

EXPONENTIAL MIXING OF 2D SDES FORCED BY DEGENERATE LÉVY NOISES

LIHU XU

ABSTRACT. We modify the coupling method established in [22] and develop a technique to prove the exponential mixing of a 2D stochastic system forced by degenerate Lévy noises. In particular, these Lévy noises include α -stable noises ($0 < \alpha < 2$). Thanks to the stimulating discussion [14], this technique is promising to study the exponential mixing problem of SPDEs driven by degenerate *symmetric* α -stable noises.

1. INTRODUCTION

We shall study in this paper the exponential ergodicity of degenerate stochastic evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} dX_1(t) = [-\lambda_1 X_1(t) + F_1(X(t))]dt + dz(t), \\ dX_2(t) = [-\lambda_2 X_2(t) + F_2(X(t))]dt \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $X(t) = (X_1(t), X_2(t))^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$ for every $t \geq 0$, $\lambda_2, \lambda_1 > 0$, $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is bounded and Lipschitz, $z(t)$ is a one dimensional Lévy process satisfying Assumption 2.1 below. We often simply write the above equation as the following form:

$$dX(t) = [AX(t) + F(X(t))]dt + dZ_t, \quad (1.2)$$

where $A = \text{diag}\{-\lambda_1, -\lambda_2\}$ and $Z_t = [z(t), 0]^T$.

Since the end of the last century, the ergodicity of stochastic systems forced by degenerate noises has also been intensively studied, see [3, 4, 5, 6] for the SPDEs with degenerate Wiener noises and [9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 13] for those forced by kick noises. However, there seems no ergodicity result for the stochastic systems driven by degenerate Lévy jump noises. To our knowledge, this paper seems the first one in this direction.

The main novelty of the present paper is that we obtain the exponential ergodicity for a family of 2D SDEs driven by a large class of degenerate Lévy jump noises which include α -stable noises with $0 < \alpha < 2$. In [9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22], the authors assumed that the kick noises come periodically and are bounded or with exponential moments. [13] studied polynomial mixing for the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation driven by random kick noises with all $p > 0$ moments. Clearly, all these assumptions in the above literatures rule out the interesting Lévy noises only with some $p > 0$ moment such as α -stable noises.

Let us also compare our ergodicity result with those known for SDEs and SPDEs forced by Lévy noises. [17] established the exponential mixing for a family of SPDEs with a form similar to Eq. (1.2) under total variational norm, provided that the noises are *non-degenerate* α -stable with $1 < \alpha < 2$. The non-degeneracy assumption and the regime of $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ are crucial for getting the strong Feller property and applying the Lyapunov function technique. The new point in the present paper is that our noises are degenerate and can be α -stable with $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. It is well known that $\alpha = 1$ is a critical point of α -stable noises and α -stable type operators. Many nice results in the case of $\alpha > 1$ can not be extended to the case $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ ([16]). [7] established some nice criteria of the exponential mixing (under total variation norm) for a family of finite

dimensional SDEs driven by jump noises which include some one dimensional equations driven by α -stable noises.

Our approach is by modifying the coupling method established in [22, 20], which has been applied to study the ergodicity problems of many degenerate stochastic systems ([9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 13]). Roughly speaking, we follow the idea in [22, 20] to split the dynamics into two parts, one with noises and the other with strong dissipation. We apply a maximal coupling for the part with noises to mix the coupling chain and take advantage of strong dissipation to control the part without noises. There are two different points between our modification and the methods in [20, 22]. We sample the solution Markov chain according to the moment that a jump larger than K comes (see Section 3), while the Markov chains in [20] are sampled periodically thanks to their special periodical kick noises. To handle this new random effect, we need to estimate some more complicated stopping times in sequel. The other point is that we use the jumps larger than K to construct the coupling chains, while [22, 20] take the advantage of small jumps.

It is natural to ask whether our exponential ergodicity result can be extended to SPDEs forced by finite dimensional Lévy noises such as $z(t) = \sum_{k=1}^n z_k(t)$ with $z_1(t), \dots, z_n(t)$ being a sequence of independent purely jump noises. Unfortunately, it seems our technique is not applicable even for the case of 3d SDEs driven by 2d Lévy jump noises. Let us point out the difficulty (very roughly by the following models. Consider

$$\begin{cases} dX_1(t) = [-\lambda_1 X_1(t) + F_1(X(t))]dt + dz_1(t), \\ dX_2(t) = [-\lambda_2 X_2(t) + F_2(X(t))]dt + dz_2(t), \\ dX_3(t) = [-\lambda_3 X_3(t) + F_3(X(t))]dt \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 > 0$, $F : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is bounded and Lipschitz, $z_1(t)$ and $z_2(t)$ are independent 1d Lévy jump processes. Let λ_3 be sufficiently large to make the dissipative term $-\lambda_3 X_3(t)$ dominate the third equation. For the first two equations, when $z_1(t)$ has a jump η_1 at some moment τ , there are no jumps for $z_2(t)$ at τ almost surely. We can take the advantage of the jump η_1 to control the growth of the sample paths of $X_1(t)$ in a short time interval $[\tau, \tau + \delta)$. Due to the lack of the random effect, the growth of the sample paths of $X_2(t)$ can not be handled in $[\tau, \tau + \delta)$.

From the stimulating discussion [14], our technique is promising to study the exponential mixing problem of SPDEs driven by finite dimensional *symmetric* α -stable processes. These type of processes have a nice representation by W_{S_t} with W_t being a standard n -dimensional Brownian motion and S_t being an $\alpha/2$ -stable subordinator. When a jump of S_t comes, all the n directions of W_{S_t} jumps simultaneously, thus the difficulties in Eq. (1.3) will not appear any more. Symmetric α -stable processes have recently studied by both analysis and probability communities ([2, 23, 24]).

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces some notations and gives our main theorem. A coupling Markov chain is introduced in Section 3. Section 4 introduces some stopping times related to this Markov chain, which is used to prove the main theorem in Section 5.

Acknowledgements: The author gratefully thanks Jerzy Zabczyk for the stimulating discussions and many useful suggestions. He also gratefully thanks Armen Shirikyan for patiently teaching him the coupling method in the paper [22]. Special thanks are due to Vahagn Nersisyan for numerous useful suggestions, carefully reading the paper and stimulating discussions about studying the exponential mixing problem of SPDEs driven by *symmetric* α -stable noises.

2. NOTATIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

Denote by $B_b(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the Banach space of bounded Borel-measurable functions $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_0 := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} |f(x)|.$$

Denote by $L_b(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the Banach space of global Lipschitz bounded functions $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_1 := \|f\|_0 + \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}.$$

where $\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|}$.

2.1. Some preliminary of Lévy process ([1]). Let $(z(t))_{0 \leq t < \infty}$ be a one-dimensional purely jumping Lévy process with the characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\xi z(t)} = e^{t\psi(\xi)}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\psi(\xi)$ is the symbol of $z(t)$. Recall

$$\psi(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \left(e^{i\xi y} - 1 - i\xi y 1_{\{|y| \leq 1\}} \right) \nu(dy),$$

where ν is the Lévy measure associated with $z(t)$.

For every $t > 0$, a Poisson random measure $N(t, \cdot)$ is defined by

$$N(t, \Gamma) := \sum_{s \in (0, t]} 1_{\Gamma}(\Delta z(s)), \quad \forall t > 0, \forall \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}),$$

where $\Delta z(s) = z(s) - z(s-)$. For every $K > 0$, define

$$z^K(t) := \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} \Delta z(s) 1_{\{\Delta z(s) \geq K\}}.$$

Further define

$$\Gamma_K := (-\infty, -K] \cup [K, \infty), \quad \gamma_K := \nu(\Gamma_K),$$

γ_K is a decreasing function of K and $\gamma_K < \infty$ for $K > 0$.

