined on a neighborhood of $[-1, 1]$ such that $b(\mp 1) = \rho^\mp$ and $0 < \rho^- \leq b(\cdot) \leq \rho^+ < 1$. Denote

$$U_n(t, u) = F_n'(\rho_t(u)) - F_n'(b(u)).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} F'_n(\rho_t(u)) \frac{d}{dt} \rho_t(u) \\
&= \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} U_n(\rho_t(u)) \frac{d}{dt} \rho_t(u) + \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} F'_n(b(u)) \frac{d}{dt} \rho_t(u) \\
&= \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} U_n(\rho_t(u)) \frac{d}{dt} \rho_t(u) du + \int_{\Lambda} F'_n(b(u)) [\rho_T(u) - \rho_0(u)] du.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Taking into account (5.3), (5.4) and $U_n \in L^2([0, T], H_0^1)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T dt \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Lambda} F_n(\rho_t(u)) du - \int_{\Lambda} F'_n(b(u)) [\rho_T(u) - \rho_0(u)] du \\
&= - \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} \nabla U_n(t, u) [\nabla \rho_t(u) - \beta \rho_t(u) (1 - \rho_t(u)) (J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \rho_t)(u)] du.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Denote $\chi_n(a) = (a + \frac{1}{n})(1 + \frac{1}{n} - a)$. We have that

$$\nabla U_n(t, u) = \frac{\nabla \rho_t(u)}{\chi_n(\rho_t(u))} - \frac{\nabla b(u)}{\chi_n(b(u))}.$$

Taking this into account and collecting the above estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} \frac{(\nabla \rho_t(u))^2}{\chi_n(\rho_t(u))} du \\
&\leq - \int_{\Lambda} [F(\rho_T(u)) - F(\rho_0(u))] du + \int_{\Lambda} F'_n(b(u)) [\rho_T(u) - \rho_0(u)] du \\
&\quad + \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} \frac{\nabla b(u) \cdot \nabla \rho_t(u)}{\chi_n(b(u))} du \\
&\quad + \beta \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} \nabla \rho_t(u) \frac{\chi(\rho_t(u))}{\chi_n(\rho_t(u))} (J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \rho_t)(u) du \\
&\quad - \beta \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} \nabla b(u) \frac{\chi(\rho_t(u))}{\chi_n(b(u))} (J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \rho_t)(u) du.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Since $b(\cdot)$ is bounded below by a strictly positive constant and above by a constant strictly smaller than 1, and since

$$\int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} du \nabla \rho_t(u) (J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \rho_t)(u) \leq C$$

for some constant C , we obtain, uniformly in n

$$\int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} \frac{(\nabla \rho_t(u))^2}{\chi_n(\rho_t(u))} du \leq C'$$

for some finite constant C' which depends only on b and T . To conclude the proof it remains to apply Fatou's Lemma and recall the definition of $\mathcal{Q}(\rho)$ given in (2.15).

We have shown that $\mathcal{Q}(\rho) < \infty$. By Lemma 5.5 we conclude that $I_T^\beta(\rho|\gamma) = 0$. Similar arguments allow to prove the second statement of the lemma. \square

5.2. Comparison between $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$ and $I_T^0(\cdot|\gamma)$. Next, we compare the rate functional $\hat{I}_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$ with the rate functional $\hat{I}_T^0(\cdot|\gamma)$ of the symmetric simple exclusion process (i.e. $\beta = 0$).

Lemma 5.7. *For $\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$, with finite energy $\mathcal{Q}(\pi) < \infty$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\hat{I}_T^0(\pi|\gamma) - \frac{\beta^2}{16} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \pi_t)^2 &\leq \hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) \\ &\leq 2\hat{I}_T^0(\pi|\gamma) + \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \pi_t)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. Fix $\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ with finite energy and $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$. Recall from (2.12), (2.9) and (2.13) the definitions of $\mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi)$, ℓ_G^β and $I_T^0(\pi)$. By the inequality $ab \leq \frac{1}{2}a^2 + \frac{1}{2}b^2$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \ell_G^\beta(\pi, \gamma) - \ell_G^0(\pi, \gamma) \right| &= \left| \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda \sigma(\pi_t) (\nabla G_t) \cdot \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda \sigma(\pi_t) (\nabla G_t)^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{4} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda \sigma(\pi_t) [\nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since for each u , $J^{\text{neum}}(u, v)dv$ is a probability density on Λ and $\sigma(\cdot) \leq 1/2$, by Lemma 3.1, Jensen inequality and Fubini's Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta^2}{4} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda \sigma(\pi_t) [\nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t)]^2 \\ \leq \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda J^{\text{neum}} \star (\nabla \pi_t)^2 = \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \pi_t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi) &\leq \ell_G^0(\pi) - \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle + \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \pi_t)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda)} \left\{ 2\ell_G^0(\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \pi_t)^2 \\ &= 2\hat{I}_T^0(\pi) + \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \pi_t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, it is enough to take the supremum over $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ to obtain

$$\hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi) \leq 2\hat{I}_T^0(\pi) + \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \pi_t)^2.$$

The inequality in the left hand side of the statement is obtained in the same way. \square

