

# A GRADIENT FLOW FORMULATION FOR THE STOCHASTIC AMARI NEURAL FIELD MODEL

CHRISTIAN KUEHN AND JONAS M. TÖLLE

**ABSTRACT.** We study stochastic Amari-type neural field equations, which are mean-field models for neural activity in the cortex. We prove that under certain assumptions on the coupling kernel, the neural field model can be viewed as a gradient flow in a nonlocal Hilbert space. This makes all gradient-flow methods available for the analysis, which could previously not be used, as it was not known, whether a rigorous gradient flow formulation exists. We show that the equation is well-posed in the nonlocal Hilbert space in the sense that solutions starting in this space also remain in it for all times and space-time regularity results hold for the case of spatially correlated noise. Uniqueness of invariant measures and ergodic properties for the associated Feller semigroups are also discussed.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The stochastic partial-integrodifferential equation we study is

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t u = -\alpha u + \int_{\mathcal{B}} w(\cdot, y) f(u(y, t)) dy + \varepsilon \partial_t W$$

where  $(x, t) \in \mathcal{B} \times [0, T)$ ,  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is the spatial domain modeling the cortex,  $u = u(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}$  is the neural field interpreted as the average/mean-field activity of the neural network, the kernel  $w$  models the connections between neurons,  $f$  is the main nonlinearity representing the firing rate,  $\alpha > 0$  is the decay rate, and  $W = W(x, t)$  is a (spatially correlated, additive) noise controlled via the parameter  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ . We shall write  $BW$  instead of  $W$  below, where  $B$  is the covariance operator. The precise mathematical formulation for (1.1) starts in Section 2. In this introduction, we outline the main setting and our results.

Deterministic neural field models are well-established in the modeling of mean-field cortex activity. The version (1.1) (for  $\varepsilon = 0$ ) is frequently attributed to Amari [2] while a version with  $f$  outside the integral is attributed to Wilson and Cowan [62]; see [14, 16, 22] for broader introductions and further references. Although the analysis of spatio-temporal pattern-formation for deterministic neural fields is well-established, only very recently there has been a surging interest in stochastic neural field equations. One broad motivation is to understand the effect of finite population size [13, 52, 59], while another is to take into account environmental fluctuations. A very concrete application is to understand the role of noise-induced fluctuations [55, 61] in perceptual bistability [47, 60].

The basic theory for (1.1), including existence, regularity, Galerkin approximations and large deviations of (1.1), has been covered in [38] for bounded domains, while unbounded domains

---

*Date:* June 8, 2019.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60H15; 92C20; Secondary: 34B10; 35B65;

*Key words and phrases.* Gradient flow in Hilbert space; stochastic Amari neural field equation; nonlocal Hilbert space; Wilson-Cowan model; spatially correlated additive noise; space-time regularity of solutions; nonnegative kernel; unique invariant measure; ergodic Feller semigroup; mathematical neuroscience.

CK acknowledges financial support by a Lichtenberg Professorship. JMT would like to thank Dirk Blömker for some useful comments.

are considered in [23]. The influence of noise on traveling waves in stochastic neural fields has been studied intensively in recent years [15, 32, 35–37, 40, 49]. Yet, a sharp study of noise-induced switching rates can only be carried out for (1.1) beyond standard large deviations if one can use a gradient structure, which is required, e.g., to generalize Kramers' law [9] for precise noise-induced switching rates. However, even in the deterministic setting ( $\varepsilon = 0$ ) it is not known, whether we can find a gradient structure to rewrite (1.1) as

$$(1.2) \quad \partial_t u = -\nabla_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{F}(u), \quad u(\cdot, t) = u(t) \in \mathcal{X},$$

where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a suitable function space, e.g., a Hilbert, Banach or even metric space [3], and  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a functional, which often has the natural interpretation of an energy, entropy, or some other physical notion. Of course, to have such a gradient structure in the (stochastic) neural field case would not only be interesting for Kramers' law as suggested in [38] but also open up a general area of techniques, which has been extremely successful for other differential equations [33, 48]. Furthermore, if we can characterize the types of kernels for which gradient structures exist, it would give us an understanding, if and when the brain might be working in two different regimes such as energy-decay versus complex non-equilibrium pattern formation. Unfortunately, direct calculations in several works have shown [21, 38] that one does not expect any gradient-structure of the form (1.2) in the *standard Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces* for neural fields, despite many analogies to certain classical PDEs with such structures [39].

In this work, we show that a gradient structure actually does exist for (stochastic) neural fields. We construct a nonlocal Hilbert space  $\mathcal{X}$  using functional-analytic methods, which allows us to obtain an exact gradient system. For the gradient framework, we analyze well-posedness of the resulting system in the nonlocal space  $\mathcal{X}$  using methods from stochastic analysis. Using the gradient structure we can characterize invariant measures of the process. Furthermore, we investigate ergodic properties of Feller semigroups generated by the neural field equation. We note that a related idea was used for the stochastic porous media equation using monotonicity methods in [51, 53].

Furthermore, we crucially note that  $\mathcal{X}$ , and the related gradient structure, only exist for a certain classes of kernels with sufficiently dominant excitation or inhibition (see Section 5 below for examples), while it fails for other classes. Kernels may, depending upon parameters, fall into different classes so that in underlying applications we might obtain major transitions in neural fields between different mathematical structures. In fact, a similar transition between classes has recently been observed in the context of entropy/gradient-structures for local cross-diffusion systems [34] modeling herding behavior, where parameter variation can destroy the entropy structure.

We conjecture that our new approach may allow us to now consider many other stochastic variants of models from biological applications, e.g., nonlocal Fisher-KPP equations [1, 8, 28], nonlocal aggregation models [58], or nonlocal swarming systems [46] via a gradient flow approach. Another important future perspective of our framework is to obtain sharp asymptotics for nonlocal small noise asymptotics and large deviation principles [20, Chapter 12] similar to Kramers' law recently obtained for stochastic partial differential equations [7, 10, 11].

## 2. INTEGRAL OPERATORS AND NONLOCAL HILBERT SPACE

Let  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be non-empty, bounded and closed. Let  $w : \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable kernel.

**Assumption 2.1.** *Assume that*

- (i)  $w(x, y) = w(y, x)$  for a.e.  $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$ ,
- (ii)  $w \in L^2(\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}) \cap C(\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B})$ ,

(iii)  $w$  is nonnegative definite in the following sense

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n c_i c_j w(x_i, x_j) \geq 0,$$

whenever  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ , and  $\{c_1, \dots, c_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ .

Now we consider the integral operator associated to the kernel  $w$

$$Kg(x) := \int_{\mathcal{B}} w(x, y)g(y) dy, \quad g \in L^2(\mathcal{B}).$$

Obviously, by (i), (ii) above,  $K$  is a self-adjoint Hilbert-Schmidt operator<sup>1</sup> on

$$H := L^2(\mathcal{B}),$$

that is,  $K \in L_2(H)$ . By a generalization of Mercer's theorem to compact spaces,  $K$  is even of trace class, that is, a nuclear operator, cf. [26, Theorem 2.6 and the remark thereafter]. Denote by  $\sigma(K) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \rho(K)$  the *spectrum* of  $K$ , where  $\rho(K)$  is the *resolvent set*, see e.g. [50]. By (iii) above and [24, Theorem 2.1]  $K$  is nonnegative definite (as a linear operator on  $H$ ), that is,

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} f(x)Kg(x) dx \geq 0, \quad f, g \in L^2(\mathcal{B}),$$

see also [25, Theorem 3.1]. See Section 5 below for examples of kernels that satisfy (2.1). By the spectral theorem, under Assumption 2.1,  $K$  has at most countably many points in its spectrum  $\sigma(K)$ , all of those being real, nonnegative and zero being their only accumulation point.