Let $\tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_n, \dots$ be a sequence of random times such that

$$\tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2 - \tilde{\tau}_1, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_n - \tilde{\tau}_{n-1}, \dots$$

are independent exponential random variables with parameter γ_K , i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_n - \tilde{\tau}_{n-1} > s) = e^{-\gamma_K s}, \quad s > 0.$$

It is well known that $z^K(t)$ can also be represented by

$$z^K(t) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \eta_k 1_{\{\tilde{\tau}_k \leq t\}} \tag{2.1}$$

where η_k are independent random variable sequences with distribution

$$\nu_K := \frac{1}{\gamma_K} \nu|_{\Gamma_K}. \tag{2.2}$$

Assumption 2.1. Assume that the following conditions hold:

(A1) For every $\lambda > 0$ and $p \in (0, \alpha)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2)$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} dz(s) \right|^p < \infty.$$

(A2) For some $K > 0$, ν_K has a density function p_K such that for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_K(z - z_1) - p_K(z - z_2)| dz \leq \beta_1 |z_1 - z_2|^{\beta_2},$$

where $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$ are constants only depending on K .

(A3) There exist some $M > 0$ and some $\beta_0 = \beta_0(K, M) \in (0, 2)$ such that if $|z_1| + |z_2| \leq M$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_K(z - z_1) - p_K(z - z_2)| dz \leq \beta_0.$$

(A4) $\gamma_K \geq 2\beta_2 \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}$.

Remark 2.2. The number '2' in ' $\gamma_K \geq 2\beta_2 \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}$ ' of (A4) can be replaced by any number $c > 1$. We choose the special '2' to make the computation in sequel more simple. Roughly speaking, (A4) means that the process $(z(t))_{t \geq 0}$ has sufficiently many jumps bigger than K . The number M will be chosen in Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 2.3. *An α -stable process $(z(t))_{t \geq 0}$ with $0 < \alpha < 2$ satisfies Assumption 2.1.*

Proof. Recall that the Lévy measure of the α -stable process has the form

$$\nu(dx) = \frac{c_\alpha}{|x|^{\alpha+1}} 1_{\{|x|>0\}} dx,$$

where c_α is some not important constant. It is easy to see that $\gamma_K \uparrow \infty$ as $K \downarrow 0$, thus (A4) holds. Since $z(t)$ has the characteristic function $e^{-|\xi|^\alpha t}$, it is easy to check that $\int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} dz_s$ has characteristic function $\exp\{-\frac{1-e^{-\alpha\lambda t}}{\alpha\lambda} |\xi|^\alpha\}$. This, together with (3.2) of [19], immediately gives (A1).

For every $K > 0$, we have

$$p_K(z - z_i) = \frac{\alpha K^\alpha}{2} \frac{1}{|z - z_i|^{\alpha+1}} 1_{\{|z - z_i| > K\}}, \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

Since the supports of the functions $p_K(z - z_1)$ and $p_K(z - z_2)$ have overlaps, it holds that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_K(z - z_1) - p_K(z - z_2)| dz < \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_K(z - z_1) dz + \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_K(z - z_2) dz = 2.$$

It is easy to check that for all $M > 0$, there exists some $\beta_0 \in (0, 2)$ depending on M and K such that (A3) holds.

It remains to verify (A2). By the easy fact $1 - \left(\frac{1}{1+r}\right)^\alpha \leq (\alpha + 1)r$ for $|r| < \frac{1}{2+2\alpha}$, when $|z_1 - z_2| \leq \frac{K}{2\alpha+2}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_K(z - z_1) - p_K(z - z_2)| dz \leq \frac{2\alpha + 2}{K} |z_2 - z_1|.$$

As $|z_2 - z_1| > \frac{K}{2\alpha+2}$, we have $\frac{4\alpha+4}{K} |z_2 - z_1| > 2$ and thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_K(z - z_1) - p_K(z - z_2)| dz \leq \frac{4\alpha + 4}{K} |z_2 - z_1|.$$

Take $\beta_1 = \frac{4\alpha+4}{K}$ and $\beta_2 = 1$, we immediately get (A2). \square

2.2. **Main result.** Let us first show Eq. (1.1) is well-posed and then give the main theorem.

Theorem 2.4. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, problem (1.1) has a unique strong solution $(X^x(t))_{t \geq 0}$ with the form:

$$X^x(t) = e^{At}x + \int_0^t e^{A(t-s)}F(X^x(s))ds + \int_0^t e^{A(t-s)}dZ_s. \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, $(X^x(t))_{t \geq 0}$ has a càdlàg version in \mathbb{R}^2 and is an \mathbb{R}^2 -valued Markov process starting from x .

Proof. The existence, uniqueness and Markov property of the strong solution have been proved in [19]. Since Z_t clearly has a càdlàg version, $\int_0^t e^{A(t-s)}dZ_s$ also has a càdlàg one. The other two terms on the r.h.s. of (2.3) are both continuous, so $(X^x(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is càdlàg. \square

Denote by $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the Markov semigroup associated with (1.1), i.e.

$$P_t f(x) := \mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))], \quad f \in B_b(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

and by $(P_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$ the dual semigroup acting on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Our *main result* is the following ergodic theorem which will be proven in the last section.

Theorem 2.5. Let $\lambda_1 > 0$ and Assumption 2.1 both hold. There exists some $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\|F\|_1, M, \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2)$, where $M, \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$ are as in Assumption 2.1, such that as $\lambda_2 > \lambda_0$, the system (1.1) is exponentially ergodic under the weak topology of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. More precisely, there exists a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ so that for any $p \in (0, \alpha)$ and any measure $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with finite p^{th} moment, we have

$$|\langle P_t^* \tilde{\mu}, f \rangle - \langle \mu, f \rangle| \leq C e^{-ct} \|f\|_1 \left(1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^p \tilde{\mu}(dx) \right), \quad \forall f \in L_b(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad (2.4)$$

where C, c depend on $p, K, \|F\|_1, \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, M$.

Let us briefly give the strategy of the coupling method we shall use (it is a modification of the method established in [22]):

(i) Take a *waiting time* T (a fixed number) and define $\tau_0 = 0$, we look for the first jump after the time T and record its moment by τ_1 . Similarly, we do not look for the next jump immediately after τ_1 but do it after the time $\tau_1 + T$, and so on. In this way we get a sequence of stopping time $\{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 0}$. The waiting time T will play an important role for estimating the stopping times associated with the coupling Markov chain below.

(ii) For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, take two copies of processes $(X^x(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and $(X^y(t))_{t \geq 0}$, consider the corresponding embedded Markov chains $(X^x(\tau_k))_{k \geq 0}$ and $(X^y(\tau_k))_{k \geq 0}$. Using maximal coupling, we construct a coupling Markov chain $(S^{x,y}(k))_{k \geq 0}$ with $S^{x,y}(k) = (S^x(k), S^y(k))$ for every $k \geq 0$. $(S^x(k))_{k \geq 0}, (S^y(k))_{k \geq 0}$ have the same distributions as those of $(X^x(\tau_k))_{k \geq 0}$ and $(X^y(\tau_k))_{k \geq 0}$ respectively.

(iii) Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma} &= \inf\{k > 0; |S^x(k)| + |S^y(k)| \leq M\}, \\ \hat{\sigma} &= \inf\{k > 0; |S^x(k) - S^y(k)| \geq \tau_k / \lambda_2^k\}. \end{aligned}$$

The exact $\hat{\sigma}$ is defined in (5.1), but the above simple version captures the essential part of (5.1). The main ingredient for showing Theorem 2.5 is

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{c\tilde{\sigma}}] < \infty, \quad \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma} = \infty | S_{\tilde{\sigma}}) > 0.$$

The first inequality implies that the system $(S(k))_{k \geq 0}$ enters the M -radius ball exponentially frequently. The second inequality means that as long as $(S(k))_{k \geq 0}$ is in that ball, there exists a set

of sample paths with positive probability such that $|S^x(k) - S^y(k)|$ converges to zero exponentially fast as long as λ_2 is sufficiently large.