Setting $\beta = 0$ in the boundary value problem (2.10) one gets the following boundary value problem for the heat equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho &= \Delta \rho & \text{in } \Lambda \times (0, T), \\ \rho_0(\cdot) &= \gamma(\cdot) & \text{in } \Lambda, \\ |\rho_t(\pm 1)| &= \rho_{\pm} & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\rho^{(0)}$ be the solution of (5.8), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_T^\beta(\rho^{(0)}|\gamma) &\leq \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^{(0)}), J^{\text{neum}} \star (\nabla \rho_t^{(0)})^2 \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{\beta^2}{16} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda |\nabla \rho_t^{(0)}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Proof. For any G in $C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$, see (2.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\rho^{(0)}) &= -\frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^{(0)}) \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t^{(0)}), \nabla G_t \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^{(0)}), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^{(0)}), [\nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t^{(0)})]^2 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

by inequality (3.11), taking $a = 1$. The solution of (5.8) belongs to $L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$ and its time derivative belongs to $L^2([0, T], H^{-1}(\Lambda))$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_T^\beta(\rho^0|\gamma) &= \sup_{G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])} \left\{ \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^0) \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t^0), \nabla G_t \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^0), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By inequality (3.11), this last expression is bounded by

$$\frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^0), [\nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t^0)]^2 \rangle.$$

We conclude the proof by applying Lemma 3.1 and Jensen inequality. \square

5.3. $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$ -Density. In this section we show that any trajectory $\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$, with finite rate function, $I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$, can be approximated by a sequence of smooth trajectories $\{\pi^n : n \geq 1\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi^n = \pi \text{ in } D([0, T], \mathcal{M}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_T^\beta(\pi^n|\gamma) = I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma).$$

Definition 5.9. *A subset \mathcal{A} of $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ is said to be $I_T(\cdot|\gamma)$ -dense if for every π in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ such that $I_T(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$, there exists a sequence $\{\pi^n : n \geq 1\}$ in \mathcal{A} such that π^n converges to π in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ and $I_T(\pi^n|\gamma)$ converges to $I_T(\pi|\gamma)$.*

Definition 5.10. *Let \mathcal{A}_1 be the subset of $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ consisting of trajectories π such that $I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$ and for which there exists $\delta > 0$ such that π is a weak solution of the equation (5.8) in the time interval $[0, \delta]$.*

Lemma 5.11. *The set \mathcal{A}_1 is $I_T(\cdot|\gamma)$ -dense.*

Proof. Fix a path π such that $I_T(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$ and let $\rho^{(0)}$ be the solution of the heat equation (5.8). For $\varepsilon > 0$, define π^ε as

$$\pi_t^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \begin{cases} \rho_t^{(0)}(\cdot) & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon, \\ \rho_{2\varepsilon-t}^{(0)}(\cdot) & \text{for } \varepsilon \leq t \leq 2\varepsilon, \\ \pi_{t-2\varepsilon}(\cdot) & \text{for } 2\varepsilon \leq t \leq T. \end{cases}$$

Since $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi^\varepsilon = \pi$ in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ and $I(\cdot|\gamma)$ is lower semicontinuous, it is enough to prove that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma) < \infty$ and that $\underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma) \leq I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma)$. From Lemma 5.1, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\pi_0^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \gamma(\cdot)$ and $\pi_t^\varepsilon(\pm 1) = \rho_\pm$. Decompose the rate function $I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma)$ as the sum of the contribution on each interval $[0, \varepsilon]$, $[\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$ and $[2\varepsilon, T]$. Since on $[0, \varepsilon]$ the path π satisfies equation (5.8), by Lemma 5.8, the contribution to the first interval is bounded by

$$\frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^\varepsilon dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \rho_t^{(0)})^2(v) dv.$$

This converges to 0 when $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. On the time interval $[\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$, π^ε satisfies

$$\partial_t \pi_t^\varepsilon = -\partial_t \rho_{2\varepsilon-t}^{(0)} = -\Delta \rho_{2\varepsilon-t}^{(0)} = -\Delta \pi^\varepsilon.$$

In particular, the contribution to $[\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$ is equal to

$$\sup \left\{ 2 \int_0^\varepsilon dt \langle \nabla \rho_t^{(0)}, \nabla G \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^\varepsilon dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^{(0)}) \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t^{(0)}), \nabla G_t \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\varepsilon dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^{(0)}), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \right\}, \quad (5.11)$$

where the supremum is taken over all $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$. We apply inequality (3.11) to the first and second term inside the supremum, then apply Lemma 5.8. By Lemma 3.1, the supremum (5.11) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & 4 \int_0^\varepsilon dt \int_\Lambda du \frac{(\nabla \rho_t^{(0)})^2}{\sigma(\rho_t^{(0)})} + \frac{\beta^2}{4} \int_0^\varepsilon dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^{(0)}) [\nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_t^{(0)})]^2 \rangle \\ & \leq 4 \int_0^\varepsilon dt \int_\Lambda du \frac{(\nabla \rho_t^{(0)})^2}{\sigma(\rho_t^{(0)})} + \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^\varepsilon dt \int_\Lambda (\nabla \rho_t^{(0)})^2. \end{aligned}$$

This last expression converges to zero as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Finally, the contribution on $[2\varepsilon, T]$ is bounded by $I_T(\pi|\gamma)$. \square

Definition 5.12. Denote by \mathcal{A}_2 the subset of \mathcal{A}_1 of all trajectories π such that for all $0 < \delta \leq T$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \leq \pi_t(u) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for $(t, u) \in [\delta, T] \times [-1, 1]$.