**Assumption 2.2.** Let  $w(x, y) := J(x - y)$ , where  $J \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , such that  $w$  satisfies Assumption 2.1 on  $\mathcal{B}$ . This assumption that the kernel only depends on the difference is typical for neural field models [14].

Note that upon setting

$$\bar{g}(x) := \begin{cases} g(x), & x \in \mathcal{B}, \\ 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{B}, \end{cases}$$

we have the convolution representation  $Kg = J * \bar{g}$ . Let  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence of positive real eigenvalues of  $K$  on  $H$ . In our situation, w.l.o.g.  $\lambda_i \rightarrow 0$ , for  $i \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\{\lambda_i\} \in \ell^2$  and there is a (possibly finite) orthonormal system  $\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of eigenfunctions for  $K$ . By the spectral theorem,

$$H = \ker K \oplus \overline{\text{span}\{e_i\}}$$

where the decomposition is orthogonal, cf. [50]. Denote

$$S := (\ker K)^\perp = \overline{\text{span}\{e_i\}}.$$

$S$  is a closed Hilbert subspace of  $H$ . The space  $S$  is key to reformulate the problem. The next step is to endow it with a norm. To emphasize this, we set

$$H_{-1} := S$$

and consider the (*nonlocal*) norm

$$\|g\|_{-1} := \|g\|_{H_{-1}} := \|K^{-\frac{1}{2}}g\|_H, \quad g \in S,$$

where  $K^{-\frac{1}{2}} : S \rightarrow S$  is the operator square root of the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse  $K^{-1} : S \rightarrow S$  of  $K : H \rightarrow S$ , see [29, Section 2.1.2].  $H_{-1}$  is a separable Hilbert space with nonlocal norm and inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{-1} := (K^{-\frac{1}{2}}\cdot, K^{-\frac{1}{2}}\cdot)_H$ . Note that  $K^{-1}$  is nonnegative on  $S$  and that  $K^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  is

<sup>1</sup>Let  $U, V$  be separable Hilbert spaces,  $L_2(V) := L_2(V, V)$ , where  $L_2(U, V)$  denotes the space of *Hilbert-Schmidt operators* from  $U$  to  $V$ .

the pseudoinverse of  $K^{\frac{1}{2}} : H \rightarrow S$ . The space  $H_{-1}$  will be used below to reformulate the neural field equation. For later use, we also note the relation

$$(2.2) \quad \|g\|_H \leq \|K^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L(H)} \|g\|_{-1} \quad g \in S,$$

which just follows from the definitions and where for separable Hilbert spaces  $U, V$ , we denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{L(U,V)}$  the *operator norm* and we set  $\|\cdot\|_{L(U)} := \|\cdot\|_{L(U,U)}$ .

Let us also define  $H_1 := K(S)$  with norm  $\|g\|_{H_1} := \|K^{\frac{1}{2}}g\|_H$ . Of course,  $\|\cdot\|_{H_1}$  is also defined for elements in  $H$  or  $S$ , however, it is zero on  $\ker K$  and  $\{h \in S : K^2h = 0\}$ .

*Remark 2.3.* Comparing to local operators, one may employ the analogy  $K - 1 \sim \Delta$ , where  $\Delta$  denotes the Dirichlet Laplacian. Then the analog to  $H_1$  is the Sobolev space  $H_0^1(\mathcal{B})$  (assuming sufficiently good boundary regularity for  $\partial\mathcal{B}$  here) and, in a similar manner,  $H_{-1}$  is a nonlocal variant of  $H^{-1}(\mathcal{B}) := (H_0^1(\mathcal{B}))^*$  (the topological dual space of  $H_0^1(\mathcal{B})$ ). However, in contrary to the local situation, where we have a triple of continuous (and dense) embeddings

$$H_0^1(\mathcal{B}) \hookrightarrow H \cong H^* \hookrightarrow H^{-1}(\mathcal{B}),$$

we have in the nonlocal situation that

$$H_1 \hookrightarrow H_{-1} \hookrightarrow H \quad \text{continuously.}$$

Furthermore, under a spectral gap property for  $K$ ,  $\ker K \equiv \{0\}$ , which would yield  $H = H_{-1} = H_1 = S$  as sets of points (not as normed spaces). Let us also remark that, since we assume that  $K$  is of convolution type, we can follow the arguments of [4, pp. 32–34] to see that the largest eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  of  $K$  satisfies  $\lambda_1 < 1$ , yielding a spectral gap for  $K - 1$ . In summary, our functional setting is a natural analogous, yet sufficiently generalized, candidate to deal with nonlocal terms.

### 3. THE STOCHASTIC AMARI MODEL

On a filtered normal probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}, \mathbb{P})$ , let  $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  be a *cylindrical Wiener process* with values in  $H$  and covariance  $Q := \text{Id}$  equal to the identity operator on  $H$ . Let  $\{v_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset H$  be a complete orthonormal system for  $H$  and let  $\{\beta_t^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a collection of independent real valued standard Brownian motions modeled on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}, \mathbb{P})$ . Then  $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  has the formal representation

$$(3.1) \quad W_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} v_i \beta_t^i, \quad t \geq 0,$$

which is a standard Wiener process in a weaker separable Hilbert space  $U$ , such that there exists a Hilbert-Schmidt embedding  $\iota : H \rightarrow U$ ,  $\iota \in L_2(H, U)$  and  $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  has the covariance operator  $\iota^*$ . By [20, Proposition 4.7 and Proposition 4.8], then  $(\iota^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}(U) = H$ , and one can always find  $U$  and  $\iota$  with the above properties such that the representation (3.1) holds; see [20, Chapter 4] for details<sup>2</sup>. Now, let  $B \in L(H)$  denote the coefficient/covariance operator for the noise term in our equation.

**Assumption 3.1.** *Assume that the covariance operator of the noise  $B \in L_2(H)$  is Hilbert-Schmidt, nonnegative and symmetric.*

This assumption essentially enforces the need for spatial correlations in dimension  $d \geq 2$ , see [20]. However, these correlations are indeed quite natural in the modeling setup so we do not give up relevant generality here. See [14, p. 91] for a justification in terms of neuroscience to

<sup>2</sup>For our purposes, it is sufficient to set  $U$  equal to the abstract completion of  $L^2(\mathcal{B})$  with respect to the alternative scalar product  $(u, v)_U := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} n^{-2} \hat{u}_n \hat{v}_n$ , where  $u, v \in H$  and  $\{\hat{u}_n\}, \{\hat{v}_n\} \in \ell^2$  are such that  $u = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hat{u}_n v_n$  and  $v = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hat{v}_n v_n$ . Then  $\iota := \text{Id}$  is a Hilbert-Schmidt embedding from  $H$  into  $U$ .

have a nonlocal covariance operator as  $B := K$ . Now, we have access to stochastic integration theory in infinite dimensions, in particular, the expressions

$$BW_t = \int_0^t B dW_s, \quad \text{and} \quad (v, BW_t)_H, \quad v \in H, \quad t \geq 0,$$

for the cylindrical Wiener process  $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  as above can be given a meaning, see [20, Proposition 4.26 and its proof]. Note that by our assumptions,  $\{BW_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is just a  $B^2$ -Wiener process on  $H$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Assumption 3.2.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  be a globally Lipschitz continuous gain function.*

Typically, we might want to include the *sigmoid function*  $f(s) = (1 + e^{-s})^{-1}$  or  $f(s) = (\tanh(s) + 1)/2$  as examples, which are commonly used in the analysis of neural fields [14]. Let  $F(g)(x) := f(g(x))$ ,  $g \in H$ , be the associated Nemytskii operator for  $f$ . Since  $f$  is Lipschitz, we get that  $F$  is a nonlinear Lipschitz continuous operator  $F : H \rightarrow H$ , see e.g. [56, Theorem II.3.2].