Without loss of generality, from now on we assume

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2.$$

Our method of course covers the case $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, in which the dissipative term $AX(t)$ dominates the system and the exponential mixing can be shown by a quite easy argument ([18]).

2.3. Some easy estimates about the solution.

Lemma 2.6. *For every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $p \in (0, \alpha)$, if $\lambda_2 > \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X^x(t)|^p &\leq (3^{p-1} \vee 1)e^{-\lambda_1 p t}|x|^p + C, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \\ \mathbb{E}|X^x(t) - X^y(t)|^p &\leq (3^{p-1} \vee 1)e^{-\lambda_1 p t}|x - y|^p + C, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \\ |X^x(t) - X^y(t)| &\leq e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}}|x - y|, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \\ |X_2^x(t) - X_2^y(t)| &\leq \left(e^{-\lambda_2 t} + \frac{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} + \lambda_2} e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \right) |x - y|, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

where $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and C depends on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_0$.

Proof. By (2.3) we have

$$|X^x(t)| \leq e^{-\lambda_1 t} |x| + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} |F(X^x(s))| ds + \left| \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} dz(s) \right|,$$

this, together with (A1) and the assumption of F , immediately gives the first inequality. Observe

$$|X^x(t) - X^y(t)| \leq e^{-\lambda_1 t} |x - y| + 2 \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} ds \|F\|_0,$$

from which the second inequality follows immediately. Further observe

$$|X^x(t) - X^y(t)| \leq |x - y| + \int_0^t \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} |X^x(s) - X^y(s)| ds,$$

from this we immediately get the third inequality by Gronwall's inequality.

We also easily have

$$|X_2^x(t) - X_2^y(t)| \leq e^{-\lambda_2 t} |x - y| + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_2(t-s)} \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} |X^x(s) - X^y(s)| ds,$$

which, together with the third inequality, yields the fourth one. \square

3. CONSTRUCTION OF THE COUPLING MARKOV CHAIN

In this section, we construct a coupling Markov chain which will be used to prove the ergodicity result. Let

$$T > 0 \text{ be a fixed number} \tag{3.1}$$

to be determined later in Theorem 4.1. We call T the *waiting* time, which means that when a jump comes we do not look for the next jump immediately but do it after waiting for a time T . This waiting time T will play an important role in estimating the stopping times below.

Define

$$\tau := \inf \{t > T : |\Delta z(t)| \geq K\}, \tag{3.2}$$

τ is a stopping time with probability density

$$\gamma_K \exp\{-\gamma_K(t - T)\} 1_{\{t > T\}}. \tag{3.3}$$

Define $\tau_0 := 0$ and

$$\tau_k := \inf \{t > \tau_{k-1} + T : |\Delta z(t)| \geq K\} \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

It is easy to see that $\{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are a sequence of stopping times such that

$$\{\tau_k - \tau_{k-1}\}_{k \geq 1} \text{ are independent and have the same density as } \tau. \quad (3.4)$$

Since the solution of problem (1.1) with the initial data $X(0) = x$ has a càdlàg version, $X^x(\tau_1-)$ is well defined with the form:

$$X^x(\tau_1-) = e^{A\tau_1} x + \int_0^{\tau_1} e^{A(\tau_1-s)} F(X^x(s)) ds + \int_0^{\tau_1-} e^{A(\tau_1-s)} dZ_s, \quad (3.5)$$

By (2.1) and strong Markov property of $z(t)$, at the time τ_1 , there is only one jump η almost surely and η has the probability density ν_K (see (2.2)). Therefore,

$$X^x(\tau_1) = X^x(\tau_1-) + \eta[1, 0]^T \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Denote by $P_x^{(1)}(\cdot) : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ the distribution of $X^x(\tau_1-)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and by $P_{\hat{x}}^{(2)}(\cdot) : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ the distribution of $\hat{x} + \eta[1, 0]^T$ for every $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, define

$$P_x(A) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{\hat{x}}^{(2)}(A) P_x^{(1)}(d\hat{x}), \quad (3.6)$$

$(X^x(\tau_k))_{k \geq 0}$ is an \mathbb{R}^2 -valued Markov chain with transition probability $(P_x(\cdot))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2}$.

For any random variable X ,

denote by $\mathcal{L}(X)$ the law of X .

Let $(\xi_x(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1), \xi_y(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1))$ be the maximal coupling of $\mathcal{L}(\hat{x}_1 + \eta)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_1 + \eta)$, we have

Lemma 3.1. *For every $\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_x(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1) \neq \xi_y(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1)) \leq \beta_1 |\hat{x}_1 - \hat{y}_1|^{\beta_2} / 2$$

where β_1, β_2 are the constants in Assumption 2.1. Furthermore, if $|\hat{x}_1| + |\hat{y}_1| \leq M$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_x(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1) \neq \xi_y(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1)) \leq \beta_0 / 2.$$

where β_0 is the constant in Assumption 2.1.

Proof. Since $(\xi_x(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1), \xi_y(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1))$ is the maximal coupling of $\mathcal{L}(\hat{x}_1 + \eta)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_1 + \eta)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_x(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1) \neq \xi_y(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1)) = \|\mathcal{L}(\hat{x}_1 + \eta) - \mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_1 + \eta)\|_{TV}.$$

Note that the distributions $\mathcal{L}(\hat{x}_1 + \eta)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_1 + \eta)$ have the densities $p_K(z - \hat{x}_1)$ and $p_K(z - \hat{y}_1)$ respectively, where p_K is defined in Assumption 2.1. It is easy to see that

$$\|\mathcal{L}(\hat{x}_1 + \eta) - \mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_1 + \eta)\|_{TV} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_K(z - \hat{x}_1) - p_K(z - \hat{y}_1)| dz,$$

this, together with (A2) and (A3) of Assumption 2.1, immediately implies the desired inequalities. \square

For every $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, define

$$\bar{\xi}_x(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) := \begin{bmatrix} \xi_x(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1) \\ \hat{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\xi}_y(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) := \begin{bmatrix} \xi_y(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1) \\ \hat{y}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.7)$$

Since $\mathcal{L}(\xi_x(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1)) = \mathcal{L}(\hat{x}_1 + \eta)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\xi_y(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1)) = \mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_1 + \eta)$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(\bar{\xi}_x(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) = \mathcal{L}(\hat{x} + \eta[1, 0]^T), \quad \mathcal{L}(\bar{\xi}_y(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) = \mathcal{L}(\hat{y} + \eta[1, 0]^T). \quad (3.8)$$

Denote the probability of $(X^x(\tau_1-), X^y(\tau_1-))$ with $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$P_{(x,y)}^{(1)}(\cdot) : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad (3.9)$$

further denote the probability of $(\tilde{\xi}_x(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), \tilde{\xi}_y(\hat{x}, \hat{y}))$ with $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$P_{(\hat{x}, \hat{y})}^{(2)}(\cdot) : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow [0, 1]. \quad (3.10)$$

For any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)$, define

$$P_{(x,y)}(A) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} P_{(\hat{x}, \hat{y})}^{(2)}(A) P_{(x,y)}^{(1)}(d\hat{x}, d\hat{y}). \quad (3.11)$$

Proposition 3.2. *There exists a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ and an $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ -valued Markov chain $\{S(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ with transition probability family $(P_{(x,y)})_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}$. Moreover, for every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, the marginal chain $\{S^x(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ has the same distribution as $\{X^x(\tau_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ and the marginal chain $\{S^y(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ has the same distribution as $\{X^y(\tau_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$.*

Proof. The construction of the coupling Markov chain is classical since the transition probability family $(P_{(x,y)})_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}$ is ready. To prove the other claim in the proposition, it suffices to show that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^2, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have

$$P_{(x,y)}(A \times \mathbb{R}^2) = P_x(A), \quad P_{(x,y)}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times A) = P_y(A) \quad (3.12)$$

where $(P_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2}$ is the transition probability family of $(X(\tau_k))_{k \geq 0}$.