Lemma 5.13. The set \mathcal{A}_2 is $I_T^\beta(\cdot|\gamma)$ -dense.

Proof. By the previous lemma, it is enough to show that each trajectory π in \mathcal{A}_1 can be approximated by trajectories in \mathcal{A}_2 . Fix π in \mathcal{A}_1 and let ρ^0 be the solution of the equation (5.8). For each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, let $\pi^\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon)\pi + \varepsilon\rho^0$. We have that π^ε converges to π as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ a.e. in $\Lambda \times (0, T)$. By the lower semicontinuity of $I_T(\cdot|\gamma)$, it is enough to show that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma) \leq I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma). \quad (5.12)$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, by construction $\pi_0^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \gamma$ and $\pi_t^\varepsilon(\pm 1) = \rho_\pm$ for almost all $t \in [0, T]$. From the convexity of $\mathcal{Q}(\cdot)$, for each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$\mathcal{Q}(\pi_\varepsilon) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{Q}(\pi) + \varepsilon\mathcal{Q}(\rho^0) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\pi) + \mathcal{Q}(\rho^0) < \infty.$$

Since $\partial_t \pi^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \partial_t \rho^0 + (1 - \varepsilon) \partial_t \pi$ and, by the assumption, $I_T(\pi|\gamma)$ is finite, it follows from Lemma 5.2, that $\pi^\varepsilon \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Lambda))$ and $\partial_t \pi^\varepsilon \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Lambda))$. Next we show that $I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma)$ is finite uniformly on ε . We decompose the rate $I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma)$ in two terms:

$$I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma) \leq A_1 + A_2 \quad (5.13)$$

where

$$A_1 = \sup \left\{ \int_0^T dt \langle \partial_t \pi^\varepsilon, G_t \rangle + \int_0^T dt \langle \nabla \pi_t^\varepsilon, \nabla G_t \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \right\} \quad (5.14)$$

$$A_2 = \sup \left\{ \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon) \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t^\varepsilon), \nabla G_t \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \right\}, \quad (5.15)$$

and the supremum is taken over $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$. By concavity of $\sigma(\cdot)$, the term A_1 is bounded above by

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \sup \left\{ \int_0^T dt \langle \partial_t \pi_t, G_t \rangle + \int_0^T dt \langle \nabla \pi_t, \nabla G_t \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \right\} \\ + \varepsilon \sup \left\{ \int_0^T dt \langle \partial_t \rho^0, G_t \rangle + \int_0^T dt \langle \nabla \rho_t^0, \nabla G_t \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\rho_t^0) \nabla G_t, \nabla G_t \rangle \right\}. \quad (5.16)$$

Since ρ^0 solves the heat equation the second term of the last expression is equal to zero, while the first term is bounded above by $4I_T^0(\pi|\gamma)$ which is bounded by Lemma 5.7. By Schwartz inequality, Lemma 3.1 and Jensen inequality

$$A_2 \leq \frac{\beta^2}{4} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon) (J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \pi_t^\varepsilon)^2 \rangle \leq \frac{\beta^2}{8} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda (|\nabla \pi_t|^2 + |\nabla \rho_t^0|^2). \quad (5.17)$$

By (5.16) and (5.17) we have that $\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma) < \infty$.

We are now going to prove $\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon|\gamma) \leq I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma)$. We have by definition of π^ε that

$$\int_0^T dt \langle \partial_t \pi^\varepsilon, G_t \rangle = (1 - \varepsilon) \int_0^T dt \langle \partial_t \pi, G_t \rangle + \varepsilon \langle \partial_t \rho^0, G_t \rangle, \quad (5.18)$$

for any $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$. By Lemma 5.5, there exists $F \in H_0^1(\sigma(\pi))$ such that π solves the boundary value problem (5.1). Taking this into account and (5.18) we can write

$$\int_0^T dt \langle \partial_t \pi^\varepsilon, G_t \rangle \\ = \int_0^T dt \left\{ \langle -\nabla \pi^\varepsilon, \nabla G_t \rangle + (1 - \varepsilon) \left\langle \sigma(\pi_t) \left[\frac{\beta}{2} \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi) + \nabla F_t \right], \nabla G_t \right\rangle \right\} \\ = \int_0^T dt \left\{ \langle -\nabla \pi^\varepsilon, \nabla G_t \rangle + \left\langle \mathbb{R}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon), \nabla G_t \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\beta}{2} \sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon) \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t^\varepsilon), \nabla G_t \right\rangle \right\}, \quad (5.19)$$

where

$$\mathbb{F}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon) = (1 - \varepsilon)\sigma(\pi_t) \left[\frac{\beta}{2} \nabla(J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t) + \nabla F \right] - \frac{\beta}{2} \sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon) \nabla(J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t^\varepsilon).$$