Formalizing equation (1.1), let  $\alpha > 0$  (decay rate for the potential),  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  (noise level parameter) and consider the following stochastic integro-differential equation in  $H$ :

$$(3.2) \quad dU_t = [-\alpha U_t + KF(U_t)] dt + \varepsilon B dW_t, \quad U_0 = u_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{B}), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where  $T > 0$  is some finite time horizon. We start by recalling the main solution concepts and their relation.

**Definition 3.3.** A *mild solution* to (3.2) is an  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -adapted stochastic process  $U \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H)$  with<sup>4</sup>  $U_0 = u_0 \in H = L^2(\mathcal{B})$  and

$$(3.3) \quad U_t = e^{-\alpha t} u_0 + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} KF(U_s) ds + \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} B dW_s \quad \text{in } H,$$

for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

**Definition 3.4.** A *solution* to (3.2) is a predictable stochastic process  $U \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H)$  with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Bochner integrable trajectories  $t \mapsto U_t$  and with<sup>4</sup>  $U_0 = u_0 \in H = L^2(\mathcal{B})$  such that

$$(U_t, v)_H = (u_0, v)_H + \int_0^t (-\alpha U_s + KF(U_s), v)_H ds + \varepsilon (v, BW_t)_H,$$

for every  $v \in H$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Under our assumptions, for<sup>4</sup>  $u_0 \in H$ , a mild solution to (3.2) is a solution to (3.2) and vice versa.*

*Proof.* We note that  $F : H \rightarrow H$  is a bounded operator and that the domain of the infinitesimal generator of the  $C_0$ -semigroup  $\{e^{-t\alpha}\}_{t \geq 0}$  is all of  $H$  (which is just identity times  $-\alpha$ ). The claim follows now from [20, Theorem 5.4 (and its proof) and Appendix A]. See also [41, Proposition G.0.5].  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** Note that in our case, the notion of a solution in  $H$  coincides both with the so-called *analytically strong solutions* and *analytically weak solutions* as defined e.g. in [41, Appendix G]. We also note that a solution is called *weak solution* in [20].

For  $u_0 \in H$ , we may assume that there exists a unique solution to (3.2) and that  $U \in C([0, T]; H)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., see [38, p. 5] and also [20, Proposition 7.5].

The next step is to study the gradient structure.

<sup>3</sup>Compare with [14, p. 91, equation (6.55)], where a model for spatial correlations of the noise being precisely  $B^2 := K^2$  is given.

<sup>4</sup>Or, more generally, with  $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P}; L^2(\mathcal{B}))$ .

**3.1. Gradients in Hilbert space.** Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be any primitive function of  $f$ . Define

$$\Phi(u) := \int_{\mathcal{B}} \varphi(u(x)) \, dx, \quad u \in H,$$

and

$$\Psi(u) = \Psi^\alpha(u) := \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{\mathcal{B}} |(K^{-\frac{1}{2}}u)(x)|^2 \, dx = \frac{\alpha}{2} \|u\|_{-1}^2, \quad u \in S.$$

**Lemma 3.7.**  $\Phi$  is well-defined, finite for all  $u \in H$  and continuous in  $H$ . Furthermore, we have that

$$D\Phi(u)h = (F(u), h)_H, \quad u, h \in H,$$

where  $D\Phi(u)h$  denotes the Gâteaux-directional derivative of  $\Phi$  in  $u$  and in direction  $h$ .

*Proof.* We start by proving the claimed properties of  $\Phi$ . By the Lipschitz property of  $f$ ,

$$(3.4) \quad |f(r)| \leq |f(0)| + \text{Lip}(f)|r|, \quad r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For  $r > 0$ , by the mean-value theorem, there exists  $r_0 \in (0, r)$  with

$$\varphi(r) - \varphi(0) = rf(r_0).$$

Hence

$$|\varphi(r)| \leq \text{Lip}(f)|r||r_0| + |f(0)||r| + |\varphi(0)| \leq \text{Lip}(f)|r|^2 + |f(0)||r| + |\varphi(0)|.$$

Replacing  $r$  by  $-r$  yields the same bound for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . The first claim follows now by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem.

For the second claim, let  $u, h \in H$ . Let  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $t \neq 0$ . By the mean-value theorem, for almost every  $x \in \mathcal{B}$ , there exists  $\theta_{x,t} \in (0, 1)$  with

$$\frac{1}{t} \varphi(u(x) + th(x)) - \varphi(u(x)) = f(u(x) + \theta_{x,t}th(x))h(x)$$

and the right-hand side converges to  $f(u(x))h(x)$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$  for almost every  $x \in \mathcal{B}$ . We have that

$$\frac{1}{t} [\Phi(u + th) - \Phi(u)] = \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathcal{B}} [\varphi(u(x) + th(x)) - \varphi(u(x))] \, dx.$$

By the Lipschitz property of  $f$  and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, the right hand side converges to  $\int_{\mathcal{B}} f(u(x))h(x) \, dx = (F(u), h)_H$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

Lemma 3.7 already indicates, how we might be able deal with the nonlocal term. We define the functional

$$(3.5) \quad \Theta(u) := -\Phi \upharpoonright_S (u) + \Psi(u), \quad u \in S,$$

where  $\Phi \upharpoonright_S$  denotes the restriction of  $\Phi$  to  $S$ .  $\Theta$  is obviously continuous on  $H_{-1}$ . Furthermore, we have the following key lemma.

**Lemma 3.8.** *We have that*

$$D\Phi \upharpoonright_S (u)h = (KF(u), h)_{-1}, \quad u, h \in H_{-1},$$

where  $D\Phi \upharpoonright_S (u)h$  denotes the Gâteaux-directional derivative of  $\Phi \upharpoonright_S$  in  $u$  and in direction  $h$ .

*Proof.* Clearly,  $u, h \in H_{-1} \hookrightarrow H$  and thus by the proof of Lemma 3.7,

$$\begin{aligned} D\Phi(u)h &= (F(u), h)_H = (KF(u), K^{-1}h)_H \\ &= (K^{-\frac{1}{2}}KF(u), K^{-\frac{1}{2}}h)_H = (KF(u), h)_{-1} \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *We have that*

$$D\Theta(u)h = \alpha(u, h)_{-1} - (KF(u), h)_{-1}, \quad u, h \in H_{-1},$$

where  $D\Theta(u)h$  denotes the Gâteaux-directional derivative of  $\Theta$  in  $u$  and in direction  $h$ .

*Proof.* We get from [56, p. 91], that the Fréchet derivative and thus the Gâteaux-directional derivative of  $\Psi$  is given by the following formula  $D\Psi(u)h = \alpha(u, h)_{-1}$ . The claim follows now from the preceding discussion, Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8.  $\square$

*Remark 3.10.* In the case that  $K$  is nonpositive definite, we can redefine  $H_{-1}$  by replacing  $K$  by  $-K$  in the definition. Now, by changing the sign for  $\Theta$  in (3.5), we obtain a gradient by a similar procedure. We can interpret the case of nonnegative definite symmetric kernels as domination by excitation, while the case of nonpositive definite kernels corresponds to domination of the inhibition effects.

**3.2. Gradient flow formulation.** Having completed the nonlocal functional setting, we now consider the stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE)

$$(3.6) \quad dV_t = -D\Theta(V_t) dt + \varepsilon B dW_t, \quad V_0 = u_0 \in H_{-1},$$

where  $W$  is a cylindrical Wiener process with values in  $H$  and  $B \in L_2(H)$  is nonnegative and symmetric as in the beginning of this section.