We only show the first equality of (3.12) since the other one can be proven similarly. Recall that $P_x^{(1)}(\cdot)$ is the distribution of $X^x(\tau_1-)$ and that $P_{\hat{x}}^{(2)}(\cdot)$ is the distribution of $\hat{x} + \eta[1, 0]^T$. It is clear that

$$P_{(x,y)}^{(1)}(\cdot \times \mathbb{R}^2) = P_x^{(1)}(\cdot), \quad P_{(\hat{x}, \hat{y})}^{(2)}(\cdot \times \mathbb{R}^2) = P_{\hat{x}}^{(2)}(\cdot),$$

where $P_{(x,y)}^{(1)}$ and $P_{(\hat{x}, \hat{y})}^{(2)}$ are defined by (3.9) and (3.10) respectively. It follows from the definitions of $P_{(x,y)}(\cdot)$ and $P_x(\cdot)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(x,y)}(A \times \mathbb{R}^2) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} P_{(\hat{x}, \hat{y})}^{(2)}(A \times \mathbb{R}^2) P_{(x,y)}^{(1)}(d\hat{x}, d\hat{y}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} P_{\hat{x}}^{(2)}(A) P_{(x,y)}^{(1)}(d\hat{x}, d\hat{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{\hat{x}}^{(2)}(A) P_x^{(1)}(d\hat{x}) = P_x(A). \end{aligned}$$

□

4. SOME ESTIMATES OF THE COUPLING CHAIN $(S^{x,y}(k))_{k \geq 0}$

$(S(k))_{k \geq 0}$ constructed in previous section is a Markov chain on the probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$. $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ is not necessarily the same as $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ on which $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is located. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) = (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}). \quad (4.1)$$

Otherwise we can introduce the product space $(\tilde{\Omega} \times \Omega, \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathcal{F}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \times \mathbb{P})$ and consider $(S(k))_{k \geq 0}$ and $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ both on this new space. However, this will make the notations unnecessarily complicated. So, we always assume (4.1) and consider $(S(k))_{k \geq 0}$ and $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ from now on.

For any $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, we denote $\{S^{x,y}(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ the coupling Markov chain with initial state (x, y) . Recall that $\{S^x(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{S^y(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ denote the two marginal Markov chains.

Let $M > 0$ and $d > 0$ both be some number to be determined later, define the stopping times

$$\tilde{\sigma}(x, y, M) := \inf \{k > 0; |S^x(k)| + |S^y(k)| \leq M\}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\sigma(x, y, d) := \inf \{k > 0; |S^x(k) - S^y(k)| \leq d\}, \quad (4.3)$$

we write $\tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{\sigma}(x, y, M)$, $\sigma = \sigma(x, y, d)$ in shorthand if no confusions arise, and shall prove the following two theorems.

Theorem 4.1. *For all $p \in (0, \alpha)$, as $T > T_0 := \frac{(p-1)\log 3}{p\lambda_1} \vee 0$, there exist some $M, \tilde{\vartheta}, C > 0$ all depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_0, T$, so that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[e^{\tilde{\vartheta}\tilde{\sigma}(x,y,M)}] < C(1 + |x|^p + |y|^p).$$

Theorem 4.2. *There exists some constants $\vartheta, C > 0$ depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_1, d, K$, such that for all $p \in (0, \alpha)$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[e^{\vartheta\sigma(x,y,d)}] \leq C(1 + |x|^p + |y|^p). \quad (4.4)$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. It suffices to show that for every $p \in (0, \alpha)$, as $T > T_0 := \frac{(p-1)\log 3}{p\lambda_1} \vee 0$, there exist some $M > 0$ depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_0, T, \nu$ and some $q \in (0, 1)$ depending on p, λ, M such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\sigma} > k) \leq q^k (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p) \quad k \geq 1, \quad (4.5)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The proof of (4.5) is by the same argument as that in Lemma 6.5 of [17]. To apply that argument, we only need to show

$$\mathbb{E}(|S^x(1)|^p + |S^y(1)|^p) \leq q^2(|x|^p + |y|^p) + C. \quad (4.6)$$

where C depends on $\lambda, p, \|F\|_0$.

By Proposition 3.2, for all $p \in (0, \alpha)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}(|S^x(1)|^p + |S^y(1)|^p) = \mathbb{E}|X^x(\tau_1)|^p + \mathbb{E}|X^y(\tau_1)|^p,$$

which, together with Lemma 2.6, implies

$$\mathbb{E}(|S^x(1)|^p + |S^y(1)|^p) \leq (3^{p-1} \vee 1)\mathbb{E}[e^{-p\lambda_1\tau_1}] (|x|^p + |y|^p) + C, \quad (4.7)$$

where C depends on $\lambda, \|F\|_0, p$. Therefore, to show (4.6), we only need to show that

$$(3^{p-1} \wedge 1)\mathbb{E}[e^{-p\lambda_1\tau_1}] < 1. \quad (4.8)$$

When $p \leq 1$, (4.8) automatically holds for all $T \geq 0$. When $p > 1$,

$$3^{p-1}\mathbb{E}[e^{-p\lambda_1\tau_1}] = \frac{3^{p-1}\gamma_K e^{-p\lambda_1 T}}{\gamma_K + p\lambda_1} < 1$$

as $T > T_0$. □

We are now at the position to show Theorem 4.2, to this end, we first show

Proposition 4.3. *For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S^x(k+1) - S^y(k+1)| > \delta_k |S^x(k) - S^y(k)| |S^{x,y}(k)\} \leq \kappa |S^x(k) - S^y(k)|^{\beta_2},$$

for all $k \geq 0$, where

$$\delta_k = e^{-\lambda_2(\tau_{k+1}-\tau_k)} + \frac{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} e^{(\tau_{k+1}-\tau_k)\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}}}{\lambda_2 + \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}}, \quad \kappa = \beta_1 e^{\beta_2 \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} T}, \quad (4.9)$$

with β_1, β_2 being the constants in Assumption 2.1 and T being defined in (3.1). Furthermore, if $|S^x(k)| + |S^y(k)| \leq M$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S^x(k+1) - S^y(k+1)| > \delta_k |S^x(k) - S^y(k)| |S^{x,y}(k)\} \leq \beta_0/2,$$

with β_0 being the constant in Assumption 2.1

Proof. The proofs of the both inequalities are similar, we only show the first one. Since $\{S^{x,y}(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a time-homogeneous Markov chain, it suffices to show the inequality for $k = 0$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}(|S^x(1) - S^y(1)| \geq \delta_0|x - y|) \leq \kappa|x - y|^{\beta_2}. \quad (4.10)$$

By the construction of the Markov chain $\{S^{x,y}(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$, $S^{x,y}(1)$ has the same distribution as

$$(\bar{\xi}_x(X^x(\tau_1-), X^y(\tau_1-)), \bar{\xi}_y(X^x(\tau_1-), X^y(\tau_1-))), \quad (4.11)$$

we shall write (4.11) by $(\bar{\xi}_x, \bar{\xi}_y)$ in shorthand. By (3.7), we have $\bar{\xi}_x = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_x \\ X_2^x(\tau_1-) \end{bmatrix}$, $\bar{\xi}_y = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_y \\ X_2^y(\tau_1-) \end{bmatrix}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\bar{\xi}_x - \bar{\xi}_y| > \delta_0|x - y|) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\xi_x - \xi_y| + |X_2^x(\tau_1-) - X_2^y(\tau_1-)| > \delta_0|x - y|) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\xi_x \neq \xi_y) + \mathbb{P}(\xi_x = \xi_y, |X_2^x(\tau_1-) - X_2^y(\tau_1-)| > \delta_0|x - y|). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_x \neq \xi_y) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\xi_x \neq \xi_y | (X_1^x(\tau-), X_1^y(\tau-)))] \leq \beta_1 \mathbb{E}|X_1^x(\tau-) - X_1^y(\tau-)|^{\beta_2},$$

this, together with Lemma 2.6 and (A4) of Assumption 2.1, implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_x \neq \xi_y) \leq \beta_1 \mathbb{E}[e^{\beta_2 \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \tau_1}] |x - y|^{\beta_2} / 2 \leq \kappa|x - y|^{\beta_2}. \quad (4.13)$$