By the definition of \hat{I}_T^β , see (2.13), we have that

$$\hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon | \gamma) = \sup \left\{ \int_0^T dt \langle \mathbb{F}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon), \nabla G_t \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon), (\nabla G_t)^2 \rangle \right\} = I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon | \gamma), \quad (5.20)$$

where the supremum is taken over all $G \in \mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda)$. The last equality in (5.20) holds because $\mathcal{Q}(\pi^\varepsilon)$ is bounded for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and then (2.16) applies. Since for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ so that $\sigma(\pi^\varepsilon) \geq \delta(\varepsilon)$ we can apply to the first term inside the argument of the supremum of (5.20) inequality (3.11) to cancel the contribution of the second term inside the argument of the supremum, obtaining

$$I_T^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon | \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda du \frac{(\mathbb{F}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon))^2}{\sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon)}.$$

On the other hand, from (5.2),

$$I_T^\beta(\pi | \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t) \nabla F_t, \nabla F_t \rangle.$$

Therefore, to conclude the proof, it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_\Lambda du \frac{(\mathbb{F}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon))^2}{\sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon)} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \sigma(\pi_t) \nabla F_t, \nabla F_t \rangle. \quad (5.21)$$

By the continuity of σ and the definition of $\mathbb{F}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon)$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\mathbb{F}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon))^2}{\sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon)} = \sigma(\pi_t) (\nabla F_t)^2, \quad a.e. \quad \text{in } \Lambda \times (0, T).$$

By the convexity of $a \rightarrow a^2$, the concavity of $\sigma(\cdot)$ and Lemma 3.1, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\mathbb{F}_t^\beta(\pi^\varepsilon))^2}{\sigma(\pi_t^\varepsilon)} &\leq \frac{\beta^2}{4} \sigma(\pi) [J^{\text{neum}} \star (\nabla \pi)^2] \\ &\quad + [\sigma(\pi) + \sigma(\rho^0)] [J^{\text{neum}} \star ((\nabla \pi)^2 + (\nabla \rho^0)^2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (5.21) follows by Lebesgue dominated convergence Theorem. \square

Definition 5.14. Denote by \mathcal{A}_3 the trajectories $\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ such that π is the solution of the boundary value problem (5.1) for some $F \in \mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda)$.

The last step is to prove that \mathcal{A}_3 is $I_T^\beta(\cdot | \gamma)$ -dense. We follow the strategy adopted in [8]: given a trajectory $\pi_t(u)$ in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ with finite rate function $I_T(\pi | \gamma) < \infty$, from Lemma 5.5, there exists a function F in $H_0^1(\sigma(\pi))$ such that π is a weak solution to the equation (5.1). Instead of approximating π by a sequence of smooth trajectories in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ (cf. [4],[20],[22]), we will approximate F by smooth functions (F_n) and we then show that the corresponding smooth solutions (π_n) of (5.1) converge to π in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ and $I_T(\pi_n | \gamma)$ converges to $I_T(\pi | \gamma)$.

Lemma 5.15. The set \mathcal{A}_3 is $I_T^\beta(\cdot | \gamma)$ -dense.

Proof. In view of the previous lemma, it is enough to show that for each π in \mathcal{A}_2 , we can exhibit a sequence $\{\pi_n : n > 0\}$ in \mathcal{A}_3 which converges to π in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ and such that $I_T(\pi_n|\gamma)$ converges to $I_T(\pi|\gamma)$. Fix $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_2$. Since $I_T(\pi|\gamma)$ is finite, by Lemma 5.5, there exists a function $F \in H_0^1(\sigma(\pi))$ such that π is the weak solution to the boundary value problem (5.1). We claim that $F \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$ and then, can be approximated by a sequence of smooth functions $(F^n)_{n \geq 1}$. Indeed, let $0 < \delta < T$ be such that, π is the solution of the heat equation (5.8) in the time interval $[0, \delta]$. We have that $\nabla F = -\frac{\beta}{2}\nabla(J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi)$ in $[0, \delta] \times \Lambda$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} |\nabla F_t(u)|^2 du &= \int_0^{\delta} dt \int_{\Lambda} \frac{\beta^2}{4} |\nabla(J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi)(t, u)|^2 du \\ &+ \int_{\delta}^T dt \int_{\Lambda} |\nabla F_t(u)|^2 du. \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

On the other hand, since $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_2$, there exists $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that $\varepsilon \leq \pi_t(\cdot) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for $\delta \leq t \leq T$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\delta}^T dt \int_{\Lambda} |\nabla F_t(u)|^2 du &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma(\varepsilon)} \|F\|_{\sigma(\pi)}^2 \\ &= \frac{2}{\sigma(\varepsilon)} I_T^{\beta}(\pi|\gamma) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

It follows from (5.22) and (5.23) that $F \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$. Let $(F^n)_{n > 0}$ be a sequence of functions in $C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times \Lambda)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F^n = F$ in $L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$.