**Definition 3.11.** A *solution* to (3.6) is an  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -adapted stochastic process  $V \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H_{-1})$  with  $V_0 = u_0 \in H_{-1}$  and

$$(V_t, h)_{-1} = (u_0, h)_{-1} - \int_0^t D\Theta(V_s)h ds + \varepsilon (h, BW_t)_{-1},$$

for every  $h \in H_{-1}$  and every  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Of course, we also have to prove that the solutions of our gradient-flow formulation indeed coincide with the solution concept for the original formulation of the neural field equations. In particular, in order to prove the invariance of the smaller subspace  $H_{-1}$  under the solutions in the original formulation for initial data in  $H_{-1}$ , we need to assume that the spatial correlations of the noise  $W$ , which are given by the covariance operator  $B$ , are sufficiently small relative to the spectrum of  $K$  in a summable way, that is,

$$(3.7) \quad \{b_i^2 \lambda_i^{-1}\} \in \ell^1,$$

where we assume that  $B$  is diagonalized with respect to the same orthonormal system as  $K$  with eigenvalues

$$Be_i = b_i e_i \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For instance,  $B := K$  is an example which yields relation (3.7), as  $K$  is of trace class in  $H$  by Mercer's theorem. We have the following:

**Lemma 3.12.** *Assume that  $B \in L_2(H)$  is diagonalized with respect to  $\{e_i\}$  with eigenvalues  $\{b_i\}$ . Then (3.7) holds if and only if  $B \in L_2(H, H_{-1})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $B$  have the specific decomposition as assumed. Then  $B$  and  $K$  (and thus  $B$  and  $K^{-1}$ ) commute on  $S$ . Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|Be_i\|_{H_{-1}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (K^{-\frac{1}{2}}Be_i, K^{-\frac{1}{2}}Be_i)_H = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (B^2K^{-1}e_i, e_i)_H = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_i^2}{\lambda_i}$$

and thus  $B \in L(H, H_{-1})$  if and only if (3.7) holds.  $\square$

We can compare the solutions to (3.2) and (3.6) in the following way. The mentioned invariance result is postponed to the next subsection.

**Proposition 3.13.** *Assume that  $B \in L_2(H)$  is diagonalized with respect to  $\{e_i\}$  with eigenvalues  $\{b_i\}$ . Suppose that  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ . If  $\{b_i\} \in \ell^2$  satisfies (3.7) (or equivalently,  $B \in L_2(H, H_{-1})$ ) then a solution to (3.2) is a solution to (3.6).*

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be a solution to (3.2). By Theorem 3.16 below, we see that  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$  and the assumed relation (3.7) imply that

$$U \in L^2(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; H_{-1})).$$

For any  $h \in H_{-1}$  there exists  $v \in H$  with  $Kv = h$ . We see that

$$(U_t, v)_H = (u_0, v)_H + \int_0^t (-\alpha U_s + KF(U_s), v)_H ds + \varepsilon(v, BW_t)_H,$$

is equivalent to

$$(U_t, K^{-1}h)_H = (u_0, K^{-1}h)_H + \int_0^t (-\alpha U_s + KF(U_s), K^{-1}h)_H ds + \varepsilon(K^{-1}h, BW_t)_H.$$

Thus, just using the definitions of the nonlocal norms, we get

$$(U_t, h)_{-1} = (u_0, h)_{-1} + \int_0^t (-\alpha U_s + KF(U_s), h)_{-1} ds + \varepsilon(h, BW_t)_{-1}.$$

Finally, the representation of  $D\Theta(\cdot)$ , proved above, yields

$$(U_t, h)_{-1} = (u_0, h)_{-1} - \int_0^t D\Theta(U_s)h ds + \varepsilon(h, BW_t)_{-1}. \quad \square$$

**Corollary 3.14.** *Assume that  $B \in L_2(H)$  is diagonalized with respect to  $\{e_i\}$  with eigenvalues  $\{b_i\}$ . Suppose that  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ . Then a solution to (3.6) is a solution to (3.2).*

*Proof.* This is proved by reading the chain of equations in the proof of Proposition 3.13 backwards.  $\square$

Although we now know that solutions are indeed equivalent, we have to show that they stay in the nonlocal space  $H_{-1}$  if they start in  $H_{-1}$  as our gradient flow formulation is only valid for this space.

**3.3. Galerkin approximation and invariance of  $H_{-1}$  under the flow.** The idea to show invariance is to use a finite-system approximation idea in combination with Itô's formula. Let  $\{v_i\}$  be an orthonormal basis of  $H$ . For simplicity and in order to obtain commutation of the operators  $B$  and  $K$ , we shall assume as above that  $B \in L_2(H)$  is diagonalized with respect to  $\{e_i\}$  with eigenvalues  $\{b_i\}$ . Consider  $u_0 \in H$  and let  $u^{i,N}$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$  be a solution to the  $N$ -dimensional Galerkin system of stochastic ordinary differential equations (SODEs)

$$(3.8) \quad du_t^{i,N} = [-\alpha u_t^{i,N} + (KF)^{i,N}(u_t^{1,N}, \dots, u_t^{N,N})] dt + \varepsilon b_i d\beta_t^i, \quad u_0^{i,N} = u_0,$$

for each  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . Here,  $(KF)^{i,N}$  are given by

$$(KF)^{i,N}(u_t^{1,N}, \dots, u_t^{N,N}) = \int_{\mathcal{B}} f \left( \sum_{j=1}^N u_t^{j,N}(x) e_j(x) \right) \left( \int_{\mathcal{B}} w(x, y) e_i(y) dy \right) dx,$$



compare with [38, Section 8]. Let  $U$  be a solution to (3.2). The  $N$ th Galerkin approximation  $U^N$  to  $U$  is defined by

$$(3.9) \quad U_t^N = \sum_{i=1}^N u_t^{i,N} e_i.$$

The following theorem can be found in [38, Theorem 8.1].

**Theorem 3.15.** *For every  $T > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|U_t - U_t^N\|_H \right] = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Having finished our preparations we can now show that if we choose the initial datum  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ , we remain in the subspace  $H_{-1}$ . This is a consequence of the following invariance result.

**Theorem 3.16.** *Let  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ . Assume that  $B \in L_2(H)$  is diagonalized with respect to  $\{e_i\}$  with eigenvalues  $\{b_i\}$ . Suppose that  $\{b_i\} \in \ell^2$  satisfies (3.7). Then  $U \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H_{-1})$  and there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$(3.10) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|U_t\|_{-1}^2 \right] \leq C \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + \varepsilon^2 C,$$

where  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  is as in (3.2).

*Proof.* Note that since  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ , we may assume that  $U^N \in C([0, T]; H_{-1})$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., see the discussion in [38, Sections 3 and 8]. Also, in this case,

$$(KF)^{i,N}(u_t^{1,N}, \dots, u_t^{N,N}) = \lambda_i \int_{\mathcal{B}} f \left( \sum_{j=1}^N u^{j,N}(x) e_j(x) \right) e_i(x) dx.$$

We also have to consider the truncated action of the kernel defined by

$$K^N v := \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (e_i, v)_H e_i.$$

Applying Itô's formula (see [20, Theorem 4.32]) for the functional  $v \mapsto \|v\|_{-1}^2$  yields