From Lemma 2.6 we have

$$|X_2^x(\tau_1-) - X_2^y(\tau_1-)| \leq \delta_0|x - y| \quad a.s.,$$

thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_2^x(\tau_1-) - X_2^y(\tau_1-)| > \delta_0|x - y|) = 0. \quad (4.14)$$

Collecting (4.12)-(4.14), we immediately get the desired inequality. \square

To prove Theorem 4.2, we also need

Lemma 4.4. *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be such that $|x| + |y| \leq M$. As λ_2 is sufficiently large, depending on $\|F\|_1, K, T, \beta, M, d$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S^x(1) - S^y(1)| > d\} < (2 + \beta_0)/4$$

where $\beta_0 \in (0, 2)$ is the constant defined in Assumption 2.1.

Proof. It is easy to have

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S^x(1) - S^y(1)| > d\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{|S^x(1) - S^y(1)| > \delta_0|x - y|, \delta_0 \leq d/M\} + \mathbb{P}\{\delta_0 > d/M\}$$

where δ_0 and κ are defined in Proposition 4.3. This inequality, together with Proposition 4.3, Markov inequality, implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{|S^x(1) - S^y(1)| > d\} &\leq \beta_0/2 + M \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[\delta_0]/d \\ &\leq \beta_0/2 + M/d \left[e^{-\lambda_2 T} \frac{\gamma_K}{\gamma_K + \lambda_2} + \frac{2e^{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} T} \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\lambda_2 + \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As λ_2 is sufficiently large, we get the desired inequality. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. It suffices to show that for every $p \in (0, \alpha)$, there exist some $\gamma > 0$ and $C > 0$ depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_1, K$, so that

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}\{\sigma = k\} \leq C e^{-\gamma k} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p), \quad \forall k > 0, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2; \quad (4.15)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}\{\sigma = \infty\} = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Step 1. Write $\tilde{\sigma}_0 = 0$, define

$$\tilde{\sigma}_k = \inf\{j > \tilde{\sigma}_{k-1} + 1; |S^x(j)| + |S^y(j)| \leq M\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $(S(k))_{k \geq 0}$ is a discrete time Markov chain, it is strong Markovian. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 4.1 that

$$\mathbb{E}_{S(\tilde{\sigma}_k)} \left[e^{\tilde{\theta}(\tilde{\sigma}_{k+1} - \tilde{\sigma}_k - 1)} \right] \leq C(1 + |S(\tilde{\sigma}_k)|^p) \leq C(1 + M^p). \quad (4.17)$$

where $C, \tilde{\theta}$ depends on $\lambda, p, M, T, \|F\|_0$. The above inequality, together with strong Markov property, implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[e^{\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\sigma}_k}] &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[e^{\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\sigma}_1} \mathbb{E}_{S(\tilde{\sigma}_1)} \left[e^{\tilde{\theta}(\tilde{\sigma}_2 - \tilde{\sigma}_1)} \dots \mathbb{E}_{S(\tilde{\sigma}_{k-1})} \left[e^{\tilde{\theta}(\tilde{\sigma}_k - \tilde{\sigma}_{k-1})} \right] \dots \right] \right] \\ &\leq C^k e^{\tilde{\theta}k} (1 + M^p)^{k-1} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Step 2. Given any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\tilde{\rho}_k = \sup\{j; \tilde{\sigma}_j \leq k\}.$$

Clearly, $\tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{\rho}_k+1} > k$ if $\tilde{\rho}_k < \infty$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = k) = \sum_{j=0}^k \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = k, \tilde{\rho}_k = j) \leq \sum_{j=0}^l \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\rho}_k = j) + \sum_{j=l+1}^k \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = k, \tilde{\rho}_k = j), \quad (4.19)$$

where $l < k$ is to be chosen later. We denote

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=0}^l \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\rho}_k = j), \quad I_2 = \sum_{j=l+1}^k \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = k, \tilde{\rho}_k = j).$$

Step 3. Let us now estimate I_1 and I_2 . By Chebyshev inequality and strong Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\rho}_k = j) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\sigma}_j \leq k/2, \tilde{\rho}_k = j) + \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\sigma}_j > k/2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\sigma}_j \leq k/2, \tilde{\sigma}_{j+1} > k) + \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\sigma}_j > k/2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[\mathbb{P}_{S(\tilde{\sigma}_j)}(\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1} - \tilde{\sigma}_j > k/2) \right] + e^{-\tilde{\theta}k/2} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[e^{\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\sigma}_j}]. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.17) and (4.18), the above inequality implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\rho}_k = j) \leq C e^{\tilde{\theta}j} (1 + M^p) e^{-\tilde{\theta}k/2} + C^j e^{j\tilde{\theta}} (1 + M^p)^{j-1} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p) e^{-\tilde{\theta}k/2}.$$

Hence,

$$I_1 \leq (C e^{\tilde{\theta}})^{l+2} (1 + M^p)^{l+2} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p) e^{-\tilde{\theta}k/2}. \quad (4.20)$$

Next we estimate I_2 . For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$A_j := \left\{ |S^x(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + 1) - S^y(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + 1)| > d, \dots, |S^x(\tilde{\sigma}_j + 1) - S^y(\tilde{\sigma}_j + 1)| > d \right\}.$$

By the definitions of σ and $\tilde{\rho}_k$, strong Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = k, \tilde{\rho}_k = j) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(A_{j-1}) = \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}\left\{|S^x(\tilde{\sigma}_{j-1} + 1) - S^y(\tilde{\sigma}_{j-1} + 1)| > d, A_{j-2}\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}\left\{\mathbb{P}_u\{|S^{u_x}(1) - S^{u_y}(1)| > d\} A_{j-2}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $u = S^{x,y}(\tilde{\sigma}_{j-1})$. Combining with Lemma 4.4, the above inequality implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = k, \tilde{\rho}_k = j) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta_0}{4}\right) \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(A_{j-2}) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta_0}{4}\right)^{j-1}$$

Hence,

$$I_2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta_0}{4}\right)^l / \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta_0}{4}\right). \quad (4.21)$$

Take $l = \varepsilon k$, it follows from the bounds of I_1 and I_2 that as $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, (4.15) follows.

Step 4: Let us now show (4.16). Define

$$\tilde{\rho}_\infty = \sup\{j; \tilde{\sigma}_j < \infty\},$$

it is clear that $\tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{\rho}_\infty+1} = \infty$ if $\tilde{\rho}_\infty < \infty$. For all $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, by strong Markov property and Theorem 4.1 we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\rho}_\infty = j) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}\left[\mathbb{P}_{S(\tilde{\sigma}_j)}(\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1} - \tilde{\sigma}_j = \infty)\right] = 0. \quad (4.22)$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\tilde{\rho}_\infty = \infty) = 1 \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

By a similar computation as estimating I_2 in step 3, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = \infty) = \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\sigma = \infty, \tilde{\rho}_\infty = \infty) \leq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(A_j) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta_0}{4}\right)^j \rightarrow 0, \quad j \rightarrow \infty.$$

□

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Define

$$\hat{\sigma}(x, y) := \inf\{k \geq 1; |S^x(k) - S^y(k)| > (\delta_0 \dots \delta_{k-1})|x - y|\} \quad (5.1)$$

where δ_j ($j = 0, \dots, k-1$) are defined in Proposition 4.3, we shall often write $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\sigma}(x, y)$ in shorthand.