For each integer $n > 0$, let π^n be the weak solution of (5.1) with F^n in place of F . By (5.2)

$$I_T^{\beta}(\pi^n|\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \nabla F_t^n \cdot \sigma(\pi_t^n) \nabla F_t^n \rangle \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T dt \int_{\Lambda} du \|\nabla F_t^n(u)\|^2.$$

Since the sequence $(F^n)_{n > 0}$ converges to F in $L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$, it follows from the last inequality that $I_T^{\beta}(\pi^n|\gamma)$ is uniformly bounded. Thus, by Theorem 5.4, the sequence π^n is relatively compact in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$. Let $\{\pi^{n_k} : k \geq 1\}$ be a subsequence of π^n converging to some π^0 in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$, then $\{\pi^{n_k} : k \geq 1\}$ converges weakly to π^0 in $L^2([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$. Since $I_T^{\beta}(\pi^n|\gamma)$ is uniformly bounded, by Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3, π^{n_k} converges to π^0 strongly in $L^2([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$. For every G in $C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi_T^{n_k}, G_T \rangle - \langle \gamma, G_0 \rangle &= \int_0^T dt \langle \pi_t^{n_k}, \partial_t G_t \rangle \\ &+ \int_0^T dt \langle \pi_t^{n_k}, \Delta G_t \rangle - \rho_+ \int_0^T dt \nabla G_t(1) + \rho_- \int_0^T dt \nabla G_t(-1) \\ &+ \int_0^T \langle \nabla G_t, \sigma(\pi_t^{n_k}) \left[\frac{\beta}{2} \nabla(J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t^{n_k}) + \nabla F_t^{n_k} \right] \rangle dt. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi_T^0, G_T \rangle - \langle \gamma, G_0 \rangle &= \int_0^T dt \langle \pi_t^0, \partial_t G_t \rangle \\ &+ \int_0^T dt \langle \pi_t^0, \Delta G_t \rangle - \rho_+ \int_0^T dt \nabla G_t(1) + \rho_- \int_0^T dt \nabla G_t(-1) \\ &+ \int_0^T \langle \nabla G_t, \sigma(\pi_t^0) \left[\frac{\beta}{2} \nabla (J^{\text{neum}} \star \pi_t^0) + \nabla F_t \right] \rangle dt. \end{aligned}$$

That is π^0 is a weak solution of equation (5.1). Thus, by uniqueness of weak solutions of (5.1), $\pi^0 = \pi$.

To conclude the proof of the lemma it remains to prove that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_T^\beta(\pi^n | \gamma) = I_T^\beta(\pi | \gamma)$. The sequence $(\pi^n)_{n>0}$ converges to π strongly in $L^2([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ and the sequence $(F^n)_{n>0}$ converges to F in $L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$. Taking into account that π is bounded and σ is Lipschitz, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_T^\beta(\pi^n | \gamma) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \nabla F_t^n \cdot \sigma(\pi_t^n) \nabla F_t^n \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \langle \nabla F_t \cdot \sigma(\pi_t) \nabla F_t \rangle = I_T^\beta(\pi | \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

□

5.4. Upper bound. Let $\tilde{Q} = \tilde{Q}^2$ be the functional given by (3.28) with $\delta_0 = 2$. For all $0 \leq a \leq 1$, denote by $\mathcal{E}_a : D([0, T], \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ the following functional

$$\mathcal{E}_a(\pi) = \hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi | \gamma) + a(1+a)\tilde{Q}(\pi).$$

The proof of the upper bound relies on the following proposition.

Proposition 5.16. *Let \mathcal{K} be a compact set of $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$. There exists a positive constants C , such that for any $0 \leq a \leq 1$,*

$$\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^d} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}(\mathcal{K}) \leq -\frac{1}{1+a} \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{E}_a(\pi) + aC(T+1).$$

Proof. Fix a density profile $\theta : [-1, 1] \rightarrow (0, 1)$, a function G in $C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ and a function H in $C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Lambda)$. For a local function $\Psi : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a function G , $c > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $B_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, \Psi}$ and $E_{N, c}^G$ denote the set of trajectories $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} B_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, \Psi} &= \left\{ \eta \in D([0, T], \mathcal{S}_N) : \left| \int_0^T V_{N, \varepsilon}^{G, \Psi}(t, \eta_t) dt \right| \leq c \right\}, \\ E_{N, c}^G &= \left\{ \eta \in D([0, T], \mathcal{S}_N) : \left| \int_0^T W_N^G(t, \eta_t) dt \right| \leq c \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_{N, \varepsilon}^{G, \Psi}$ and W_N^G are defined in (3.17) and (3.25).

Define $\Psi_1(\eta) = [\eta(1) - \eta(0)]^2$, let $A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H}$ be the set

$$A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H} = B_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{\nabla G, \Psi_1} \cap E_{N, c}^{\nabla G} \cap B_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{\nabla H, \Psi_1}.$$

By the superexponential estimates stated in Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.7, it is enough to prove that, for every $0 < a \leq 1$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{c \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}(\mathcal{K} \cap A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H}) \leq -\frac{1}{1+a} \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{E}_a(\pi) + aC_0 T.$$