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|U_t^N\|_{-1}^2 &= \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + 2 \int_0^t (-\alpha U_s^N + K^N F(U_s^N), U_s^N)_{-1} ds \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t (U_s^N, b_i e_i d\beta_s^i)_{-1} + t\varepsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^N b_i^2 \lambda_i^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $K^N$  is a nonnegative definite operator. We see that  $dt \otimes \mathbb{P}$ -a.e., by the spectral decomposition of  $U^N$  and  $K^{-1}$  and orthogonality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-\alpha U^N + K^N F(U^N), U^N)_{-1} \\
&= -\alpha \|U^N\|_{-1}^2 + \left( \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j (e_j, F(U^N))_H e_j, K^{-1} U^N \right)_H \\
(3.12) \quad &= -\alpha \|U^N\|_{-1}^2 + \left( \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j (e_j, F(U^N))_H e_j, \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k^{-1} (U^N, e_k)_H e_k \right)_H \\
&= -\alpha \|U^N\|_{-1}^2 + (F(U^N), U^N)_H \\
&\leq -\alpha \|U^N\|_{-1}^2 + [|f(0)| + \text{Lip}(f)] \|K\|_{L(H)} \|U^N\|_{-1}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.4) and (2.2). To bound  $U_t^N$  uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$ , we are going to use the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, the Young inequality, and Gronwall's lemma to show that there exist constants  $C := [|f(0)| + \text{Lip}(f)] \|K\|_{L(H)} > 0$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\delta < \frac{1}{2} e^{2(\alpha-C)T}$  and  $\kappa(\delta) > 0$ , i.e., we first estimate (3.11) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|U_t^N\|_{-1}^2 \right] &\leq e^{2(C-\alpha)T} \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + e^{2(C-\alpha)T} \delta \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|U_s^N\|_{-1}^2 ds \\
&\quad + e^{2(C-\alpha)T} T \varepsilon^2 \kappa(\delta) \sum_{i=1}^N b_i^2 (e_i, e_i)_{-1} \\
&\leq e^{2(C-\alpha)T} \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + e^{2(C-\alpha)T} \delta \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|U_s^N\|_{-1}^2 \right] \\
&\quad + e^{2(C-\alpha)T} T \varepsilon^2 \kappa(\delta) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \lambda_i^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.7), we get that there exists another constant  $C > 0$  with

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|U_t^N\|_{-1}^2 \right] \leq C \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + \varepsilon^2 C$$

for each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|U_t^N\|_{-1}^2 \right] \leq C \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + \varepsilon^2 C.$$

Hence  $\{U^N\}$  has a subsequence  $\{U^{N_k}\}$  that converges in the weak\* sense in the Banach space  $L^2(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; H_{-1}))$  to some element  $\tilde{U} \in L^2(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; H_{-1}))$ . Since  $H_{-1}$  is continuously embedded into  $H$ , we see by Theorem 3.15 that  $\tilde{U} = U$  holds  $dt \otimes \mathbb{P}$ -a.e.. We conclude the proof by noting that the  $L^2(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; H_{-1}))$ -norm is lower semi-continuous with respect to weak\*-convergence. Hence, we can pass on to the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.13) and get that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|U_t\|_{-1}^2 \right] \leq C \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + \varepsilon^2 C$$

which indeed just means that the solution stays in  $H_{-1}$ .  $\square$

**3.4. Pathwise regularity of the flow.** In addition to the construction of the flow, it is often helpful, sometimes even imperative, to have finer control over its regularity. Let  $V \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H_{-1})$  be a solution to (3.6) for the initial datum  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ . Consider the Doss-Sussmann transformation

$$Y := V - \varepsilon BW,$$

which is an established tool for certain classes of SPDEs [17]. Then  $Y$  satisfies the random partial differential equation (RPDE)

$$(3.14) \quad dY_t = -D\Theta(Y_t + \varepsilon BW_t) dt, \quad Y_0 = u_0.$$

If  $Y$  is a pathwise solution for (3.14), we may transform back by setting  $V(\omega) = Y(\omega) + \varepsilon BW(\omega)$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Note that we may have to drop the assumption that the filtered probability space is normal in order to obtain a collection of paths which fits our purposes. We shall use the formulation of (3.14) in order to prove additional regularity for the gradient flow  $V$ .

**Proposition 3.17.** *Suppose that for fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $t \mapsto BW_t(\omega)$  is càdlàg<sup>5</sup> in  $H_{-1}$  and that*

$$(3.15) \quad BW(\omega) \in L^2([0, T]; H_{-1})$$

*Let  $V$  be a solution to (3.6) for the initial datum  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ . Then the map  $t \mapsto V_t$  is weakly continuous in  $H_{-1}$  and strongly right-continuous in  $H_{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* The strategy of the argument can, e.g., be found in another setting in [27, Proof of Theorem 2.6]. Since we work with an RPDE pathwise, we may apply the chain rule [56, Section III.4] for the functional  $v \mapsto \|v\|_{-1}^2$  such that for any  $\kappa \geq 0$ ,

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|Y_t\|_{-1}^2 e^{-\kappa t} \\ &= \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 - 2 \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} (D\Theta(Y_s + \varepsilon BW_s), Y_s)_{-1} ds - \kappa \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|Y_s\|_{-1}^2 ds \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 - 2\alpha \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|Y_s + \varepsilon BW_s\|_{-1}^2 ds + 2\alpha\varepsilon^2 \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} (Y_s + BW_s, BW_s)_{-1} ds \\ &\quad + 2[|f(0)| + \text{Lip}(f)] \|K\|_{L(H)} \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|Y_s + \varepsilon BW_s\|_{-1} \|Y_s\|_{-1} ds \\ &\quad - \kappa \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|Y_s\|_{-1}^2 ds \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + \frac{\alpha\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|BW_s\|_{-1}^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|Y_s\|_{-1}^2 ds + C\varepsilon^2 \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|BW_s\|_{-1}^2 ds - \kappa \int_0^t e^{-\kappa s} \|Y_s\|_{-1}^2 ds; \end{aligned}$$

compare with (3.12). Choosing  $\kappa = C$  yields

$$\|Y_t\|_{-1}^2 e^{-Ct} \leq \|u_0\|_{-1}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \left(C + \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \int_0^t e^{-Cs} \|BW_s\|_{-1}^2 ds,$$

which is finite by (3.15). As, in particular,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|Y_t\|_{-1}^2 < \infty$$

---

<sup>5</sup>That is, *right-continuous with left limits*.

and since  $t \mapsto Y_t = V_t - BW_t$  is continuous in  $H$ , we get by the continuous embedding  $H_{-1} \hookrightarrow H$  that  $t \mapsto Y_t$  is continuous with respect to the weak topology in  $H_{-1}$ . Note that by the same calculation as in (3.16), we get that

$$\|Y_t\|_{-1}^2 e^{-Ct} \leq \|Y_s\|_{-1}^2 e^{-Cs} + \varepsilon^2 \left(C + \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \int_s^t e^{-Cr} \|BW_r\|_{-1}^2 dr,$$

for  $T \geq t > s \geq 0$ . Let  $t_n \in [0, T]$  with  $t_n \searrow t$ . We find that

$$\|Y_{t_n}\|_{-1}^2 e^{-Ct_n} \leq \|Y_t\|_{-1}^2 e^{-Ct} + \varepsilon^2 \left(C + \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \int_t^{t_n} e^{-Cs} \|BW_s\|_{-1}^2 ds$$

and thus

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Y_{t_n}\|_{-1}^2 \leq \|Y_t\|_{-1}^2.$$

By weak continuity in  $H_{-1}$ , we obtain that  $Y_{t_n} \rightarrow Y_t$  in  $H_{-1}$ . Since  $t \mapsto BW_t$  is right-continuous in  $H_{-1}$ , we get that  $V = Y + \varepsilon BW$  is right-continuous in  $H_{-1}$ .  $\square$

**3.5. Regularity by dissipativity.** Let us go back to the gradient SPDE (3.6) and let  $X \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H_{-1})$  be a solution to it for the initial datum  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ . Note that we can write equation (3.6) also in the form

$$(3.17) \quad dX_t = (AX_t + D\Phi(X_t)) dt + \varepsilon B dW_t, \quad X_0 = x \in H_{-1},$$

where  $A$  corresponds to the linear decay term. In the situation of higher regularity for the spatial component of the noise, we get an improved regularity result, namely, time-continuity of the trajectories of the solutions in the smaller space  $H_{-1}$ . Writing the SPDE as (3.17) proves also useful when we study the invariant distributions of the flow, see the subsequent Section 4.