Lemma 5.1. *If $|x - y| \leq d$ with $0 < d < \left(\frac{1}{4\kappa}\right)^{1/\beta_2}$ and κ defined in Proposition 4.3, as $\lambda_2 > 0$ is sufficiently large, depending on $T, K, \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}, \beta$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\hat{\sigma} = \infty) > 1/2.$$

Moreover, there exists some $\varepsilon, C > 0$ depending on $d, \lambda, \|F\|_1, K$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[e^{\varepsilon \hat{\sigma}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{\sigma} < \infty\}}] \leq C.$$

Proof. For all $k \geq 0$, define

$$B_k := \{|S^x(k+1) - S^y(k+1)| > \delta_k |S^x(k) - S^y(k)|\},$$

$$C_k := \{|S^x(j+1) - S^y(j+1)| \leq (\delta_0 \dots \delta_j)|x - y|, \quad 0 \leq j \leq k\},$$

it is easy to see that $C_k \supset B_k^c \cap C_{k-1}$. It follows from Proposition 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(C_k) &\geq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(B_k^c \cap C_{k-1}) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[\mathbb{P}(B_k^c | S^{x,y}(k)) 1_{C_{k-1}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left\{ \left[1 - \mathbb{P}(B_k | S^{x,y}(k)) \right] 1_{C_{k-1}} \right\} \geq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[\left(1 - \kappa |S^x(k) - S^y(k)|^{\beta_2} \right) 1_{C_{k-1}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(C_{k-1}) - \kappa \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[(\delta_0 \dots \delta_{k-1})^{\beta_2} \right] |x - y|^{\beta_2}. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality, together with (3.3), (3.4), (A4) of Assumption 2.1, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(C_k) &\geq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(C_{k-1}) - \kappa \theta^k |x - y|^{\beta_2} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(C_{k-2}) - \kappa \theta^{k-1} |x - y|^{\beta_2} - \kappa \theta^k |x - y|^{\beta_2} \\ &\geq 1 - \kappa \frac{1 - \theta^{k+1}}{1 - \theta} |x - y|^{\beta_2} > 1/2 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\theta = \frac{\gamma_K}{\gamma_K + \lambda_2 \beta_2} e^{-\lambda_2 \beta_2 T} + 2 \left(\frac{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} + \lambda_2} \right)^{\beta_2} < \frac{1}{2},$$

as long as $\lambda_2 > 0$ is sufficiently large. Thus, we get the first inequality.

Defining $D_k := \{|S^x(k+1) - S^y(k+1)| > (\delta_0 \dots \delta_k) |x - y|\}$ for all $k \geq 0$, by a similar calculation as above we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\hat{\sigma} = k) &= \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(D_{k-1} \cap C_{k-2}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(B_{k-1} \cap C_{k-2}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[\mathbb{P}(B_{k-1} | S^{x,y}(k-1)) 1_{C_{k-2}} \right] \leq \kappa \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[(\delta_0 \dots \delta_{k-2})^{\beta_2} \right] |x - y|^{\beta_2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \theta^{k-1} \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

This immediately implies the second inequality. \square

Define

$$\sigma^\dagger(x, y, d) := \sigma + \hat{\sigma}(S^{x,y}(\sigma)) \quad (5.2)$$

where $\sigma = \sigma(x, y, d)$ is defined by (4.3). Further define

$$\bar{\sigma}(x, y, d, M) := \sigma^\dagger + \tilde{\sigma}(S^{x,y}(\sigma^\dagger), M). \quad (5.3)$$

where $\sigma^\dagger = \sigma^\dagger(x, y, d)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are defined in (4.2).

The motivation for defining $\bar{\sigma}$ is the following: we only know $|S^x(\sigma^\dagger) - S^y(\sigma^\dagger)| \leq d$, but have no idea about the bound of $|S^x(\sigma^\dagger)| + |S^y(\sigma^\dagger)|$. This bound is very important for iterating a stopping time argument as in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 4.2. To this aim, we introduce (5.3) and thus have

$$|S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma})| \leq M \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (5.4)$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $0 < d < \left(\frac{1}{4\kappa}\right)^{1/\beta_2}$ and $p \in (0, \alpha)$. There exist some $\gamma, C > 0$ depending on $d, \lambda, \|F\|_1, p, M, K$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[e^{\gamma \bar{\sigma}(x,y,d,M)} 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}(x,y,d,M) < \infty\}} \right] \leq C(1 + |x|^p + |y|^p).$$

Proof. Note that $\sigma < \infty$ a.s. by Theorem 4.2. By the strong Markov property we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[e^{\gamma \sigma^\dagger(x,y,d)} 1_{\{\sigma^\dagger(x,y,d) < \infty\}} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_u \left[e^{\gamma \hat{\sigma}} 1_{\{\hat{\sigma} < \infty\}} \right] e^{\gamma \sigma} \right\}$$

where $\sigma = \sigma(x, y, d)$, $u = S^{x,y}(\sigma)$, $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\sigma}(S^{x,y}(\sigma))$.

By (2) of Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 4.2, as $\gamma > 0$ is sufficiently small we immediately get

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[e^{\gamma \sigma^\dagger(x,y,d)} 1_{\{\sigma^\dagger(x,y,d) < \infty\}} \right] \leq C(1 + |x|^p + |y|^p) \quad (5.5)$$

where C is some constant depending on $d, \lambda, \|F\|_1, p, K$.

By strong Markov property and the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[e^{\gamma \bar{\sigma}^{(x,y,d,M)}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{\sigma}^{(x,y,d,M)} < \infty\}} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_u \left[e^{\gamma \bar{\sigma}^{(u,M)}} \right] e^{\gamma \sigma^\dagger(x,y,d)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma^\dagger(x,y,d) < \infty\}} \right\} \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[(1 + |u|^{p/2}) e^{\gamma \sigma^\dagger(x,y,d)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma^\dagger(x,y,d) < \infty\}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where $u = S^{x,y}(\sigma^\dagger)$ and C depends on $M, \lambda, \|F\|_1, p, K$. Note from Lemma 2.6 that

$$\mathbb{E}|S^{x,y}(\sigma^\dagger)|^p = \mathbb{E}|X^x(\tau_{\sigma^\dagger})|^p + \mathbb{E}|X^y(\tau_{\sigma^\dagger})|^p \leq C(1 + |x|^p + |y|^p).$$

The inequality (5.6), together with Hölder inequality and (5.5), immediately implies the desired inequality as $\gamma > 0$ is sufficiently small. \square

Define $\bar{\sigma}_0 = 0$, for all $k \geq 0$ we define

$$\bar{\sigma}_{k+1} = \bar{\sigma}_k + \bar{\sigma}(S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_k), d, M).$$

Lemma 5.3. *For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\bar{\sigma}_k < \infty) \leq 1/2^k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4.2 that $\sigma < \infty$ a.s.. By the definition of $\bar{\sigma}$, strong Markov property, Lemma 5.1, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\bar{\sigma} = \infty) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} [\mathbb{P}_{S^{x,y}(\sigma)}(\hat{\sigma} = \infty)] > 1/2.$$

This, together with strong Markov property, implies that as $\bar{\sigma}_{k-1} < \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}_u(\bar{\sigma}_k - \bar{\sigma}_{k-1} = \infty) > 1/2,$$

where $u = S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_{k-1})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\bar{\sigma}_k < \infty) &= \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\bar{\sigma}_k < \infty, \bar{\sigma}_{k-1} < \infty) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} [\mathbb{P}_u(\bar{\sigma}_k - \bar{\sigma}_{k-1} < \infty) \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{\sigma}_{k-1} < \infty\}}] \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\bar{\sigma}_{k-1} < \infty) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}(\bar{\sigma}_{k-2} < \infty) \leq \dots \leq \frac{1}{2^k}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 2.5. The existence of invariant measures has been established in [18]. According to Section 2.2. of [22], the inequality (2.4) in the theorem implies the uniqueness of the invariant measure. So now we only need to show (2.4), by [22] again, it suffices to show that for all $p \in (0, \alpha)$ we have

$$|P_t f(x) - P_t f(y)| \leq C e^{-ct} \|f\|_1 (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p) \quad \forall f \in L_b(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad (5.8)$$

where C, c depend on $p, \beta, K, \|F\|_1, \lambda$. Let us prove (5.8) by the following four steps.