For $H \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Lambda)$, recall from (3.27) the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi) = \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H^2(\pi)$, with $\delta_0 = 2$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left(\mathcal{K} \cap A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H} \right) &= \\ \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left[\mathbb{1} \{ \mathcal{K} \cap A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H} \} e^{aN \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon)} e^{-aN \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder inequality the right hand side of the last equality is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(1+a)N} \log \mathbb{E}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left[\mathbb{1} \{ \mathcal{K} \cap A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H} \} e^{-a(1+a)N \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon)} \right] \quad (5.24) \\ + \frac{a}{(1+a)N} \log \mathbb{E}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left[e^{(1+a)N \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.8, the second term of this inequality is bounded by $aC_1(T+1)$. Consider the exponential martingale M_t^G defined by

$$\begin{aligned} M_t^G &= \exp \left\{ N \left[\langle \pi_t^N, G_t \rangle - \langle \pi_0^N, G_0 \rangle \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t e^{-N \langle \pi_s^N, G_s \rangle} (\partial_s + N^2 \mathcal{L}_N) e^{N \langle \pi_s^N, G_s \rangle} ds \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

Since the sequence $\{\eta^N : N \geq 1\}$ is associated to γ , an elementary computation shows that on the set $A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H}$

$$M_T^G = \exp N \left\{ \mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon) + O_G(\varepsilon) + O(c) \right\}, \quad (5.26)$$

where $O_G(\varepsilon)$ (resp. $O(c)$) is a quantity which vanishes as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ (resp. $c \downarrow 0$) and $\mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\cdot)$ is the functional defined in (2.12). Consider the first term of (5.24) and rewrite it as

$$\frac{1}{(1+a)N} \log \mathbb{E}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \left[M_T^G (M_T^G)^{-1} \mathbb{1} \{ \mathcal{K} \cap A_{N, \varepsilon, c}^{G, H} \} e^{-a(1+a)N \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi^N * \iota_\varepsilon)} \right]$$

Optimizing over π^N in \mathcal{K} , since M_t^G is a mean one positive martingale, the previous expression is bounded above by

$$-\frac{1}{1+a} \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi * \iota_\varepsilon) + a(1+a) \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi * \iota_\varepsilon) \right\} + O_G(\varepsilon) + O(c).$$

Optimize the previous expression with respect to G and H . Since the set \mathcal{K} is compact and $\mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\cdot * \iota_\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\cdot * \iota_\varepsilon)$ are lower semi-continuous for every G, H, ε , we may apply the arguments presented in [25, Lemma 11.3] to exchange the supremum with the infimum. In this way we obtain that the last expression is bounded above by

$$\frac{1}{1+a} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \inf_{G, H, \varepsilon} \left\{ -\mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi * \iota_\varepsilon) - a(1+a) \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi * \iota_\varepsilon) \right\} + O_G(\varepsilon) + O(c).$$

Letting first $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and then $c \downarrow 0$, we obtain that the limit of the previous expression is bounded above by

$$\frac{1}{1+a} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \inf_{G, H} \left\{ -\mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi) - a(1+a) \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_H(\pi) \right\}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma because $\sup_G \mathcal{J}_G^\beta(\pi) = \hat{I}_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma)$. \square

Proof of the upper bound. Let \mathcal{K} be a compact set of $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$. If for all $\pi \in \mathcal{K}$, $\tilde{Q}(\pi) = \infty$ then the upper bound is trivially satisfied. Suppose that $\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \{\tilde{Q}(\pi)\} < \infty$, from Proposition 5.16, for any $0 < a \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}(\mathcal{K}) &\leq -\frac{1}{1+a} \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}, \tilde{Q}(\pi) < \infty} \mathcal{E}_a(\pi) + aCT \\ &= -\frac{1}{1+a} \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) + a(1+a)\tilde{Q}(\pi) \right\} + aCT \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{1+a} \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) \right\} - a \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{K}} \tilde{Q}(\pi) + aCT. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude the proof of the upper bound for compact sets, it remains to let $a \downarrow 0$.

To pass from compact sets to closed sets, we have to obtain exponential tightness for the sequence $Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}$. The proof presented in [16, Section 10.4.] is easily adapted to our context. \square

5.5. Lower bound. In this section we establish the large deviations lower bound.

The strategy of the proof of the lower bound consists of two steps. We first prove that for each $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_3$, recall its definition in 5.14, and each neighborhood \mathcal{N}_π of π in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$

$$\underline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \{ \mathcal{N}_\pi \} \geq -I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma). \quad (5.27)$$

The proof of the lower bound is then accomplished by showing, see Subsection 5.3, that for any $\pi \in D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ with $I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma) < \infty$ we can find a sequence of $\pi^k \in \mathcal{A}_3$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi^k = \pi$ in $D([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_T^\beta(\pi^k|\gamma) = I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma)$.