We have that  $A : H_{-1} \rightarrow H_{-1}^* \cong H_{-1}$  is just  $-\alpha$  times the Riesz isometry of  $H_{-1}$  here:

$$(3.18) \quad (Au, \cdot)_{-1} := -\alpha(u, \cdot)_{-1} = -\alpha(K^{-1}u, \cdot)_H,$$

compare with the proof of Lemma 3.9.

To this end, let us recall the conditions from [20, Hypothesis 7.7] (reformulated for our purposes).

**Condition 3.18.** Let  $E \subset H$  be a continuously embedded separable Hilbert space. For the stochastic PDE

$$(3.19) \quad dX_t = (AX_t + F^0(X_t)) dt + \varepsilon B dW_t, \quad X_0 = u_0 \in E,$$

we consider the following conditions.

- (i) The linear operator  $A : \text{dom}(A) \subset E \rightarrow E$  generates a semigroup  $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  on  $E$  which is strongly continuous in  $(0, +\infty)$ .
- (ii) There exists  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\|S_t\|_E \leq e^{\theta t}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

- (iii) The map  $F^0 : E \rightarrow E$  is continuous (with respect to the strong topology).

- (iv) There exists  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$(A(u - v) + F^0(u) - F^0(v), u - v)_E \leq \rho \|u - v\|_E^2 \quad \forall u, v \in \text{dom}(A).$$

- (v) The stochastic convolution satisfies that  $t \mapsto \varepsilon \int_0^t S_{t-s} B dW_s \in C([0, T]; E)$  for arbitrary  $T > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

**Theorem 3.19.** *Let  $X$  be a solution to (3.19) with initial datum  $u_0 \in H_{-1}$ . Assume that  $B \in L_2(H, H_{-1})$ . Then Condition 3.18 is satisfied for  $E := H_{-1}$ ,  $\theta := -\alpha$ ,  $(F^0(u), h)_{-1} := D\Phi(u)h$ , for  $u, h \in H_{-1}$ ,  $\rho := \text{Lip}(f)\|K\|_{L(H)} - \alpha$ .*

*As a consequence,  $X$  is a unique mild solution that satisfies  $X \in C([0, T]; H_{-1})$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.*

*Proof.* We aim at applying [20, Theorem 7.14]. Therefore, it is sufficient to verify that Condition 3.18 holds. Set  $E := H_{-1}$ .

- (i): Keeping in mind that  $\{\sqrt{\lambda_i}e_i\}$  is a complete orthonormal system for  $H_{-1}$  w.r.t. the scalar product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{-1}$ , we have the explicit spectral representation in  $H_{-1}$

$$(3.20) \quad S_t v = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \exp(-\alpha t) \left( \sqrt{\lambda_i} e_i, v \right)_{-1} \sqrt{\lambda_i} e_i, \quad v \in H_{-1}.$$

$\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  generates  $A$  and is strongly continuous in  $H_{-1}$  by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem (for sums), since the summands are dominated by  $\text{Tr}_H(K)\|v\|_{H_{-1}}$ .

- (ii): By (3.20),  $\|S_t\|_{L(H_{-1})} = \sup\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(S_t)\} = \exp(-\alpha t) \leq 1$ .  
 (iii): Clearly, by the calculation in the proof of Lemma 3.8, for  $u, v, h \in H_{-1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (F^0(u) - F^0(v), h)_{-1} &= D\Phi(u)h - D\Phi(v)h \\ &= (F(u) - F(v), h)_H \leq \text{Lip}(f)\|K\|_{L(H)}\|u - v\|_{-1}\|h\|_{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all  $h \in H_{-1}$  with  $\|h\|_{-1} \leq 1$  yields the Lipschitz continuity of  $F^0$  from  $H_{-1}$  to  $H_{-1}$ .

- (iv): This is essentially the same computation as in the proof of (iii) with  $h := u - v$  and  $\rho := \text{Lip}(f)\|K\|_{L(H)} - \alpha$ .  
 (v): This follows by  $B \in L_2(H, H_{-1})$  and [20, Theorem 5.15], noting that  $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is analytic.  $\square$

#### 4. ERGODICITY AND UNIQUE INVARIANT MEASURES

We are going to now exploit the gradient structure for the neural field equation (1.1). In particular, we are going to apply classical results, which allow for a direct computation of the unique invariant measure of the ergodic semigroup of the (stochastic) flow, see e.g. [43, 44]. To apply these results in our setting, let  $V^x : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow H_{-1}$  be the unique solution to (3.6) with initial datum  $V_0^x = x \in H_{-1}$ . Assume  $\varepsilon > 0$  here, which rules out the situation of the deterministic PDE. Define the semigroup

$$P_t G(x) := \mathbb{E}[G(V_t^x)] \quad G \in \mathcal{B}_b(H_{-1}), \quad x \in H_{-1}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where, for a topological space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_b(X)$  denotes the space of bounded Borel measurable maps from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Definition 4.1.** We say that  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is symmetric with respect to a probability measure  $\nu$  on  $(H_{-1}, \mathcal{B}(H_{-1}))$  if<sup>6</sup>

$$\int_{H_{-1}} G_1(x) P_t G_2(x) \nu(dx) = \int_{H_{-1}} G_2(x) P_t G_1(x) \nu(dx) \quad \forall G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{B}_b(H_{-1}) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

*Remark 4.2.* If  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is symmetric with respect to some  $\nu$ , then  $\nu$  is an *invariant measure* for  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , that is,

$$P_t^* \nu = \nu \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where

$$P_t^* \nu(E) := \int_{H_{-1}} P_t 1_E \nu(dx), \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(H_{-1})$$

is the dual semigroup, see [19] for details regarding these standard semigroup constructions.

<sup>6</sup>For a topological space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  denotes the *Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra*.

Note that we can write equation (3.6) also in the form

$$dX_t = (AX_t + D\Phi(X_t)) dt + \varepsilon B dW_t, \quad X_0 = x \in H_{-1},$$

where  $A$  corresponds to the linear decay term.

Clearly,  $A$  generates a  $C_0$ -contraction semigroup  $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  on  $H_{-1} = (S, \|\cdot\|_{-1})$  which is extendable to a  $C_0$ -contraction semigroup  $\{S_t^0\}_{t \geq 0}$  on the subset  $(S, \|\cdot\|_H)$  of  $H$  by the spectral theorem (more precisely, by (3.20)). The infinitesimal generator of  $\{S_t^0\}_{t \geq 0}$  is denoted by  $A^0$ . By (3.18),  $A^0$  is a realization of  $-\alpha K^{-1}$ .

Also note that by our assumptions above,  $A^0$  is self-adjoint and on  $(S, \|\cdot\|_H)$  and nonpositive definite. Set

$$\Gamma_\varepsilon := \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} (-A^0)^{-1} = \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\alpha} K,$$

which is a trace class (i.e., a nuclear) operator. Denote by  $\gamma_\varepsilon \sim N(0, \Gamma_\varepsilon)$  the centered Gaussian measure with covariance operator  $\Gamma_\varepsilon$ , which is concentrated on  $S$ , see e.g. [12].