Step 1. Let $l \geq 2$ be some natural number to be determined later. We easily have

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))] - \mathbb{E}[f(X^y(t))]| \leq I_1 + I_2$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \left| \mathbb{E} \{ [f(X^x(t)) - f(X^y(t))] \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{l-1} > t\}} \} \right|, \\ I_2 &:= \left| \mathbb{E} \{ [f(X^x(t)) - f(X^y(t))] \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{l-1} \leq t\}} \} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.3), we have $\mathbb{E} e^{\tau_j \gamma_K / 2} = e^{\gamma_K T j / 2} 2^j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, thus

$$I_1 \leq 2 \|f\|_0 \mathbb{P}(\tau_{l-1} > t) \leq 2 \|f\|_0 \left(2e^{\gamma_K T / 2} \right)^{l-1} e^{-\gamma_K t / 2}. \quad (5.9)$$

Step 2. Now we estimate I_2 . Observe

$$I_2 \leq I_{2,1} + I_{2,2}, \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,1} &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ [f(X^x(t)) - f(X^y(t))] 1_{\{\tau_{l-1} \leq t < \tau_l\}} \right\} \right|, \\ I_{2,2} &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ [f(X^x(t)) - f(X^y(t))] 1_{\{\tau_l \leq t\}} \right\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument as for I_1 , we have

$$I_{2,1} \leq 2\|f\|_0 \mathbb{P}(\tau_l > t) \leq 2\|f\|_0 \left(2e^{\gamma\kappa T/2}\right)^l e^{-\gamma\kappa t/2}.$$

For $I_{2,2}$, by strong Markov property we have

$$I_{2,2} = \left| \mathbb{E} \left[(g(X^x(\tau_l)) - g(X^y(\tau_l))) 1_{\{\tau_l \leq t\}} \right] \right|$$

where

$$g(X^x(\tau_l)) = \mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))|X^x(\tau_l)], \quad g(X^y(\tau_l)) = \mathbb{E}[f(X^y(t))|X^y(\tau_l)].$$

By strong Markov property again, on the set $\{\tau_l \leq t\}$ we have

$$g(u_x) = \mathbb{E}[f(X^{u_x}(t - \tau_l))], \quad g(u_y) = \mathbb{E}[f(X^{u_y}(t - \tau_l))],$$

where $u_x = X^x(\tau_l)$, $u_y = X^y(\tau_l)$, by the third inequality in Lemma 2.6 we further have

$$\begin{aligned} |g(u_x) - g(u_y)| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[|f(X^{u_x}(t - \tau_l)) - f(X^{u_y}(t - \tau_l))| \right] \\ &\leq \|f\|_1 \mathbb{E} \left[|X^{u_x}(t - \tau_l) - X^{u_y}(t - \tau_l)| \right] \\ &\leq \|f\|_1 e^{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} |u_x - u_y|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

By Proposition 3.2 and the easy fact $\|g\|_0 \leq \|f\|_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,2} &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} [g(X^x(\tau_l)) - g(X^y(\tau_l))] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ [g(X^x(\tau_l)) - g(X^y(\tau_l))] 1_{\{\tau_l > t\}} \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] \right| + 2\|f\|_0 \mathbb{P}(\tau_l > t) \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] \right| + 2\|f\|_0 \left(2e^{\gamma\kappa T/2}\right)^l e^{-\gamma\kappa t/2}. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by a similar calculation as for I_1 .

Step 3. Let $m = \lceil \varepsilon l \rceil$ with $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ to be determined later. We have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] \right| = J_1 + J_2,$$

where

$$J_1 = \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_m < \infty\}} \right\} \right|, \quad J_2 = \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_m = \infty\}} \right\} \right|.$$

By the easy fact $\|g\|_0 \leq \|f\|_0$ and Lemma 5.3, we have

$$J_1 \leq 2\|f\|_0 \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}\{\bar{\sigma}_m < \infty\} \leq \frac{\|f\|_0}{2^{m-1}} \leq \|f\|_0 2^{-\varepsilon l + 1}. \quad (5.12)$$

Observe

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_m = \infty\}} \right\} = J_{2,1} + J_{2,2}.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2,1} &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] 1_{\{l/2 < \bar{\sigma}_i < \infty, \bar{\sigma}_{i+1} = \infty\}} \right\}, \\ J_{2,2} &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ [g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))] 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i \leq l/2, \bar{\sigma}_{i+1} = \infty\}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Chebyshev inequality and Lemma 5.2

$$J_{2,1} \leq 2\|f\|_0 \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}_{(x,y)} \left\{ \frac{l}{2} < \bar{\sigma}_i < \infty \right\} \leq 2\|f\|_0 e^{-\frac{l}{2}\gamma} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} [e^{\gamma\bar{\sigma}_i}],$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} [e^{\gamma\bar{\sigma}_i}] &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} \left[e^{\gamma\bar{\sigma}_1} \mathbb{E}_{S(\bar{\sigma}_1)} \left[e^{\gamma(\bar{\sigma}_2 - \bar{\sigma}_1)} \dots \mathbb{E}_{S(\bar{\sigma}_{i-1})} \left[e^{\gamma(\bar{\sigma}_i - \bar{\sigma}_{i-1})} \right] \dots \right] \right] \\ &\leq C^i e^{\gamma i} (1 + M^p)^{i-1} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by (5.4). Hence,

$$J_{2,1} \leq 2\|f\|_0 e^{-\frac{l}{2}\gamma} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} e^{\gamma i} (1 + M^p)^{i-1} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p)$$

Recall $m = \lceil \varepsilon l \rceil$, as $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough we have

$$J_{2,1} \leq e^{-\frac{\gamma l}{4}} \|f\|_0 (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p).$$

It remains to estimate $J_{2,2}$. Recall the definition of $\sigma, \hat{\sigma}, \sigma^\dagger, \bar{\sigma}, \tilde{\sigma}$ and note that

$$\bar{\sigma}_{i+1} = \bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma + \hat{\sigma} + \tilde{\sigma}, \quad (5.13)$$

with $\sigma = \sigma(S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_i), d)$, $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\sigma}(S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma))$, $\tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{\sigma}(S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma + \hat{\sigma}), M)$. Observe that

$$J_{2,2} = J_{2,2,1} + J_{2,2,2},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2,2,1} &:= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))| 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i \leq l/2, \bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma > \frac{3l}{4}, \bar{\sigma}_{i+1} = \infty\}} \right], \\ J_{2,2,2} &:= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))| 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i \leq l/2, \bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma \leq \frac{3l}{4}, \bar{\sigma}_{i+1} = \infty\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By strong Markov property, Chebyshev inequality, Theorem 4.2 and the clear fact $|S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_i)| \leq M$ for all $i \geq 1$, as $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2,2,1} &\leq 2\|f\|_0 \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)} [\mathbb{P}_{u_i}(\sigma > l/4)] \\ &\leq C\|f\|_0 e^{-\vartheta l/4} [(m-1)(1 + M^p) + (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p)] \\ &\leq C\|f\|_0 e^{-\vartheta l/8} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p) \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

where $u_i = S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_i)$ and C, ϑ depend on $d, \lambda, \|F\|_1, p, M$.