The proof of (5.27) is similar to the one in the periodic case, see [16, Section 10.5.]. It depends on establishing laws of large numbers, in hydrodynamic scaling, for weak perturbations of the original process, and controlling by the Girsanov formula the relative entropies of the processes that go with these perturbations. Fix a path $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_3$. Then, by construction, there exists $F \in \mathcal{C}_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ so that π is the weak solution of the equation (5.1). Recall from (5.25) the definition of the exponential martingale M_T^F . Let $\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F$ be the probability measure on the path space $D([0, T], \mathcal{S}_N)$ with density M_T^F with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}$: $\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F[A] = \mathbb{E}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}[M_T^F \mathbf{1}\{A\}]$. Let $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be the process with law $\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F$ on $D([0, T], \mathcal{S}_N)$. Let $(\pi_t^N)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be the corresponding empirical measure. Then $(\pi_t^N)_{t \in [0, T]}$ converges weakly in probability to $(\pi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. From the super exponential estimates, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.7, we have

$$\underline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log Q_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \{ \mathcal{N}_\pi \} \geq -\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} H \left(\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F | \mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \right),$$

where $H(\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F | \mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N})$ stands for the relative entropy given by

$$H(\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F | \mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}) = \int \log \left\{ \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F}{d\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N}} \right\} d\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F.$$

To conclude the proof, it remains to show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} H \left(\mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^F | \mathbb{P}_{\eta^N}^{\beta, N} \right) = I_T^\beta(\pi|\gamma).$$

The proof of [16, Theorem 10.5.4] is easily adapted to our model. \square

6. APPENDIX

In this section we summarize the properties of the equation (2.10) needed to prove the main results of the paper. The proofs of these results are based on applying standard tools in partial differential equations, although some care need to be taken because of the presence of the nonlocal term. Notice that because of the nonlocal term the comparison property does not hold for this equation, so tools based on maximum principle will not work for (2.10).

We recall the notion of weak solution of (2.10). A function $\rho(\cdot, \cdot) : [0, T] \times \Lambda \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a weak solution of the initial-boundary value problem (2.10) if $\rho \in L^2([0, T], H^1(\Lambda))$ and for every $G \in C_0^{1,2}([0, T] \times [-1, 1])$ one has $\ell_G^\beta(\rho, \gamma) = 0$, where ℓ_G^β was defined in (2.9).

Theorem 6.1. *For any $\beta \geq 0$ there exists an unique weak solution of (2.10).*

The existence of a weak solution of (2.10) is a consequence of the tightness of $(Q_{\mu_N}^\beta)_{N \geq 1}$ and the characterization of the support of its limit points, see Lemma 4.3. The uniqueness can be easily proven performing estimates as in Theorem 6.2 for all β . A proof of existence without invoking the hydrodynamic limit can be done applying in our setting the argument done in [10], Section 4.

Theorem 6.2. *There exists β_0 depending on J^{neum} and Λ , so that for $\beta \leq \beta_0$ there exists an unique weak stationary solution $\bar{\rho}$ of (2.11). Further, let $\rho_t(\rho_0)$ be the weak solution of (2.10) with initial datum $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. For $\beta < \beta_0$, there exists $c(\beta) > 0$ so that*

$$\|\rho_t(\rho_0) - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^2(\Lambda)} \leq e^{-c(\beta)t} \|\rho_0 - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^2(\Lambda)}.$$

Proof. Let $\rho_{i,0} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\rho_{i,t}$ be the solution of (2.10) for $t \geq 0$, with initial datum $\rho_{i,0}$, $i = 1, 2$. Set $v = \rho_1 - \rho_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 &= - \int_{\Lambda} \nabla v [\nabla v - \beta \chi(\rho_1) J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \rho_1 + \beta \chi(\rho_2) J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \rho_2] \\ &= - \int_{\Lambda} \nabla v [\nabla v - \beta \chi(\rho_1) J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla v + \beta [\chi(\rho_2) - \chi(\rho_1)] J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla \rho_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Since $\chi(a) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ for $a \in [0, 1]$ and $|\chi(\rho_2) - \chi(\rho_1)| = |[\rho_2 - \rho_1][1 - (\rho_2 + \rho_1)]| \leq |v|$ we have that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \nabla v [\nabla v - \beta \chi(\rho_1) J^{\text{neum}} \star \nabla v] \geq \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 [1 - \frac{\beta}{4}] \quad (6.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Lambda} \nabla v [\chi(\rho_2) - \chi(\rho_1)] \nabla J^{\text{neum}} \star \rho_2 \right| &\leq \sup |\nabla J^{\text{neum}}| \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{a}{2} \sup |\nabla J^{\text{neum}}|^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2a} \|v\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

for any $a > 0$. Taking into account (6.2) and (6.3) we can estimate (6.1) as following:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 [1 - \beta(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{a}{2} \sup |\nabla J^{\text{neum}}|^2)] + \frac{\beta}{2a} \|v\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (6.4)$$

and we choose a so that

$$\frac{1}{4} + \frac{a}{2} \sup |\nabla J^{\text{neum}}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

Since we are in a bounded domain we can use the Poincaré inequality

$$\|v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\Lambda) \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2$$

obtaining

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -\|v\|_{L^2}^2 \frac{[1 - \frac{\beta}{3}]}{C(\Lambda)} + \frac{\beta}{2a} \|v\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (6.5)$$

Take β_0 so that

$$\frac{[1 - \frac{\beta_0}{3}]}{C(\Lambda)} - \frac{\beta_0}{2a} = 0$$

Then for $\beta < \beta_0$ there exists $c(\beta) > 0$, $\frac{[1 - \frac{\beta}{3}]}{C(\Lambda)} - \frac{\beta}{2a} = c(\beta) > 0$, so that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -c(\beta) \|v\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (6.6)$$