**Theorem 4.3.** *Assume the same hypotheses as for Theorem 3.19. Then we get that the semigroup  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is strongly Markovian<sup>7</sup> and symmetric with respect to the measure*

$$(4.1) \quad \mu^\varepsilon(dz) := Z_\varepsilon^{-1} \exp(2\varepsilon^{-2}\Phi(z)) \gamma_\varepsilon(dz),$$

where  $Z_\varepsilon := \int_S \exp(2\varepsilon^{-2}\Phi(z)) \gamma_\varepsilon(dz)$ . In particular,  $\mu^\varepsilon$  is an invariant measure for  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ .<sup>8</sup>

*Proof.* We have the correct structure for our equation enabling us to apply [64, Theorem 2]. Note that ‘‘Assumption (H3)’’ in [64] follows from the proof of Theorem 3.19 above, combined with [20, Theorem 9.21]. We refer also to [18] for an historical account.  $\square$

Of course, we recognize the invariant measure (4.1) as the usual Gibbs measure well-known from statistical physics, yet here it simply ‘‘lives’’ on a nonlocal space. However, its biophysical relevance is the same as the classical one as it can be interpreted as the stationary probability of a state. In fact, even more can be said about  $\mu^\varepsilon$ . Under the assumptions above, the measure  $\mu^\varepsilon$  is in fact unique and the semigroup  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is ergodic. Recall that  $\delta_x(B) := 1_B(x)$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{B}(H_{-1})$  denotes the *Dirac measure* and  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$  denotes the *total variation* of a measure.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Assume the same hypotheses as for Theorem 3.19. Then the measure  $\mu^\varepsilon$ , as defined in (4.1), is unique and the semigroup  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is ergodic and strong Feller in the following restricted sense:*

$$\|P_t^* \delta_{x_n} - P_t^* \delta_{x_0}\|_{\text{TV}} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for any sequence of points  $x_n \in H_{-1}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x_0 \in H_{-1}$  with  $\|x_n - x_0\|_{-1} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and for any  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* See [45, Theorem 2.1], where ‘‘Assumption (H4)’’ follows in [45] follows from the proof of Theorem 3.19 above, combined with [20, Theorem 9.21].  $\square$

Uniqueness of the invariant measure (4.1) then follows from its so-called *asymptotic strong Feller property*, see [30, 31] for this notion.

**Corollary 4.5.** *Assume the same hypotheses as for Theorem 3.19. Then  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is asymptotic strong Feller.*

*Proof.* See [30, Remark 3.9].  $\square$

Under additional monotonicity and weak dissipativity assumptions on  $f$  one might even obtain decay estimates on invariant measures as e.g. in [6, 42]. However, these steps are beyond the basic framework we develop here.

<sup>7</sup>See [20, Chapter 9] for the definition of this notion.

<sup>8</sup>Of course, the semigroup  $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  also depends on  $\varepsilon > 0$ , which we suppressed in the notation.

## 5. EXAMPLES OF NONNEGATIVE DEFINITE KERNELS

To illustrate the setting, we also have to provide several concrete examples. The key restriction that is required for the gradient structure setup is the nonnegative definiteness assumption for the kernel. Let us recall the following useful generating function characterization of positive definite kernels  $w$  determined by a function  $J$  as in Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2.

**Theorem 5.1.** *A kernel  $w$  of the form  $w(x, y) = J(x - y)$ ,  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , for some function  $J : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is nonnegative definite in the sense of (2.1) if and only if there exists a finite Borel measure  $\sigma$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  for which*

$$(5.1) \quad J(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\langle y, x \rangle} \sigma(dy), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

*Proof.* See [25, Theorem 7.5] and also [54, 57].  $\square$

This result can be applied under the caveat that it essentially holds for  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , but we need to truncate and rescale accordingly (while restricting to radially symmetric support) in order to adapt it to use in our context.

We shall give a couple of classical examples.

**Example 5.2.** The following examples for  $J$  satisfy relation (5.1) for some  $\sigma$ , see e.g. [54].

- (i) (*centered Gauss distribution*)  $J(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle x, Mx \rangle}$ , where  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a symmetric and positive semi-definite matrix.
- (ii) (*centered Cauchy distribution*)  $J(x) = e^{-\sqrt{\langle x, Mx \rangle}}$ , where  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a symmetric and positive semi-definite matrix.
- (iii) (*centered Laplace distribution*)  $J(x) = (1 + \frac{1}{2}\langle x, Mx \rangle)^{-1}$ , where  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a symmetric and positive semi-definite matrix.
- (iv) (*uniform distribution on  $[-1, 1]^d$* )  $J(x) = J(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{\sin(x_j)}{x_j}$ , where the factors of the product are (by definition) equal to 1 if  $x_j = 0$ .

In fact, by [54, Theorem 1.3.13], relation (5.1) can be verified for some  $J$  with the required properties for any probability measure  $\sigma$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  which is *symmetric*, that is,  $\sigma(B) = \sigma(-B)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . These are precisely the distributions of random vectors  $X$  for which it holds that  $X$  and  $-X$  have the same distribution. In this case, we have that

$$J(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \cos(\langle y, x \rangle) \sigma(dy), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

see [54, Theorem 1.3.13] again. Hence, we can always use the Fourier relation (5.1) to (explicitly or numerically) check, whether our gradient-structure formulation applies.

*Remark 5.3.* We also point out in this context that there seems to be potential for confusion in the literature regarding nonnegative definiteness of certain classes of kernels commonly used in neural fields. For example, consider the (one-dimensional) Mexican hat kernel

$$(5.2) \quad J(x) = (1 - x^2) \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right),$$

which can easily be normalized by a positive pre-factor, scaled in the spatial variable and/or extended into higher dimensions. In a work related to neuroscience one finds the statement that “the Mexican hat kernel differs from the other kernels, since it is not positive definite” [5]. While in certain works on machine learning one finds that “Mexican hat kernel(s) are Mercer kernel(s)” [63], which just implicitly means that the Mexican hat kernel is nonnegative definite

(or positive semi-definite). Indeed, the second statement seems correct in view of (5.1) as shown by the simple calculation

$$(5.3) \quad J(x) = (1 - x^2) \exp(-x^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\xi x} e^{-\xi^2/2} \xi^2 d\xi$$

so that Fourier inversion is possible, i.e., there even exists a measure  $\sigma$  with an explicit density.