As for $J_{2,2,2}$, recall (5.13) and note $\tilde{\sigma} < \infty$ a.s. from Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2,2,2} &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ |g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))| 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i \leq l/2, \bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma \leq \frac{3l}{4}, \hat{\sigma} + \tilde{\sigma} = \infty\}} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ |g(S^x(l)) - g(S^y(l))| 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i \leq l/2, \bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma \leq \frac{3l}{4}, \hat{\sigma} = \infty\}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

It follows from the above equality, (5.11) and strong Markov property that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{2,2,2} &\leq \|f\|_1 e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|S^x(l) - S^y(l)| 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma \leq \frac{3l}{4}, \hat{\sigma} = \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq \|f\|_1 e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|S^x(l) - S^y(l)| 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma \leq \frac{3l}{4}, \hat{\sigma} = \infty\}} \right] \\
&= \|f\|_1 e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_u (|S^x(l) - S^y(l)| 1_{\{\hat{\sigma} = \infty\}}) 1_{\{\bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma \leq \frac{3l}{4}\}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $u = S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma)$. By the definition of σ we have $|u_x - u_y| < d$. By the definition (5.1) with $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\sigma}(S^{x,y}(\bar{\sigma}_i + \sigma))$ and the previous inequality, as $\lambda_2 > 0$ is sufficiently large, depending on $T, K, \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{2,2,2} &\leq \|f\|_1 e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_u (\delta_0 \dots \delta_{l/4}) |u_x - u_y| \right] \\
&\leq dm \|f\|_1 e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \left(\frac{\gamma_K}{\gamma_K + \lambda_2} e^{-\lambda_2 T} + 2 \frac{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} + \lambda_2} \right)^{l/4} \\
&\leq \varepsilon dl \|f\|_1 e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \left(\frac{2}{\lambda_2} \right)^{l/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 4. Collecting the bounds for $J_{2,2,1}, J_{2,2,2}, J_{2,1}, J_1$, we have that there exist some $\varepsilon, C > 0$ depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_1, K$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{2,2} &\leq J_1 + J_2 + 2\|f\|_0 \left(2e^{\gamma_K T/2} \right)^l e^{-\gamma_K t/2} \\
&\leq J_1 + J_{2,1} + J_{2,2,1} + J_{2,2,2} + 2\|f\|_0 \left(2e^{\gamma_K T/2} \right)^l e^{-\gamma_K t/2} \\
&\leq \|f\|_0 2^{-\varepsilon l + 1} + C\|f\|_0 e^{-\theta l/8} (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p) + \varepsilon dl \|f\|_1 e^{t\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}} \left(\frac{2}{\lambda_2} \right)^{l/4} + 2\|f\|_0 \left(2e^{\gamma_K T/2} \right)^l e^{-\gamma_K t/2}
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $l = [\delta t]$ with $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small (depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_1, K, \beta, M$) and then choosing λ_2 sufficiently large (depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_1, K, \beta, M, \delta$), we immediately get

$$I_{2,2} \leq C_0 e^{-c_0 t} \|f\|_1 (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p),$$

where C_0 and c_0 both depending on $p, \lambda, \|F\|_1, K, \beta, M$.

Combining the estimates of $I_1, I_{2,1}$ and $I_{2,2}$, we immediately get the desired (5.8). \square

REFERENCES

1. Jean Bertoin, *Lévy processes*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 121, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996. MR 1406564 (98e:60117)
2. Zhen-Qing Chen, Panki Kim, Renming Song, and Zoran Vondraček, *Boundary Harnack principle for $\Delta + \Delta^{\alpha/2}$* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **364** (2012), no. 8, 4169–4205. MR 2912450
3. Weinan E and Jonathan C. Mattingly, *Ergodicity for the Navier-Stokes equation with degenerate random forcing: finite-dimensional approximation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **54** (2001), no. 11, 1386–1402. MR 1846802 (2002g:76075)
4. M. Hairer, *Exponential mixing properties of stochastic PDEs through asymptotic coupling*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **124** (2002), no. 3, 345–380. MR 1939651 (2004j:60135)
5. Martin Hairer and Jonathan C. Mattingly, *Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing*, Ann. of Math. (2) **164** (2006), no. 3, 993–1032.
6. Martin Hairer and Jonathan C. Mattingly, *A theory of hypoellipticity and unique ergodicity for semilinear stochastic PDEs*, Electron. J. Probab. **16** (2011), no. 23, 658–738. MR 2786645

7. Alexey M. Kulik, *Exponential ergodicity of the solutions to SDE's with a jump noise*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **119** (2009), no. 2, 602–632. MR 2494006 (2010i:60176)
8. Sergei Kuksin, Andrey Piatnitski, and Armen Shirikyan, *A coupling approach to randomly forced nonlinear PDEs. II*, Comm. Math. Phys. **230** (2002), no. 1, 81–85. MR 1927233 (2003h:37080)
9. S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan, *A coupling approach to randomly forced nonlinear PDEs. I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **221** (2001), no. 2, 351–366.
10. ———, *Coupling approach to white-forced nonlinear PDEs*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **81** (2002), no. 6, 567602.
11. ———, *Mathematics of 2D Statistical Hydrodynamics*, manuscript of a book (available on www.u-cergy.fr/shirikyan/book.html)
12. Jonathan C. Mattingly, *Exponential convergence for the stochastically forced Navier-Stokes equations and other partially dissipative dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **230** (2002), no. 3, 421–462. MR 1937652 (2004a:76039)
13. Vahagn Nersesyan, *Polynomial mixing for the complex Ginzburg–Landau equation perturbed by a random force at random times*, J. Evol. Equ. **8** (2008), no. 1, 129.
14. Vahagn Nersesyan, *Private communication*, 2011.
15. S. Peszat and J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic partial differential equations with Lévy noise*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 113, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, An evolution equation approach.
16. Enrico Priola, *Pathwise uniqueness for singular SDEs driven by stable processes*, Osaka J. Math. **49** (2012), no. 2, 421–447. MR 2945756
17. E. Priola, A. Shirikyan, L. Xu and J. Zabczyk, *Exponential ergodicity and regularity for equations with Lévy noise*, Stoch. Proc. Appl., **122**, 1 (2012), 106–133.
18. E. Priola, L. Xu and J. Zabczyk, *Exponential mixing for some SPDEs with Lévy noise*, Stochastic and Dynamics, 11 (2011), 521–534.
19. Enrico Priola and Jerzy Zabczyk, *Structural properties of semilinear SPDEs driven by cylindrical stable processes*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **149** (2011), no. 1–2, 97–137. MR 2773026
20. Armen Shirikyan, *Exponential mixing for 2D Navier-Stokes equations perturbed by an unbounded noise*, J. Math. Fluid Mech. **6** (2004), no. 2, 169–193. MR 2053582 (2005c:37160)
21. ———, *Ergodicity for a class of Markov processes and applications to randomly forced PDE's. II*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B **6** (2006), no. 4, 911–926 (electronic). MR 2223915 (2007b:60185)
22. ———, *Exponential mixing for randomly forced partial differential equations: method of coupling*, Instability in models connected with fluid flows. II, Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.), vol. 7, Springer, New York, 2008, pp. 155–188. MR 2459266 (2009i:35359).
23. Wang F.Y.: Gradient estimate for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck jump processes. Stoch. Proc. Appl., Vol.121, 3 (2011), 466–478.
24. Zhang X.: Derivative formula and gradient estimate for SDEs driven by α -stable processes. arXiv:1204.2630v2.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON LANE, UXBRIDGE, MIDDLESEX UB8 3PH, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: xulihu2007@gmail.com