This implies immediately that the stationary solution is unique and that it is exponential attractive in L^2 . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Asselah A. and Giacomin G. : *Metastability for the exclusion process with mean-field interaction*. J. Stat. Phys., **93**, Nos 5/6, (1998), 1051-1110.
- [2] Bertini L., De Sole A., Gabrielli D., Jona-Lasinio G., Landim C., *Large deviations for the boundary driven simple exclusion process*. Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **6**, 231–267 (2003).
- [3] Bertini L., De Sole A., Gabrielli D., Jona-Lasinio G., Landim C., *Large deviation approach to non equilibrium processes in stochastic lattice gases*. Bull. Braz. Math. Soc., New Series **37** 611-643 (2006).
- [4] Bertini, L. Landim, C. and Mourragui, M. *Dynamical large deviations for the boundary driven weakly asymmetric exclusion process*. Ann. Probab. Volume 37, Number 6 (2009), 2357-2403.
- [5] De Masi A., Presutti E., Tsagkarogiannis D., *Fourier Law, phase transition and the stationary Stephan problem*. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-011-0423-1,
- [6] Derrida B., *Non equilibrium steady states: fluctuations and large deviations of the density and of the current*. J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. P07023 (2007).
- [7] Deuschel, J. D., Stroock D. W., *Large Deviations*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1989.
- [8] Farfan, J.S. Landim, C. and Mourragui, M. *Hydrostatics and dynamical large deviations of boundary driven gradient symmetric exclusion processes*. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 2010.
- [9] Giacomin G. and Lebowitz J. L.: *Phase segregation dynamics in particle systems with long range interaction I. Macroscopic limits*. J. Stat. Phys **87**(1997), 37–61.
- [10] Giacomin G. and Lebowitz J. L.: *Phase segregation dynamics in particle systems with long range interaction II. Interface Motion*. SIAM J. Appl. Math. **58**(1998), 1707–1729.
- [11] Giacomin, G., Lebowitz, J. L. and Marra, R.: *Macroscopic evolution of particle systems with short- and long-range interactions*. Nonlinearity. **13**, (2000), 2143–2162.
- [12] Guo M.Z., G. Papanicolau G., Varadhan S.R.S., *Nonlinear diffusion limit for a system with nearest neighbor interactions*. Comm. Math. phys. **118**, 31–59, (1988).
- [13] Kac M., Uhlenbeck G., and Hemmer P.C.: On the van der Waals theory of vapour-liquid equilibrium. I. Discussion of a one-dimensional model. *J. Math. Phys.* **4**(1963), 216–228.
- [14] II. Discussion of the distribution functions. *J. Math. Phys.* **4**(1963), 229–247.
- [15] III. Discussion of the critical region. *J. Math. Phys.* **5**(1964), 60–74.
- [16] Kipnis C., Landim C., *Scaling limits of interacting particle systems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1999.
- [17] Kipnis C., Olla S., Varadhan S.R.S., *Hydrodynamics and large deviations for simple exclusion processes*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **42**, 115–137 (1989).

- [18] Liggett, T.M. *Continuous time Markov processes: an introduction*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics., Vol 113, AMS. (2010).
- [19] Lebowitz J. and Penrose O.: Rigorous treatment of the Van der Waals Maxwell theory of the liquid-vapour transition. *J. Math. Phys.* **7**(1966), 98–113.
- [20] Mourragui M. and Orlandi E. *Large deviations from a macroscopic scaling limit for particle systems with Kac interaction and random potential*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Probabilités, **43**, p.677-715, (2007).
- [21] Mourragui, M. Orlandi, E. *Lattice gas model in random medium and open boundaries: hydrodynamic and relaxation to the steady state*. *Journal of Statistical Physics*. Volume 136, Number (2009), 685-714.
- [22] Quastel, J., Rezakhanlou, F., Varadhan, S. R. S., *Large deviations for the symmetric simple exclusion process in dimensions $d \geq 3$* , Probab. Th. Rel. Fields **113**, 1–84, (1999).
- [23] O. Penrose and J. L. Lebowitz, *Rigorous treatment of metastable states in the Van der Waals Maxwell theory*, *J. Statist. Phys.*, **3**, 211-236, (1971).
- [24] Simon, J. *Compact Sets in the Space $L^p(0, T; B)$* . Annali di Matematica pura ed applicata, (IV), Vol. **CXLVI**, 65–96 (1987).
- [25] Varadhan S.R.S., *Large Deviations and Applications*. CBMS- NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, **46** (1984).
- [26] E. Zeidler, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Applications*. II/A, Linear Monotone Operators and II/B Nonlinear Monotone Operators. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.

MUSTAPHA MOURRAGUI

CNRS UMR 6085, UNIVERSITÉ DE ROUEN,
 AVENUE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ, BP.12, TECHNOPOLE DU MADRILLET,
 F76801 SAINT-ÉTIENNE-DU-ROUVRAY, FRANCE.
E-mail address: Mustapha.Mourragui@univ-rouen.fr

ENZA ORLANDI

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA TRE,
 L.GO S.MURIALDO 1, 00146 ROMA, ITALY.
E-mail address: orlandi@mat.uniroma3.it