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Achleitner and C. Kuehn. On bounded positive stationary solutions for a nonlocal Fisher-KPP equation. *Nonl. Anal. A: Theor. Meth. & Appl.*, 112:15–29, 2015.
- [2] S. Amari. Dynamics of pattern formation in lateral-inhibition type neural fields. *Biol. Cybernet.*, 27:77–87, 1977.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient Flows: In Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. Birkhäuser, 2006.
- [4] F. Andreu-Vaillio, J. M. Mazón, J. D. Rossi, and J. J. Toledo-Melero. *Nonlocal diffusion problems*, volume 165 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [5] C. Bachmair and E. Schöll. Nonlocal control of pulse propagation in excitable media. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 87(11):276, 2014.
- [6] V. Barbu and G. Da Prato. Ergodicity for nonlinear stochastic equations in variational formulation. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 53(2):121–139, 2006.
- [7] F. Barret. Sharp asymptotics of metastable transition times for one-dimensional SPDEs. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 51(1):129–166, 2015.
- [8] H. Berestycki, G. Nadin, B. Perthame, and L. Ryzhik. The non-local Fisher-KPP equation: travelling waves and steady states. *Nonlinearity*, 22:2813–2844, 2009.
- [9] N. Berglund. Kramers’ law: validity, derivations and generalisations. *Markov Processes Relat. Fields*, 19(3):459–490, 2013.
- [10] N. Berglund and B. Gentz. Sharp estimates for metastable lifetimes in parabolic SPDEs: Kramers’ law and beyond. *Electronic J. Probability*, 18(24):1–58, 2013.
- [11] N. Berglund, G. D. Gesù, and H. Weber. An Eyring-Kramers law for the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation in dimension two. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 22:1–27, 2017.
- [12] V. I. Bogachev. *Gaussian measures*. Amer. Math. Soc., Rhode Island, 1998.
- [13] P. Bressloff. Stochastic neural field theory and the system-size expansion. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 70(5):1488–1521, 2009.
- [14] P. Bressloff. Spatiotemporal dynamics of continuum neural fields. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 45:(033001), 2012.
- [15] P. Bressloff and M. Webber. Front propagation in stochastic neural fields. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 11(2):708–740, 2012.
- [16] S. Coombes. Waves, bumps, and patterns in neural field theories. *Biol. Cybern.*, 93:91–108, 2005.
- [17] H. Crauel and F. Flandoli. Attractors for random dynamical systems. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 100(3):365–393, 1994.
- [18] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. A note on semilinear stochastic equations. *Differential and Integral Equations*, 1(2):143–155, 1988.
- [19] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems*, volume 229 of *London Mathematical Society lecture note series*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
- [20] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 152 of *Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 2014.
- [21] M. Enculescu and M. Bestehorn. Liapunov functional for a delayed integro-differential equation model of a neural field. *Eur. Phys. Lett.*, 77:68007, 2007.
- [22] G. Ermentrout. Neural networks as spatio-temporal pattern-forming systems. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 61(4):353, 1998.
- [23] O. Faugeras and J. Inglis. Stochastic neural field equations: a rigorous footing. *J. Math. Biol.*, 71(2):259–300, 2015.
- [24] J. C. Ferreira and V. A. Menegatto. Eigenvalues of integral operators defined by smooth positive definite kernels. *Integral Equations and Operator Theory*, 64(1):61–81, 2009.
- [25] J. C. Ferreira and V. A. Menegatto. Positive definiteness, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and beyond. *Annals of Functional Analysis*, 4(1):64–88, 2013.
- [26] J. C. Ferreira, V. A. Menegatto, and C. P. Oliveira. On the nuclearity of integral operators. *Positivity*, 13(3):519–541, 2008.



- [27] B. Gess and J. M. Tölle. Multi-valued, singular stochastic evolution inclusions. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 101(6):789–827, 2014.
- [28] S. Gourley. Travelling front solutions of a nonlocal Fisher equation. *J. Math. Biol.*, 41(3):272–284, 2000.
- [29] R. Hagen, S. Roch, and B. Silbermann. *C\*-Algebras and Numerical Analysis*. Marcel Dekker, 2001.
- [30] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 164(3):993–1032, 2006.
- [31] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. A Theory of Hypocoellipticity and Unique Ergodicity for Semilinear Stochastic PDEs. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16(0), 2011.
- [32] J. Inglis and J. MacLaurin. A general framework for stochastic traveling waves and patterns, with application to neural field equations. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 15(1):195–234, 2016.
- [33] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker–Planck equation. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- [34] A. Jüngel, C. Kuehn, and L. Trussardi. A meeting point of entropy and bifurcations in cross-diffusion herding. *Euro. J. Appl. Math.*, 28(2):317–356, 2017.
- [35] Z. Kilpatrick and B. Ermentrout. Wandering bumps in stochastic neural fields. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 12(1):61–94, 2013.
- [36] J. Krüger and W. Stannat. Front propagation in stochastic neural fields: a rigorous mathematical framework. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 13(3):1293–1310, 2014.
- [37] J. Krüger and W. Stannat. Well-posedness of the stochastic neural field equation with discontinuous firing rate. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 27(12):1–33, 2017.
- [38] C. Kuehn and M. G. Riedler. Large deviations for nonlocal stochastic neural fields. *J. Math. Neurosci.*, 4(1):1–33, 2014.
- [39] C. Laing and W. Troy. PDE methods for nonlocal models. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 2(3):487–516, 2003.
- [40] E. Lang. A multiscale analysis of traveling waves in stochastic neural fields. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 15(3):1581–1614, 2016.
- [41] W. Liu and M. Röckner. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: An Introduction*. Universitext. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [42] W. Liu and J. M. Tölle. Existence and uniqueness of invariant measures for stochastic evolution equations with weakly dissipative drifts. *Electr. Comm. Probab.*, 16:447–457, 2011.
- [43] R. Marcus. Parabolic Itô equations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 198:177–190, 1974.
- [44] R. Marcus. Parabolic Itô equations with monotone nonlinearities. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 29(3):275–286, 1978.
- [45] B. Maslowski. Strong Feller property for semilinear stochastic evolution equations and applications. In *Stochastic Systems and Optimization*, pages 210–224. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1989.
- [46] A. Mogilner and L. Edelstein-Keshet. A non-local model for a swarm. *J. Math. Biol.*, 38(6):534–570, 1999.
- [47] R. Moreno-Bote, J. Rinzel, and N. Rubin. Noise-induced alternations in an attractor network model of perceptual bistability. *J. Neurophysiol.*, 98(3):1125–1139, 2007.
- [48] F. Otto. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 26(1):101–174, 2001.
- [49] D. Poll and Z. Kilpatrick. Stochastic motion of bumps in planar neural fields. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 75(4):1553–1577, 2015.
- [50] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics I. Functional analysis*. Academic Press, New York, revised and enlarged edition, 1980.
- [51] J. Ren, M. Röckner, and F.-Y. Wang. Stochastic generalized porous media and fast diffusion equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 238(1):118–152, 2007.
- [52] M. Riedler and E. Buckwar. Laws of large numbers and Langevin approximations for stochastic neural field equations. *J. Math. Neurosci.*, 3(1):1, 2013.
- [53] M. Röckner and F.-Y. Wang. Non-monotone stochastic generalized porous media equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 245(12):3898–3935, 2008.
- [54] Z. Sasvári. *Multivariate characteristic and correlation functions*. De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston, 2013.
- [55] T. Schwalger, M. Deger, and W. Gerstner. Towards a theory of cortical columns: From spiking neurons to interacting neural populations of finite size. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 13(4):e1005507, 2017.
- [56] R. E. Showalter. *Monotone operators in Banach space and nonlinear partial differential equations*. Mathematical surveys and monographs, Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.
- [57] J. Stewart. Positive definite functions and generalizations, an historical survey. *Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics*, 6(3):409–434, 1976.
- [58] C. Topaz, A. Bertozzi, and M. Lewis. A nonlocal continuum model for biological aggregation. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 68(7):1601, 2006.

- [59] J. Touboul, G. Hermann, and O. Faugeras. Noise-induced behaviors in neural mean field dynamics. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 11(1):49–81, 2012.
- [60] R. van Ee. Dynamics of perceptual bi-stability for stereoscopic slant rivalry and a comparison with grating, house-face, and Necker cube rivalry. *Vision Res.*, 45:29–40, 2005.
- [61] M. Webber and P. Bressloff. The effects of noise on binocular rivalry waves: a stochastic neural field model. *J. Stat. Mech.*, 2013:P03001, 2013.
- [62] H. Wilson and J. Cowan. A mathematical theory of the functional dynamics of cortical and thalamic nervous tissue. *Biol. Cybern.*, 13(2):55–80, 1973.
- [63] S. Xie, A. Lawniczak, S. Krishnan, and P. Lio. Wavelet kernel principal component analysis in noisy multiscale data classification. *ISRN Computational Mathematics*, 2012:197352, 2012.
- [64] J. Zabczyk. Symmetric solutions of semilinear stochastic equations. In *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations and Applications II*, pages 237–256. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1989.

TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, RESEARCH UNIT “MULTISCALE AND STOCHASTIC DYNAMICS”, 85748 GARCHING BEI MÜNCHEN, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* ckuehn@ma.tum.de

UNIVERSITÄT AUGSBURG, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, 86135 AUGSBURG, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* jonas.toelle@math.uni-augsburg.de